

104608319023

HARPER'S ATLAS OF
AMERICAN HISTORY

WITH MAP STUDIES BY
DIXON RYAN FOX




Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

<http://www.archive.org/details/harpersatlasofam00foxduoft>

HARPER'S ATLAS
OF AMERICAN HISTORY

UNITED STATES 1920

- Original States
- States Admitted 1791-1860
- States Admitted 1861-1917
- Organized Territories 1917
- Unorganized Territories 1917



HARPER'S ATLAS
OF
AMERICAN HISTORY

Selected from
"THE AMERICAN NATION SERIES"

With
MAP STUDIES

BY
DIXON RYAN FOX, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of History
Columbia University



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON

G
1201
SIF6
1920

THE AMERICAN NATION

A History

From Original Sources by Associated Scholars

Edited by

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH.D., LL.D.

Professor of History, Harvard University



- Vol. 1 EUROPEAN BACKGROUND OF AMERICAN HISTORY. By Edward Potts Cheyney, A.M., Professor European History, University of Pennsylvania.
- Vol. 2 BASIS OF AMERICAN HISTORY. By Livingston Farrand, LL.D., President University of Colorado.
- Vol. 3 SPAIN IN AMERICA. By the late Edward Gaylord Bourne, Ph.D., formerly Professor of History, Yale University.
- Vol. 4 ENGLAND IN AMERICA. By Lyon Gardiner Tyler, LL.D., President of William and Mary College.
- Vol. 5 COLONIAL SELF-GOVERNMENT. By Charles McLean Andrews, Ph.D., Professor of American History, Yale University.
- Vol. 6 PROVINCIAL AMERICA. By Evarts Boutell Greene, Ph.D., Professor of History and Dean of College, University of Illinois.
- Vol. 7 FRANCE IN AMERICA. By the late Reuben Gold Thwaites, LL.D., formerly Secretary of the Wisconsin State Historical Society.
- Vol. 8 PRELIMINARIES OF THE REVOLUTION. By George Elliot Howard, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science, University of Nebraska.
- Vol. 9 THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By Claude Halstead Van Tyne, Ph.D., Head Professor of American History, University of Michigan.
- Vol. 10 THE CONFEDERATION AND THE CONSTITUTION. By Andrew Cunningham McLaughlin, A.M., Head Professor of History, University of Chicago.
- Vol. 11 THE FEDERALIST SYSTEM. By John Spencer Bassett, Ph.D., Professor of American History, Smith College.
- Vol. 12 THE JEFFERSONIAN SYSTEM. By Edward Channing, Ph.D., Professor of Ancient and Modern History, Harvard University.
- Vol. 13 THE RISE OF AMERICAN NATIONALITY. By Kendrick Charles Babcock, Ph.D., Dean Col. Arts and Sciences, University of Illinois.
- Vol. 14 RISE OF THE NEW WEST. By Frederick Jackson Turner, Ph.D., Professor of History, Harvard University.
- Vol. 15 JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY. By William MacDonald, LL.D., Professor of Government, University of California.
- Vol. 16 SLAVERY AND ABOLITION. By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., Professor of Government, Harvard University.
- Vol. 17 WESTWARD EXTENSION. By the late George Pierce Garrison, Ph.D., formerly Professor of History, University of Texas.
- Vol. 18 PARTIES AND SLAVERY. By Theodore Clarke Smith, Ph.D., Professor of American History, Williams College.
- Vol. 19 CAUSES OF THE CIVIL WAR. By Rear-Admiral French Ensor Chadwick, U. S. N., Retired, former President of the Naval War College.
- Vol. 20 THE APPEAL TO ARMS. By James Kendall Hosmer, LL.D., formerly Librarian of the Minneapolis Public Library.
- Vol. 21 OUTCOME OF THE CIVIL WAR. By James Kendall Hosmer, LL.D.
- Vol. 22 RECONSTRUCTION, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC. By William Archibald Dunning, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Philosophy, Columbia University.
- Vol. 23 NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. By Edwin Erle Sparks, Ph.D., President Pennsylvania State College.
- Vol. 24 NATIONAL PROBLEMS. By Davis R. Dewey, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Vol. 25 AMERICA AS A WORLD POWER. By John H. Latané, Ph.D., Professor of American History, Johns Hopkins University.
- Vol. 26 NATIONAL IDEALS HISTORICALLY TRACED. By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., Professor of Government, Harvard University.
- Vol. 27 NATIONAL PROGRESS — 1907 - 1917. By Frederic Austin Ogg, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.
- Vol. 28 INDEX TO THE SERIES. By David Maydole Matteson, A.M., Harvard College Library.

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS

AN ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Copyright 1920, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America

Published November, 1920

K-U

LIST OF MAPS

	PAGE		PAGE
United States, 1920	1	<i>Frontispiece</i>	
Mediæval Trade Routes Across Asia	1		
Conquests of the Ottoman Turks, 1300-1525	2		
The Four Voyages of Christopher Columbus, 1492-1503	3		
Schöner's Globe, with Magellan's Route and Demarcation Line	4		
Portuguese Discoveries on the Coast of Africa, 1340-1498	4		
Development of North America, 1492-1564	5		
Distribution of American Indians About 1500 by Linguistic Stocks	6		
Virginia in 1652	7		
Virginia and the Carolinas, 1689	7		
Extent of Settlement, 1652	8		
New England, New York, and East New Jersey, 1689	9		
Pennsylvania, West New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, 1689	10		
Territory of the Five Nations About 1650	11		
Settlement of Georgia, 1732-1763	11		
North America, Showing European Claims, Occupations, and Settlements, 1689	12		
Progress of French Discovery in the Interior, 1600-1762	13		
Eastern North America, 1715	14		
The Far West, 1686-1754	15		
The Western Frontier, 1763	15		
British Possessions in North America, 1765	16		
Proposed Western Colonies, 1763-1775	17		
Seat of War in the Eastern and Middle States, 1775-1780	18		
I. Lake Champlain to Albany			
II. Albany to New York			
III. New York to Delaware Bay			
Seat of War in the Southern States 1775-1781	19		
The West, 1775-1782	19		
Division of the West Proposed by France, Sept. 6, 1782, as Located on Mitchell's Map of 1755	20		
State Claims to Western Lands, 1783-1802	21		
Georgia Claims and Spanish Boundary, 1789-1802	21		
Distribution of Votes in Ratification of the Constitution, New England, 1787-1790	22		
Distribution of Votes in Ratification of the Constitution, Middle and Southern States, 1787-1788	22		
Distribution of Population, 1790	23		
Distribution of Population, 1800	23		
Presidential Election of 1800	23		
Presidential Election by States of 1801	23		
The United States, 1800	24		
Route of Lewis and Clark to Oregon and Return, 1803-1806	25		
Route of Aaron Burr, 1806-1807	26		
West Florida, 1803-1819	26		
West Florida Under the English, 1763-1780	26		
West Florida, 1756	26		
United States and Canada, 1810	27		
Indian Cessions in the Northwest, 1789-1816	28		
Northern Campaign, 1812-1814 (with Inset)	28		
Chesapeake Campaign, 1814	29		
Treaty with Spain, 1819	30		
House Vote on the Tariff, April 18, 1816	31		
Jackson's Indian and Gulf Campaigns, 1813-1818	31		
Cessions of Indian Lands, 1816-1830	32		
Distribution of Population, 1820	33		
Distribution of Population, 1830	33		
Presidential Election of 1824, Electoral Vote	33		
Presidential Election of 1825, in House of Representatives	33		
Highways and Waterways in the United States, 1826-1830	34		

LIST OF MAPS

	PAGE		PAGE
Latin American States, 1823	35	Seat of War in the West, 1861-1865	56
House Vote on Tariff Bill, April 16, 1824	35	Neighborhood of Richmond	57
House Vote on Tariff Bill, April 22, 1828	35	Shenandoah Valley, 1861-1865	57
Western Indians, Trading Posts, and Routes of Travel, 1820-1835	36	Central Maryland and Pennsylvania, 1861-1865	58
United States, 1821	37	Seat of War in the East, 1861-1865	53
United States, 1830	38	Seat of War in the South, 1861-1865	59
House Vote on Bank Bill of 1832	39	Georgia Campaign, 1863-1864	59
House Vote on Force Bill of 1833	39	Means of Transit, March 4, 1861	60
Removal of Southern Indians, 1830-1834	39	Progress of Emancipation, 1850-1865	61
Distribution of Population, 1830	40	Trunk Line Railway Systems, 1875	62
Distribution of Population, 1840	40	Congressional Election of 1866, House of Represen- tatives	63
Presidential Election, 1836	40	Process of Reconstruction	63
Presidential Election, 1840	40	Distribution of Population, 1870	64
Texas Settlements, 1819-1837	41	Alaska Boundary Controversy, 1867-1903	65
Routes of the Underground Railroad, 1830-1865	41	Election of 1876	65
Slavery and Slave Trade, 1830-1850	42	Distribution of Population, 1880	66
Maine Boundary Controversy, 1782-1842	43	Presidential Election, 1884	67
Oregon Controversy, 1792-1846	43	Distribution of Population, 1890	68
Mountain Passes and Overland Routes, 1841-1850	44	House Vote on McKinley Tariff Bill, 1890	69
Presidential Election, 1844	44	Presidential Election, 1892	70
Presidential Election, 1848	44	House Vote on Wilson Tariff Bill, August 13, 1894	71
Mexican War, 1846-1848 (with Two Insets)	45	Proposed Isthmian Canal Routes, 1848-1884 (with Inset)	72
Test Vote on the Compromise of 1850	45	West Indies and Mexico (with Insets)	73
Territorial Growth	46	Philippines and Eastern Coast of Asia	74
Principal Routes of Trade and Migration, 1840-1850	47	Distribution of Races, 1900	75
United States, September, 1850	48	Manufacturing Areas, 1900	76
Railroad Lines in Actual Operation, October, 1850	49	Presidential Election, 1912	77
Texas Controversy and Territorial Adjustment, 1836-1850	50	House Vote on Underwood Tariff, 1913	78
Central American and Isthmian Route, 1846-1860	50	Presidential Election, 1916	79
Vote on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 1854	51	Conservation and Reclamation, 1900-1917	80
Civil War in Kansas, 1854-1856	51	Development of American Interests in the Pacific, 1791-1903	80
Party Situation Shown by Election of 1855	52	Caribbean Region, Showing Protectorates of the United States, 1917	81
Presidential Election of 1856	52	Military Expeditions to 1917	82
Value of Manufactures and Staple Agricultural Products	53	Regional Distributions of Products in the United States	82
Presidential Election of 1860	54	The Western Front in the World War	83
United States, 1860	55	Western Railroads, 1906	84
Distribution of Population, 1860	56		

FOREWORD

IN historical study, even of an elementary sort, the map has ceased to be regarded as a luxury. Yet, as every teacher knows, maps which adequately show the progress of American life have been impossible to find in a cheap, convenient form. This unobtainable necessity has, therefore, been so often a subject of complaint that it is believed that this atlas will be welcomed with somewhat of relief. The one hundred and twenty-eight maps herein presented were prepared in consultation with a number of the leading scholars in the field of American history, and it seems doubtful if the benefits of complete and special information are likely to be more satisfactorily combined.

An atlas is, of course, primarily a work of reference. Yet an orderly arrangement, as in a museum, may suggest the development of process or of life; and as a curator might carefully point out the illustrative value of such specimens and models, so here the editor has appended a short essay intended to suggest some ways in which the historical map may be of service. But he would be a sanguine teacher who expected students from these few reflections to realize for themselves the possibilities of an atlas. Consequently there is joined with it an extended course in the historical geography of the United States, in which the student, by observing these directions, works out on outline maps, easily procured, the record of a development in space as well as in time, following the national history with his hand as well as his eye. The studies are closely integrated with the atlas, by specific reference, so that it will seldom be necessary to look beyond its pages for essential facts. In many cases, however, additional information is included in the text, which the student is asked to transfer into graphic form. Citations to Professor Bassett's *Short History of the United States*, New York, 1913, and, for more elaborate treatment, to the *American Nation Series*, make the studies available as supplementary to a classroom course, or as a course in themselves, to be rounded out by lectures and library research. Naturally map studies may be cut to meet the individual requirements, and, indeed, the book is so arranged that the atlas may be used alone without reference to Part II.

There is one class of students, happily growing more numerous and important—those who study by themselves at home—whose needs have been constantly considered, and it is sincerely hoped that to many a solitary inquirer this book will bring a clearer understanding of the history of the United States.

DIXON RYAN FOX.



THE FOUR VOYAGES OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS 1492-1503

SCALE OF MILES
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700

Spanish — French —

Portuguese — Line of Voyages —

..... Coast lines not explored by Columbus



SCHÖNER'S GLOBE

with Magellan's Route
and Demarcation Line

DRAWN 1523



BORMAY & CO., N.Y.




BORMAY & CO., N.Y.



DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN INDIANS ABOUT 1500 BY LINGUISTIC STOCKS

SCALE OF MILES
0 100 200 300 400 500









**NEW ENGLAND,
NEW YORK
AND
EAST NEW JERSEY
1689**

Frontier of Settlement

R. D. Swaine, N. Y.









PROGRESS OF FRENCH DISCOVERY IN THE INTERIOR
1600 - 1762



■ Forts
■ British Possessions in 1713
■ French Possessions and Claims

SCALE OF MILES
 0 50 100 150 200










SEAT OF WAR
IN THE
EASTERN AND MIDDLE
STATES
1775-1780

SCALE OF MILES
 0 5 10 20 30 40

SPERRY & CO., N.Y.








**DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES
IN RATIFICATION OF
THE CONSTITUTION**


**MIDDLE AND SOUTHERN
STATES**

1787-1788

Based on Map

Prepared by O. G. Libby

-  Federal Majority
-  Anti-Federal Majority
-  Evenly Divided






**DISTRIBUTION OF VOTES
IN RATIFICATION OF
THE CONSTITUTION**

NEW ENGLAND


1787-1790

Based on Map

Prepared by O. G. Libby

-  Federal Majority
-  Anti-Federal Majority
-  Evenly Divided





BORNEY & CO., N. Y.



BORNEY & CO., N. Y.



**ROUTE OF
LEWIS AND CLARK
TO OREGON AND RETURN
1803-1806**
Drawn by David Maydole Matteson

SCALE OF MILES
0 25 50 100 200 300 400
Route of Lewis and Clark




WEST FLORIDA, 1803-1819

In 1810 Madison by proclamation annexed West Florida to the Perdido; but it was occupied only to the Pearl. In 1812 this part of West Florida was admitted to the Union as a portion of Louisiana. In 1813 Mobile and the country to the Perdido was occupied. In 1819 by treaty Spain ceded all territory claimed by her, east of the Mississippi, to the United States.





WEST FLORIDA UNDER THE ENGLISH, 1763-1780

In 1763 the King of Great Britain by royal proclamation limited West Florida on the west by the Mississippi R., on the north by the 31st parallel, on the east by the Chattahoochee and Apalachicola rivers; in 1767 the territory as far north as 32° 28' S was added to the government of West Florida.




It then formed portions of French Louisiana and Spanish Florida; the Perdido R. was the recognized boundary; the northern limits were undefined.



















**HIGHWAYS
AND WATERWAYS
IN THE
UNITED STATES
1826-1830**

Based on H.S. Tanner's Map of 1825

SCALE OF MILES
0 25 50 75 100 150 200

Canals
 Roads

97° 96° 95° 94° 93° 92° 91° 90° 89° 88° 87° 86° 85° 84° 83° 82° 81° 80° 79° 78° 77° 76° 75° 74° 73° 72° 71°
 46° 44° 42° 40° 38° 36° 34° 32° 30°
 BERRY & CO., N.Y.







THE UNITED STATES 1830


SCALE OF MILES
0 50 100 200 300 400 500

Canals navigable by end of 1830
National road in 1820

RODNEY & CO., N. Y.





EDMIST & CO. N.Y.





EDMIST & CO. N.Y.



BORNAY & CO., N.Y.




BORNAY & CO., N.Y.




















**VALUE OF MANUFACTURES
(IN MILLIONS)
AND DISTRIBUTION OF
STAPLE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS
1860**

Value of Manufactures shown thus: **210.1**

● Rice
 ▲ Corn
 ○ Cotton
 ◆ Tobacco
 ● Sugar

Value of Wheat produced in 1860 \$216,331,165

" " " " " " 680,001,665
 " " " " " " 20,000,000 (At 10¢ per bushel)
 " " " " " " 237,030,268 (At 10¢ per bushel)
 " " " " " " 193,710,988 (At 10¢ per bushel)





Revised 1885, U.S.G.



THE UNITED STATES


1860

SCALE OF MILES




- Distribution of slave population**
(Darkest areas have largest proportion of slaves)
- Slave States**
- Territory, all open to slavery**
(Under Compromise of 1850; under decision of Supreme Court, and under Southern claims that slavery should exist until status should be fixed by state constitution, etc.)
- Free States**






**NEIGHBORHOOD OF
RICHMOND**

GEORGE L. B. CO., N. Y.



**SHENANDOAH VALLEY
1861 - 1865**

SCALE OF MILES
0 5 10 15 20 25
DIRECT U.S. GEO. S. I.







MEANS OF TRANSIT
March 4, 1861

SCALE OF MILES
0 25 50 100 150 200

— Navigable Rivers
— Canals
— Railroads

Longitude West from Greenwich

91° 87° 83°





**TRUNK LINE
RAILWAY SYSTEMS
Disregarding minor branches
1875**

SCALE OF MILES
0 50 100 200 300

Lines controlled by parent companies in 1865 (green)
Lines acquired or constructed 1865-1875 (red)


- Pennsylvania
- Erie
- Baltimore & Ohio
- Grand Vermont
- Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
- Chicago & Northwestern
- Vanderbilt Lines
- Toledo, Wabash & Western
- Chicago, Alton & St. Paul
- Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific





DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION 1870

	Under 2 in hab. per sq. mile
	2 to 6 " " "
	6 to 18 " " "
	18 to 45 " " "
	45 to 90 in hab. per sq. mile
	90 and over
	Indian Reservation
	Range or Hunting Ground
	Center of Population






**DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION
1880**

	Under 2 inhab. per sq. mile
	2 to 6
	6 to 18
	18 to 45 inhab. per sq. mile
	45 to 90
	90 and over

Center of Population

BERRY ENG. CO., N. Y.






DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION 1890









[White box]	Under 2 inhabitants to a square mile
[Light gray box]	2 to 5 "
[Medium gray box]	6 to 18 "
[Dark gray box]	18 to 25 "
[Cross-hatched box]	25 to 50 "
[Dense cross-hatched box]	50 and over "

BEHNEY ENGRAVING CO., N.Y.

115° 107° 103° 99° Longitude West 95° from Greenwich 91° 87° 83° 79° 75°



HOUSE VOTE ON MCKINLEY TARIFF BILL 1890

	Affirmative (161)		Negative (142)		Not voting (21) (2 vacancies)
	2 Affr. 2 Neg.		Philadelphia		Baltimore
	1 Affr. 12 Neg.		Chicago		



PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION 1892

Cleveland, Democrat, electoral vote, 277
 Harrison, Republican, electoral vote, 145
 Weaver, Populist, electoral vote, 22
 Bitwell, Prohibition

Shading of the body of the state shows majority vote.
 Circles show proportional minority vote.
 Numbers in parentheses show electoral votes of the states.
 Figures show popular votes.










PHILIPPINES AND EASTERN COAST OF ASIA 1900


SCALE OF MILES



- United States
- France
- Great Britain
- Netherlands
- Japan

COAST OF THE YELLOW SEA, 1900

SCALE OF MILES




- Great Britain
- Germany
- Russia


NORTHERN LUZON


SCALE OF MILES





















BOSNAY ENGRAVING CO., N. Y.

Showing approximately the Productive Areas of principal Agricultural and other Staples, 1912.



Reprinted from a report of the U. S. Bureau of Statistics.

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTS IN THE UNITED STATES



THE WESTERN FRONT IN THE WORLD WAR

— Battle front, November 11, 1914

- - - - - Furthest German advance

Line on November 11, 1918



MAP STUDIES

LIST OF MAP STUDIES

STUDY	PAGE	STUDY	PAGE
1. The Old World: Dissatisfaction with the Way to the Indies and the Way to Heaven	111	13. Organizing a Nation: From Jealousy to Confidence	143
2. The Discovery of America: A Straitless Barrier	112	14. The New Government in Action	144
3. The Land: "My Country, 'Tis of Thee"	115	15. Agrarianism and Expansion: Attention Turning Toward the West	148
4. The Pathfinders: Spaniards and Frenchmen Penetrate the Wilderness	119	16. The Second War of Independence	150
5. The Tobacco Country: Virginia and Maryland	124	17. The Settling of the Mississippi Valley	154
6. New England: The Home of a Maritime People	125	18. Sectionalism: Economic Development of the East	156
7. The Dutch and Quaker Colonies: Great Grants and Small Farms	127	19. The Plantation Empire and the Antislavery Crusade	157
8. The Southern Plantations: The Carolinas and Georgia	129	20. Manifest Destiny: Settlement, Diplomacy, and War Carry the Boundary to the Pacific	159
9. Society and Commerce in the Young American Communities	131	21. Slavery and the Territories: From the Missouri Compromise to Secession	165
10. Latin or Saxon? The Hundred Years' War	134	22. The Civil War	167
11. Americans for America: From Irritation to Independence	139	23. The Process of Reconstruction	168
12. The Revolutionary War	142	24. Creating Wealth: Mines, Ranches, Farms, Railroads, Mills	170
		25. Third Parties and Other Critics of "Big Business"	174
		26. World Power	176
		27. Reforms and Enterprise of the Twentieth Century	179

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

AMERICAN HISTORY AND THE MAP

“**M**AN can no more be scientifically studied apart from the ground which he tills, or the lands over which he travels, or the sea over which he trades, than polar bear or desert cactus can be understood apart from its habitat. Man's relations to his environment are infinitely more numerous and complex than those of the most highly organized plant or animal. So complex are they that they constitute a legitimate and necessary object of special study. The investigation which they receive in anthropology, ethnology, sociology, and history, so far as history undertakes to explain the causes of events, fails to reach a satisfactory solution of their problem largely because the geographic factor which enters into them all has not been thoroughly analyzed. Man has been so noisy about the way he has 'conquered Nature,' and Nature has been so silent in her persistent influence over men, that the geographic factor in the equation of human development has been overlooked.”¹ In these words the leading American exponent of the science of Anthropogeography lays down its dogma.

The winning of this continent was less a conquest than an adaptation. The drama of man's effort has been conditioned to an important degree by the theater that he has played it in. Indeed, this is so clearly true that before the statement is completed it is branded commonplace; no one will disagree except those poet-historians who sing of nothing but the genius of a people, or those transcendentalists who present all history as the biography of great men. But though the phrase is glibly spoken, it generally remains the wisdom of a phrase; few there are who actually attempt to understand it by application in detail to the problems of history. Yet no one will come to knowledge of the growth and spread of the American nation from a few small shiploads of refugees and needy immigrants to a great society of scores of millions, without again and again referring to this factor.

The small particulars of coast line and hill barrier, the even reaches of pla-

¹ Ellen Churchill Semple, *Influence of Geographic Environment* (New York, 1911), p. 2.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

teaus, the stretch of waterways, the forest wilderness and open prairie, the possibilities of produce and of transportation—all these have helped or hindered, often quite determined, the course of growth. Without a constant sense of these hard and steady influences, one can never get a vivid picture of the frontier moving westward mile by mile in a jagged, ever-changing line. Without it one can never understand the specializing of our economic life with its appropriate variety of social customs; or those antipathies, almost inevitable, between Americans, who found themselves quite capable of self-support, and the English government, which looked for service to the Empire; or those between our own communities, marked off into sections finally, after a great struggle, knit together by the bonds of commerce. If one would share the thought of leaders in senate house, in military tent, or in the office rooms of mills, he must know what could and what could not be done upon this continent.

No one will get a reputation for originality by pointing out that sectionalism has been a very important factor in our history. The consciousness of difference between one group and others, set off by walls of hills or by mere intervening distance, or distinguished no less certainly by some exclusive uniformity in type of thought and work, has been so marked as to endanger the Union time after time. In nearly every section in one decade or another up to 1876 the central government was defied because some special hopes or needs had not received enough consideration. To understand this it is very clear that the map, and often a detailed map, is indispensable.

Take, for example, the New England of a hundred years ago. The map of the geologist shows it to be a "united field," a rock-dust soil which yields good product if tilled with unremitting labor. The contour map reveals a barrier ridge, the Litchfield and the Berkshire Hills, some sixty miles in breadth and about twelve hundred feet in height, supplemented at the north by a considerable lake, and giving a degree of isolation—enough to interfere with an internal trade, though not enough to hold back penetrating parties of home seekers trudging toward the West.¹ The coastal survey shows a multitude of fiord harbors, from which men were drawn to sea almost as irresistibly as from Scandinavia. "In New England the deeply embayed coasts, the narrowness of the lowland belt, and the glaciated soil were all geographic factors operating to develop maritime life."² A chart of ocean streams and winds makes clear the fortunate position of these ports near the median point in the American arc of that great current which circles around the whole North Atlantic basin.

¹ The traveler H. B. Fearon (*Sketches of America*, London, 1818, p. 108) says: "Boston is not a thriving—i.e., an increasing—town; it wants a fertile back country and it is too far from the Western states to be engaged in the supply of that new and vast emporium, except, indeed, with inhabitants, a commodity which, I am informed, they send in numbers greater than from any other quarter."

² E. C. Semple, *American History and Its Geographic Conditions* (Boston, 1903), p. 120.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Puritan faced out from his hill fence at the west through the front doors of his harbors. Here was a people of a common stock transplanted whole as a community, self-reliant in its temper, and penetrated with a sense of mission. Its spiritual aloofness, which had not passed away in 1815, had been confirmed and long sustained by the character of its homeland. It seemed an ethnographic unit on a geographic unit—the circumstances of a nation—with a full equipment of the self-satisfaction which all nations have. In the first years of the nineteenth century this people faced away from the west toward England, just as for a dozen years after the Revolution the pioneers of Tennessee had faced away from the east toward Spain beckoning from the Gulf of Mexico. The “Essex Junto” and the defiant citizens of Franklin are equally accounted for in part by the configuration of the earth’s crust.

Examining the map with greater care, we note the continuity of the Connecticut Valley and, by reference to statistics of elections, observe here a community stretching from the Sound to Dartmouth College, preserving the mental state of the eighteenth century. The people to whom this was distasteful moved over the hills and far away, to the satisfaction of the orthodox; the New-Englandism of the coastal towns was softened by commercial contact with the world; but the Connecticut Valley folk, cut off in their complacency, long went their old, tried, customary way. The district of Maine, on the other hand, because it was a frontier region, its people bitter toward their urban creditors, discovered a restless spirit, sent Democratic members up to Boston and so clamored for home rule that Boston and the Valley were glad to see it go in 1820. That there were other well-marked sections in this general area, like the interior counties of New Hampshire, or the sterile plains and bogs of southeastern Massachusetts, is strikingly illustrated in the maps of Doctor Libby, included in this book, on the vote for and against the Federal Constitution, or in the tables of votes recorded in modern monographic studies of New England history.¹

By tracing in the “fall line,” where the tumbling rivers from the mountains make their final plunge before their short glide to the sea, one notices the fortunate proximity of power to the highway of the ships, making manufacturing doubly profitable through facilities of distribution. After reading an account of the industrial expansion of a century ago, a dozen dots placed properly here and there along the line, vividly record the growth of mill towns. Even little Rhode Island, scarcely more extensive than the average county of its larger neighbors, had both waterfalls and harbors within its close constricted borders. Indeed, sometimes, as in Pawtucket, ships and water wheels were found within the con-

¹See, e.g., R. S. Purcell, *Connecticut in Transition* (Washington, 1918), pp. 97, 349, 412; A. E. Morse, *The Federalist Party to the Year 1800* (Princeton, 1909), p. 179; W. A. Robinson, *Jeffersonian Democracy in New England* (New Haven, 1916), pp. 162-165; S. B. Harding, *Massachusetts and the Federal Constitution* (New York, 1896); F. G. Bates, *Rhode Island and the Formation of the Union* (New York, 1898).

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

finer of a single town. The harnessing of power, New England's inevitable answer to the embargo, seemed another count toward self-sufficiency to the men of 1815; but they misunderstood its tendency. Through their household industries supplemented by their English trade, they had before been largely independent; the new release of energy in the mills forced them into contact with the lands beyond the Hudson. A glance at a "wool map" would make clear how necessary now was connection, by the long canals, with western New York and, afterward, Ohio, whose flocks produced the fleece that the Eastern looms could turn to gold. And more important was the new relation with the cotton kingdom, whose fleets plied back and forth between New Orleans and Boston. As industry diversified, a growing consciousness of poverty in mineral resources also must have chastened any heady craving for a life apart. By manufacturing, as easily can be traced out on a map, New England had been emancipated from itself.

Everywhere throughout the country there have flourished these sectional antipathies, impossible to understand without the map, whether we turn to the east and west of the old South, or north and south in the old Northwest, or to any other state or part. The spirit has been felt in the far West, for "during the progress of the Civil War there were frequent rumors that the people of the isolated Pacific slope, who had for ten years in vain demanded overland communication, intended erecting an independent republic."¹ It was the railroad, the bonds of steel, that finally made sectionalism no longer really dangerous to American unity.

Turnpikes, canals, and railroads shrunk the earth and drew its people into contact, making possible and easy the exchange of things and thoughts. Since culture grows with imitating new and better ways, the American life, broadened and enriched by this communication, was leveled upward by the mutual aid of the sturdy individualism of the Western pioneer, the habit of social and economic organization in the East, and the dignified tradition of public service in the South. Doubtless each patriot in the early nineteenth century thought that sectionalism was a curse upon his country and mourned because the other sections willfully refused to grow like his. Where an institution such as slavery was of great vitality and yet utterly incompatible with the settled modes of living in the other areas, the result, it is too true, was tragic, especially when one reflects that African slavery was the easiest, but not the only possible, solution of the problems of production in the South. But, with this exception, the diversity of culture caused or aided by geographic difference has been beneficial. And modern communication has fortunately not obliterated the peculiarities of sections.

Despite the sectional animosities which have raged in times now fortunately past, the land seems formed for a great and a united people. No Italic or Iberian

¹ E. E. Sparks, *The Expansion of the American People* (Chicago 1900), p. 368.

peninsula here presents the proper basis for a separate stock. The Chesapeake and Delaware Bays lead gently into, but certainly do not divide, our country as they might were they of such proportions as the Red or Baltic Seas. The pious John Jay out of this conviction wrote a paragraph in the second paper of the *Federalist*: "This country and this people seem to have been made for each other, and it appears as if it was the design of Providence that an inheritance so proper and convenient for a band of brethren, united to one another by the strongest ties, should never be split into a number of unsocial, jealous, and alien sovereignties." The German geographer Karl Ritter has remarked that the mountain ranges which sever people in Eurasia run along parallels of latitude, making homogeneous and comparatively undiversified societies. But in America, where they run along meridians, "they unite and mingle peoples of different climates, and hint at the development of a national life of far greater richness and variety than the Old World can show."¹ It is this integrity of territory made up of many parts—*E pluribus unum*—with its unescapable suggestion of destiny, which has been the theme of many a sublime oration, from those of Webster down.

It may seem that American society will soon become quite homogeneous. The stream of immigration from across the sea, which, notwithstanding eddies in the port towns, really does diverge throughout the land, carries strangers everywhere. The ease of change in residence to meet new opportunities for the individual encourages an unprecedented moving here and there. But sooner or later, it may be assumed, with the more even development of the country, this kaleidoscopic whirl will come to rest and population reach, more or less, an equipoise. Then we will have to study our maps again in the same old way, for sectionalism, though of a kind mild and advantageous to the whole, must be the result of geographical sections. He who would understand America of the twentieth century, as he who studies that of the nineteenth, must learn of her climates and her soils, and, probably, despite the airplane, her highways on the railroad levels and the navigable rivers.

Though the geography and the history of the United States are learned along with decimals and the rules of grammar in the elementary school, too often the knowledge of these subjects remains as insulated in the two sealed compartments of the mind. Yet in maturer years, a review, however hasty, shows clearly their connection and how necessary is the former to an understanding of the latter. The map that would illustrate the interests of colonial New England must include the fishing banks of Newfoundland, the islands of the Caribbean, the Guinea coast of Africa, and the British ports, as properly as the stern and rockbound coast, on which, the poetess has told us, the breaking waves dashed high. When one has traced out how food produce went from Massachusetts to the specialized

¹ R. E. Thompson, *The Hand of God in American History* (New York, 1902), p. 7.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

plantations of the Antilles, there making possible the staple cargoes to the English mills, which in their turn sent finished goods back across three thousand miles of sea to Boston, one contemplates a great triangle of trade. Later, it is observed, this three-cornered commerce was transferred westward to the continent itself. The farmers of the old Northwest sent raft-loads of cereals and pork and beef down the Mississippi to the lower South to sustain the toilers who produced the cotton for the spindles by the Merrimac, whence came the calicoes, which, slowly freighted by wagon and canal boat, were finally to clothe the mistresses of Indiana cabins. This diagram upon an outline map reveals one reason for the indifference to the wrongs of slavery prevalent in sections of the northern part of the Ohio Valley, a sentiment somewhat reformed when railroads gave the West a direct market in the Eastern towns, with possibilities of exportation.

The graphic record of migration will clearly show that the configuration of the land, and not the man-made boundaries of states, is what marks out the areas of settlement—why upper Illinois belongs in taste and tradition more with Wisconsin than with “Egypt,” caught between the rivers in the southern part of that same commonwealth; and why Cattaraugus and Chautauqua Counties in New York are culturally one with Erie, Crawford, Warren, and McKean across the Pennsylvania line. It demonstrates why the valley walled in by the ridges of the Appalachians, rising steadily to a plateau as one journeys southward from the Monongahela,¹ was settled through its length by Germans and Scotch-Irish, who, untouched by loyalties to governments seated near the coast of their respective provinces, became a force for nationalism.

The comparison of areas shaded to set forth the tariff votes throughout the nineteenth century, with those which show the distribution of extractive industry that could not well be satisfied with a home market, requires no commentary, nor does that of maps which locate silver mines with those which give the districts which supported Mr. Bryan. Then, too, the location of one's home is oftentimes an index as well as a conditioning influence. At a meeting of the American Historical Association in 1917, Prof. F. J. Turner displayed some maps designed to show how in the old Northwest the line marking the extent of the glacier, which throughout its breadth enriched the soil with silt, likewise was the boundary of a higher grade of literacy. The kind of men who lacked the “push” to move out of the barren area beyond the line had not the enterprise to learn to read and write.

The student, with a map before him, marks how the French, lured on by easy water reaches, scattered their settlement to an exhausting thinness, while the English were checked by obstacles of earth and man. He notices that the

¹ C. H. Merriam, *Life Zones and Crop Zones of the United States*, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Div. of Biological Survey, Bulletin No. 10, pp. 20-24, 30-36.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

valley of the Genesee remained a wilderness until, with Sullivan's raid, the Iroquois were crushed. He sees the settlements to the south were, as a whole, held back by the Alleghany ridges, which, though not high, presented a broad and shaggy barrier to set a bound to any hasty spread until the coastal colonies, growing strong by reason of their fertile soil and well-indented coast, could serve securely as a base. From a military point of view the French with their communication routes and, in the later phase, interior lines, were better placed, but the numbers from the close-compacted English settlements finally overwhelmed them. It is true, then, that "Nature has persistently influenced the course of man's development."

So numerous and so striking are the examples of this influence that one who reads, with long and serious attention to the map, the narrative of man's achievement, is likely to conclude that human history, like ecology, is a science which concerns itself only with how environment conditions life growth. There have been earnest essays to prove that all civilization is a geographic fact—"Der mensch ist was er isst"—that all the hopes and fears of history are but phases of the stern struggle for existence upon the lands and waters of the earth. Some historians, like Henry Thomas Buckle, have maintained that man's physical surroundings have determined his major motives not only through his economic life, but in what we call æsthetic, intellectual, and religious interests as well—that the stormy climates make one superstitious, and smiling skies and placid hills hearten man to poetry. "In India, man was intimidated; in Greece, he was encouraged."¹

"The mountains made men free," writes Buckle. But the answer comes that those who would be free fled to the mountains. "It may be," remarks Professor Adams,² "that when England has become a memory and Holland a myth, the advocate of geographic environment will find in the rocks and in the chilling mists of New England the forces that created the Puritan conscience and dwarfed his emotion." There is danger, then, that too much contemplation of the map may lead to a one-sided "interpretation" of history, if it is not balanced with some common sense. The Rev. H. B. George, a brilliant student of the subject,³ remarks by way of illustration: "It has been said that the long political predominance of feudal aristocracy was only possible in fairly level countries. This is so far true that their military strength could only be effectively exerted in regions fit for mailed horsemen to fight in. It would, however, be preposterous to attribute the origin of feudalism to the influence of the plains. One has never heard that the Mongols, who were all horsemen and came off the boundless steppes,

¹ H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilization in England* (New York, 1884), vol. i, p. 100. The influence of geographic environment over character is discussed in pp. 86-108. Other scholars have written to show that such gently rolling country as that of Suabia and Thuringia produces artists, whereas the grandeur of the Alps seems to overpower and stunt the imagination to a degree that the Swiss make little contribution to the arts; see Heinrich von Treitschke, *Politik* (Leipzig, 1897), vol. i, p. 225.

² E. D. Adams, *The Power of Ideals in American History* (New Haven, 1912), p. x.

³ H. B. George, *The Relations of Geography and History* (Oxford, 1919), p. 14.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

developed any feudal ideas, or even the less barbarous Cossacks of later ages." "Circumstances," says another English scholar, "can unmake, but of themselves they never yet made man, or any other form of life."¹

Despite this caution it remains true that man cannot "be scientifically studied apart from the ground which he tills, or the lands over which he travels, or the seas over which he trades." But this philosophical reason is not the only one for setting the atlas side by side with the historical narrative. Even if one thought as little of environment as Carlyle or Emerson, a careful study would still be indispensable. Human influences, too, can be indicated on a map. Certain lines of the Underground Railroad are seen to have run near Quaker settlements, votes for liberty and union in the crisis of 1860 are recorded to the credit of the German immigrants in Missouri and Illinois. The geographical distribution of the New England conscience had something to do with the spread of anti-masonry and the abolition movement.

Neither can the action of men be traced if one refuses to learn where they acted. To understand the story of a war or peaceful progress, one must know place names and have a fairly accurate sense of distances. Unless one can picture with precision the political boundaries of colonies and states, and the location of rivers, bays, forts, and towns, the reading of history is the mere mumbling of words. *Est locus in rebus*. When in reading of the old South the student finds a reference to the people of the piney woods of Alabama, he misses some of the significance if he thinks that they were mountaineers. He may become confused, in studying the expansion toward the West, if he thinks that the Cumberland Road was built through Cumberland Gap. He will be puzzled as he reads of the exploits of Gen. Zachary Taylor and Commodore Sloat, unless he knows that there were two towns in Mexico named Monterey. He is apt to be misled in following Grant's campaigns, if he supposes Pittsburg Landing to be in southwestern Pennsylvania. Historical facts are localized facts, and precision in this respect is especially essential in American history, which is so much an evolution in space as well as time.

In Mark Twain's tale of the adventures of *Tom Sawyer Abroad*, the hero and the faithful Huckleberry Finn are represented steering eastward from the Mississippi in an airship. After sailing several hours they fall into a fierce contention as to the state that they are passing over. Finn believes that by this time they must have reached at least to Indiana, but his companion, with pity for this ignorance, retorts that they cannot yet be past the boundary of Illinois, for, as they look down, do they not see a stretching space of green? And in the map book they have studied is this not the color which marks the state of Illinois? Many students look upon a map in a fashion scarcely less absurd. When this

¹ R. R. Marrett, *Anthropology*, p. 129.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

type of student reads that Lincoln moved in 1830 from Indiana into Illinois, he merely draws a line an inch long from a yellow state into a green one, without the slightest effort in imagination, to visualize the little family trudging beside their wagon on the narrow, sloughy pathway leading through the forest from one clearing to another.

Something may be said for the old maps which pictured ships, sea serpents, bears, woods, and houses, for they prodded up the laggard fancy to some conception of the regions that they indicated. The map to have a meaning must be regarded as a symbol. When the student, drawing in a line to mark the route of Daniel Boone, comes to the pass through the Alleghanies, he must be forcibly reminded of that important day in the history of America when this resolute pioneer looked out upon a billowy sea of tree tops, with the same thrill at scanning boundless space that must have stirred the soul of Balboa on the peak of Darien. "I had gained the summit of a commanding ridge, and, looking round with astonishing delight, beheld the ample plains, the beauteous tracts below." As later with his pencil he follows Lewis and Clark, or Captain Pike, or the dashing Colonel Frémont, he will likewise come to feel something of what American history has meant—if he has the type of mind to which a map can mean more than black lines printed on white paper.

The student often looks upon map study as the driest kind of drudgery, wasting time which might be better used. And if map study is to degenerate, as it too frequently does, into the mere slavish copying of meaningless lines and colors from an atlas, such a viewpoint is in large measure justified. But that lies with the student himself. Certainly the course of studies which accompanies these maps is planned to serve a wider purpose. From time to time comments are included as suggestions in interpretation or to introduce related reading, and opportunity is often given to set down in graphic form the statements of the printed page, sometimes from the text and sometimes from other accessible books or from extracts reprinted with the map directions. Generally these directions are intended to give a sense of sequence so that the student may more truly seem to illustrate a process, to show how this land comes into history, and how that. In short, the maps may prove a kind of laboratory where the student may himself discover and indicate the forces which have interplayed to make this nation.

*Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto*

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

THERE is one general direction of the first importance: **THE FULLEST AND MOST INTELLIGIBLE ILLUSTRATIVE MAP IS DESIRED IN EACH STUDY.** Do not content yourself with doing the things specifically directed.

The student is to provide himself with outline maps on which all data are to be presented. Care and thought will be necessary to make the maps not only satisfactory aesthetically, but to make them intelligible illustrations as well; when the scale of the map is considered, the wandering of a quarter of an inch may mean an error of fifty miles or more, which sometimes is important. The student is advised to use inks of different colors whenever possible, or at least to keep his colored pencils very sharp. An advantage of using ink lining or water color for an area is that single lines to show a route or boundary may be laid across them, which is not true when the masses are laid in with wax pencils. The good taste of the student must be relied upon in the placing of his color values. Satisfactory results may often be obtained by careful cross-hatching and with lines of different character. Lettering should always be done in neat, plain print, and, as often as possible, imposed upon the map itself, though when this might seem to produce confusion a key sheet may be pinned or pasted to the map.

It will be found desirable always to read through the directions before beginning, so that devices may be hit upon to take care of overlapping areas before it is too late.

MAP STUDY No. 1

THE OLD WORLD: DISSATISFACTION WITH THE WAY TO THE INDIES AND THE WAY TO HEAVEN

TEXT: Cheyney, *European Background of American History*, chaps. i-iii; Hayes, *History of Modern Europe*, vol. i, pp. 27-28, 43-49; Bassett, pp. 24, 26-27.

MAPS: Asia and Europe.

THE *Way to the Indies*.—The principal economic cause of the Commercial Revolution was the desire of the nations of Western Europe to share in the trade of the Orient by finding new routes to the lands of spices, silks, and gold. Long before, the Crusades had introduced these riches and refinements to the knowledge of the northern barons, and a taste thus formed had grown until they were considered indispensable. More and more merchants were involved in the trade as the years went on, and as the towns grew in size and number concern as to the cheapness and safety of the trade routes naturally grew as well. This map study is devised to show those lines of contact and thereby to explain the great explorations that come after.

After reading the assignment in the text, indicate on the outline map the chief localities in which the commodities of the Eastern trade were produced, denoting each commodity by an initial explained in an accompanying key sheet. Trace the route of Marco Polo's journey, begun in 1271 at Ormuz (Map 1) and leading through Balkh, then the famous center of the Zoroastrian religion, to the oasis of Yarkand, whose horses were in great demand, and thence, through the passes and around the deserts, over the long way to Cambaluc (Peking). Show his return through Quinsay (now known as Hangchow-Fu), which, impressed with its twelve thousand bridges and three thousand baths, he described as the finest and noblest city in the world; then overland to Zayton (the modern Tsuan-chau), whose glossy silk, by a corruption of the city's name, was known to Western trade as "satin." Then, sailing near the coasts of

Hainan, Indo-China, and the Malay Peninsula, he reached Malacca, beyond which Chinese traders seldom ventured. In these ancient towns of Peking, Quinsay, and Zayton, for a time the Mohammedan traders had their agencies, and, due in part to the enterprise of missionary priests, likewise the Italian. But about the middle of the fourteenth century, as far as Europe was concerned, "night descended upon the farther East, covering Cathay, with those cities of which the old travelers had told such marvels." The great importance of Marco Polo's book was that it kept before the minds of scholarly priests and navigators the memory that far, far to the east was a land of fabulous riches and teeming population. Out of that mysterious country, of course, there continued to come bales of silks and herbs, and trinkets wrought with incredible cunning, but the Westerners who read old books could not but reflect that if some easier road could be discovered, relations could be closer, exchange much more convenient, and the cause of God and man would be well served.

Show (1) two possible routes by caravan and ship from Yarkand to Constantinople; (2) the route of a cargo of nutmegs, mace, and cloves from the Moluccas, or Spice Islands, to Venice, picking up rare woods in Farther India, cinnamon at Ceylon, pepper on the Malabar Coast, aloes and ambergris at Socotra, and emeralds at Berenice (where the goods were carried overland from the Red Sea to the Nile); (3) the route of packets of jewels from Pulicat and Calicut to Antioch, locating the principal markets touched. Show the position in Central India of the kingdom of Golconda, then the great diamond center of the world. Locate

four leading Italian commercial towns, and, with the help of a map of Europe, the route from Venice *via* Augsburg and Nuremburg to Hamburg and Antwerp, and from Genoa along the Riviera to the Rhone and up to Paris. The annual Venetian fleet should be traced to Lisbon, the Seine, London, the Netherlands, and the Hansa towns in northern Germany.

The student will notice the advantageous position of the Italian cities, as the trading centers for Europe. They had their agencies or *fondachi* in most towns of the Levant. Venice, in 1400, had virtual control of Tyre, Sidon, Acre, Crete, Saloniki, the ports of Thessaly, seven towns on the Morean peninsula, Corfu, the Cyclades, and the Sporades. Genoa was her greatest rival and at one time drove her from the Black Sea, where Genoese influence was very powerful in towns like Trebizond and Kaffa (now Theodosia). Provençal and Spanish cities were also represented in the bazaars of the Levant. Locate seven towns in this region which were important about the middle of the fifteenth century.

An explanation frequently advanced for the decline of the older trading towns of southern

Europe after the Commercial Revolution is that their commerce with the Orient was strangled by the Turkish occupation of the old trade routes. Indicate (from Map 2) the dates at which the old Levantine markets fell into the hands of Ottoman Turks and compare with the dates of the voyages of the Portuguese navigators and Columbus. Did the Turkish conquests of themselves cause the Commercial Revolution? Do you think that they accelerated it? What part do you think the factors of time and expense involved in the old routes had in urging it forward?

The Way to Heaven.—Since differences in religion played so important a part in driving people to the New World, indicate on your outline, with the help of the map in Hayes, Vol. I, page 164, the Catholic and the Protestant countries to Europe in the latter part of the sixteenth century. It might be observed that at the time America was discovered the center of commercial and political affairs was shifting from the Mediterranean towns to the Atlantic coast, where the new national states, England, France, Spain, and Portugal, were growing more and more important.

MAP STUDY No. 2

THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA: A STRAITLESS BARRIER

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 25-36; Cheyney, *European Background*, chaps. iv-v; Bourne, *Spain in America*, chaps. i-ix.

MAP: The World.

IT is the purpose of this map study to illustrate that mighty expansive movement which, by hazarding the terrors of uncharted seas, broadened European history into world history and brought into the view of Christendom two enormous continents full of wealth and wonders. There is no better way to realize the significance of this Commercial Revolution than by comparing the world that Europe knew when Columbus was born with that we know to-day. After reading

the assignment in the text, draw a red boundary line to indicate the known world of the middle of the fifteenth century.

A. *The Portuguese.* Why should Portugal rather than Spain have undertaken, early in the fifteenth century, the task of discovering a new trade route to the East by sailing south around Africa? Trained and inspired in the famous college of mathematics at Cape Sagres under Prince Henry the Navigator,

Portuguese captains found and charted the successive promontories of the western coast of the "Dark Continent." To mark their slow, laborious progress, indicate, with dates, the Canary Islands, Cape Bojador, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, the Congo River, and Cape Padrana. Trace, indicating date, the royal expedition under Bartholomew Diaz along the coast to Algoa Bay and, on the return, past the Cape of Storms and Torments, later called Good Hope; that under Vasco da Gama directly from the Cape Verde Islands around this cape to Natal Bay, the mouth of the Zambesi, Mozambique, and thence to Melinde, about a thousand miles farther up the coast, where he fell in with merchants from India, whose pilot guided him to Calicut. Here at Melinde, in 1498, Europe and the Orient met by sea. The Portuguese, despite the opposition of Mohammedan traders, set up trading stations along the coasts of the Indian Ocean. By 1509 they had reached Malacca; by 1525, the Spice Islands; and by 1542, Cipangu, or Japan. Pedro Alvarez Cabral in the spring of 1500, leading out from the Cape Verde Islands another expedition for the Portuguese crown, tried to follow da Gama's route; but, venturing too far west, he was blown along the Brazilian coast to a point which may be located at about 39° west longitude by 16° south latitude and, before striking out for the Cape of Good Hope, formally took possession of the land for his sovereign. Show also the coast charted by Gaspar Cortereal.

In using Mercator's Projection, the most common world map, it is well to remember that while the relative positions of the earth's features are here correctly indicated, the areas are necessarily distorted and appear all out of proportion. In fact, the geographer says, in his haste, "all maps are liars"; a globe is the only reliable guide, though in our study its employment would be most inconvenient. Greenland is not, as Mercator presents it, larger than the continent of South America, but rather stands in ratio of about one to ten. Contrary to our first impression, Brazil is in reality considerably larger than the United States.

B. *Columbus*. Meanwhile, Columbus, under the patronage of Queen Isabella, was setting forth in

exactly the opposite direction, hoping to reach the Indies by sailing westward. The reason why the enterprise did not seem to him too discouraging will appear when the student has drawn an oval about an inch in length which would overlap the western part of Mexico and labeled it "Cipangu," for about here it was thought to be, as indicated on the globe furnished by Martin Behaim in Nuremberg about the time Columbus sailed. Show his first and third voyages, and with a heavy line the coast he explored on the third and fourth, giving dates (as is required in all indications in this map study). Beside the line of Columbus's first outward voyage place an arrow pointing toward the southwest, representing the trade winds, and beside that of his return place an arrow pointing toward Spain to show the prevailing westerlies. A record is now made of the good fortune of the discoverer. In those days of crude instruments of navigation, it was the custom to find the parallel of latitude of the destination and then sail as nearly as possible along that line. So Columbus sailed to the Canaries to take up his course at about the twenty-seventh parallel, on which, through an error of Toscanelli and other cartographers, was supposed to lie the northern point of Cipangu, the outpost of the Orient. The trade winds in this latitude so favored him that he dared not share with his men the knowledge of his fearful progress, and made a practice of reporting each day less than the actual distance sailed. The vagary midway is thus explained in his journal: "He sailed this day toward the West a quarter northwest . . . because of the veering winds and calm that prevailed." He was glad to experience a west wind on the 22d of September, that he might convince his crew that a homeward voyage would not be impossible. Following the general custom, on the return he sought the parallel of southern Spain, on which, by more good fortune, he fell in with the westerlies, and then made a swift and easy journey. Later, when these phenomena were widely known, their importance was so well recognized that many voyages, even from England, to the continental colonies were made by way of the West Indies.

Indicate the coast explored in 1499 by Hojeda

with Amerigo Vespucci on board. Of course, it was realized that even though Columbus's first landfall might be within the Indies, a land so large as to contain the Orinoco River must be a "new world," as there was no such area so far south in the known East. Waldseemüller's geography of 1507 placed the word "America" at about the latitude of modern Paraguay. The names "North" and "South America" were not in general use until after 1600. Using the map of the world drawn by Johan Schöner in 1523 (Map 4a), trace the voyage of Magellan's ship completed the year before, and draw the line of demarcation as corrected from the line of Pope Alexander VI (1493) by the Treaty of Tordesillas between Spain and Portugal in 1494, the "Linea divisionis Castellano-Portugallie" (see also Map 3). To which part of the earth was the line intended to apply? This line with Cabral's discovery helps to explain why Portuguese is to-day the language of Brazil. It also accounts for the absence of the Spanish in the development of the route around Africa. What also deterred Spain? Why and how was Portugal largely superseded in the East Indies?

C. *The English.* The northern national states, too, were to share in this activity. Inasmuch as routes were considered as a species of property and thought to carry with them a sort of jurisdiction and monopoly, it was to be expected that the merchants of France, England, and the United Netherlands would desire to find ways of their own to the Indies, and that the northern sovereigns would desire to rival Their Majesties of Spain and Portugal in the glory of overseas dominion. The epoch-making exploration of the Cabots, dispatched by Bristol merchants with the favor of Henry VII, should be indicated, and also Frobisher Bay and Davis Strait, reached, respectively, in 1576 and 1585 by Sir Martin Frobisher and Capt. John Davis, both searching for a northwest passage to Cathay. These may be found on any modern map of North America. In this quest Englishmen made several other notable attempts. In 1610 and 1611 Henry Hudson skirted the southeast coast of Greenland and then sailed across through Hudson Strait and Hudson Bay to James Bay, where he met his

death; in 1616 William Baffin, in his little ship the *Discovery*, penetrated to a point 77° 45' in the great bay that bears his name, thereby establishing a "farthest north" in those seas unsurpassed till 1852. His report discouraged further attempts in that direction.

Not finding a route or riches for themselves, the English sailors preyed upon the Spaniards, the two nations being most of the time in a state of quasi-war. The first circumnavigation by the English was made by one of those privateers, Sir Francis Drake. He had twice harried the coasts of the Spanish Main—that is, roughly speaking, the American land and waters within the tropics, and from the top of a tree on the Isthmus of Panama had, in 1572, surveyed the Pacific. Arriving home, he fitted out an expedition of five ships and 166 men and set out to explore this great ocean and incidentally enrich himself by plunder on the way. His route may be traced by way of the Moroccan coast, the Cape Verde Islands, the coast of Brazil to the Rio de la Plata, the Straits of Magellan, Mocha Island (off Chile), Panama, and then along the American coast to 38° north latitude, where he landed, and in the name of the queen called the country Nova Albion. He was disappointed that he had found no strait through to the Caribbean Sea. He now bore away for fourteen weeks to the Moluccas, where cloves and other spices were received as gifts, and, having touched at Java, he started for home. About twelve weeks later he doubled the Cape of Good Hope and set sail to the north, stopping for provisions at Sierra Leone (Map 4b), and arrived in England, September 26, 1580, after nearly three years' absence, "very richly fraught with gold, silver, silk, pearls, and precious stones."

D. *France.* Francis I of France, impressed with the fortune of his rival, Charles V, the king of Spain, set out also to gain new routes and a commercial empire. Giovanni da Verrazano, a Florentine in his employ, in 1524 was the first to strike straight across to what is now the United States, avoiding the Spanish Main to the south and the ice-strewn seas to the north. Though ill-recorded, his route may be traced with fair assurance from

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

France to Cape Fear (Map 7b), south to the site of Savannah (Map 11b), thence north to New York harbor and, exploring the New England coast from Rhode Island to Maine, home to Europe. There is certainly no doubt as to the two voyages of Jacques Cartier, ten years later, which may be shown as from France to the coast of Newfoundland, already known to fishermen, through the Straits of Belle Isle to Gaspé Bay and the island of Anticosti and home; and, in 1535, up the St. Lawrence to the Indian town of Hochelega (Montreal). That the hope of reaching China long survived Cartier is recorded in the name *La Chine* derisively bestowed much later on the near-by rapids. He made two more voyages to this region, but, though a settlement was attempted, bitter religious wars at home postponed further ventures by the French until the time of Henry IV.

E. *The Northeast Passage and the Dutch.* But the northwest passage was not the only short way to the Orient that Europeans of the sixteenth century believed might be discovered. In 1553 Sebastian Cabot and others promoted a voyage to search for a water route to the Indies beyond North Cape. In that year Sir Hugh Willoughby and Robert Chancellor set out to seek this northeast passage, and the latter, having succeeded in reaching the site of Archangel, penetrated overland, along a route familiar to the Norwegians, to Moscow, thereby establishing, for the first time, trade relations between Russia and the west. As the student indicates this route he may mark the region as

the sphere of the famous Muscovy Company. The directors of this corporation, still desirous of the passage, sent Henry Hudson on two voyages of Arctic exploration, in 1607 and 1608, the second especially to find a good sea route to Spitzbergen and Nova Zembla. His failure brought an end to such investigations by the company, but the Dutch, who for nearly twenty years had been exploring these frozen seas with a similar purpose, now engaged this navigator to carry forward the search in their behalf. In the employ of the Dutch East India Company he set out in 1609. Disheartened at the prospect of a voyage in that fearful climate, his crew of eighteen or twenty men mutinied before they reached North Cape and forced him to abandon his plan, though they accepted his new proposition to seek a northwest passage along the American coast at about the 40th parallel of latitude. "This idea," states a contemporary writer, "had been suggested to Hudson by some letters and maps which his friend Captain Smith had sent him from Virginia. The route of the *Half Moon* may thus be traced from the Texel, an island off the Netherlands, to Newfoundland, Penobscot Bay, Cape Cod, Delaware Bay (which he later called the "South River"), and, on September 4th, at the mouth of the "Great North River of New Netherland," later to bear his name. During the next month he explored this stream and, disappointed at finding no passage, sailed for home, to tell of this new region apparently of good fertility and rich in furs.

MAP STUDY No. 3

THE LAND: "MY COUNTRY, 'TIS OF THEE"

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 1-11; Farrand, *Basis of American History*.

MAP: The United States.

THIS map study concerns itself with the interior of the great continent the exploration of whose coasts we have traced. It was, indeed, a magnificent home-land that was revealed to western civilization by these soldiers, missionaries,

and fur traders who in early modern times cut their way through the wilderness or paddled their canoes along the almost endless waterways of North America. The migrations and settlements of Europeans on this soil cannot be intelligently fol-

lowed, it is clear, without first spying out the land to note its chief outstanding features. Its size impresses us at once; applying the scale of your map, it is observed that some three thousand miles stretch between Cape Cod and Cape Mendocino and more than half as many from the Lake of the Woods to the mouth of the Rio Grande. Europe west of Russia could be included almost twice within the great rectangle of the United States.

Its diversity is as impressive as its size. The land divides itself into six grand geographic provinces. They are the Coastal Plains, the Appalachian Highland, the Central Lowland Plains or Prairie, the Northwestern Peneplain, the High Plains of the Southwest, and the Cordilleras. Let us indicate them in this order, for so they were reached by the Anglo-Saxon settlers, though explorers had come last upon the northwestern plains.

Starting at a point about three hundred miles up the Rio Grande, draw an arc, swinging toward the east, to a point on the Red River (Map 34) about four hundred miles from its mouth, and then a similar curve to the mouth of the Ohio. There the line goes almost straight to a point about two hundred miles north of Mobile Bay. This has defined the Gulf Coastal Plain. Continue, curving round the hills, northeastward to New York harbor. Between this line and the sea, adding in Long Island, lies most of the Atlantic Coastal Plain, for the margin in New England is very narrow.

Prof. Ellsworth Huntington, in his *Red Man's Continent*,¹ gives a clear description of the Appalachian Highland. Of the three bands, the crystalline is chiefly developed in New England, of which it occupies almost the whole. Where penetrated by the Hudson it is but a few miles wide and, smoothed to easy hills, includes Manhattan Island; it then crosses southward to a point beyond the Potomac, where it divides into the Piedmont or foothill region, about a hundred miles wide in Virginia, and back of this the Blue Ridge, which finally itself becomes a high plateau cut into many peaks and stretching toward the west. The second band, the Appalachian valley system, begins at Lake Champlain and, following down the Hudson

to beyond the Catskills, it sweeps through to Pennsylvania, where it rises and is striped by irregular ridges. From the southwestern counties of this state it rises gradually as it stretches out behind the Blue Ridge, until in the southern part of the Carolinas it reaches the high level of the eroded crystalline table-land. The third band, the "Alleghany front," runs through western Pennsylvania, West Virginia and eastern Kentucky as the Alleghanies; it rises higher in Tennessee, where, changing its name to Cumberland, it is cut into deep, short isolated valleys, where live the "poor whites," famous in the missionary monthlies, the moving pictures, and internal-revenue reports.

After the student has indicated these three several parts of the great Appalachian highland which extends along a line not far south of Lake Erie over most of Ohio, he may define the Central Lowland Plain or Prairie, roughly as the region inclosed by the Alleghany Plateau, the Great Lakes, the lower Ohio, and the last seven hundred miles of the Missouri, with bays running northwest into Canada, east into New York, and southwest to the Red. The Ozark Plateau stands between the last-named section and the Mississippi. "There is some justification for those who say that the north central portion of the United States is more fortunate than any other part of the earth. Nowhere else, unless in western Europe, is there such a combination of fertile soil, fine climate, easy communication, and possibilities for manufacturing and commerce." The Northwestern Peneplain may be shown as extending northward from about the southern boundary of Nebraska, a region long unsettled, but despite its dryness now a field renowned for wheat and cattle. The High Plains toward the south are made of silt and gravel washed down from the Rockies, and here the horned cattle herded by the ranchmen have succeeded the buffalo. To the west is, of course, the great Cordillera range, with its ridges of the Rockies and the Cascade-Sierra Nevada, holding between them the Columbia Plateau and the dry Great Basin (Map 36). This great mountain system, fascinating to the geographer, did not come into our history until the middle of the nineteenth century, when its conquest for pur-

¹ New Haven, 1919, pp. 59-68.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

poses of commerce was more easily effected by the railroad.

Certainly the varying climates of the earth exercise a profound influence on the development of men and nations. A school of climatologists has arisen who believe this influence almost, if not quite, determining. It is said that the white race is physically at its best when the average temperature ranges from 50° to 73° F.¹ Since investigation shows that the best mental work is done where the average outside temperature is about 40°, to get conditions best for mind and body it would be well, perhaps, to bring the figures down to 45° and 65°, respectively. Relying upon the United States Weather Bureau maps, let us plot these isotherms. That of 45° begins at the southern corner of Maine and runs almost due west to Wyoming, thence south to the boundary of New Mexico, and then northwest to the northern line of Idaho. That of 65° begins at the mouth of the Santee River (Map 24) and, curving gently into the south, reaches the northwest corner of Louisiana, and then, deflecting slightly to the northwest, runs through Presidio on the Rio Grande (near 30° north latitude; Map 50a), across to New Mexico near its southwestern corner, then northwesterly nearly to Fresno, California (near Lake Tulare; frontispiece), and then, doubling south, it parallels the coast into Lower California. Comparison with a rainfall map would suggest deletion of the Rockies, southwestern California, southern Arizona, and the regions of the "high plains" north and south. After this correction there is a striking correspondence with the area of the highest civilization in America, as judged by many authorities,² the greatest development being in the well-watered region of the northeast and the basin of the Great Lakes.

¹ E. Huntington, *Red Man's Continent*, chap. i; and *Civilization and Climate* (New Haven, 1915), chap. i.

² Huntington, *Civilization and Climate*, pp. 172-182. The interested student should consult Supan's map of climatic provinces, conveniently found reproduced in R. De C. Ward's *Climate* (New York, 1908), p. 56. The whole subject of environmental control of individual and social development may be studied conveniently by the aid of A. H. Koller, *The Theory of Environment* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1918), a handbook more of bibliographical suggestion than orderly exposition, and Jean Brunhes, *Human Geography* (New York, 1920). The student should be on his guard, however, with respect to generalizations advanced by anthropogeographers, remembering that many of the results of this science are as yet conjectural.

The distribution of the glacial drifts has so affected the fertility of the soil in our country, and thus the quality of civilization, that this subject is also worth at least a moment's investigation. The line marking the extent of the greatest glacial area may be indicated thus: virtually all New England being included, it may start from New York harbor and proceed to Lake Chautauqua (Map 13); then, deflecting slightly to the southeast around to Warren, Ohio (Map 34); due west to Columbus and, deeply curving, first toward the south, to Cincinnati; following the Ohio nearly to Louisville; abruptly north to a point not far west of Indianapolis; doubling back to the mouth of the Wabash, and then across to Chester on the Mississippi (Map 41b), up which stream to the Missouri and then due west to the Kansas boundary, from which the line runs parallel with the Missouri River, at a distance of about a hundred miles, to its source, and thence to the mountains. Because the glacier converged in two streams, there is a driftless area comprising the southeast quarter of Wisconsin, where they had not yet united.¹ The mechanically ground rock thus deposited has greatly increased the productivity of the soil. In Wisconsin it was found in 1910 that the average value of farm land in six counties partially covered with drift was \$56.90 per acre, while that of thirteen driftless counties, otherwise quite similar, was \$33.30 per acre.² But tillage of the glaciated soil, especially in the east, has required more labor. Professor Shaler has estimated that a month's toil is needed to put such an acre in a state of cultivation.

"Next to the quality of the soil," wrote this physiographer, in his famous chapter in Justin Winsor's *History*,³ "the forest covering of a country

¹ For details, see G. Frederick Wright, *The Ice Age in North America* (5th ed., Oberlin, 1911), pp. 202 *et seq.*

² R. H. Whitbeck, "Economic Aspects of Glaciation in Wisconsin," in *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. iii; cited by Huntington, *Red Man's Continent*, pp. 56-59. Similar observations have been made elsewhere—for example, in Ohio and Indiana.

³ Nathaniel Southgate Shaler deserves a word in such a work as this. He was a professor of paleontology and geology in Harvard from 1868 to 1906, and by his voluminous writing and his inspiring teaching did much to stimulate interest in the influence of geography on history in America. Justin Winsor, librarian of Harvard from 1877 to 1897, was the foremost authority on early American history. His greatest contribution was an

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

does the most to determine its uses to man. Although the Western prairies have the temporary advantage in that they are more readily brought under cultivation than wooded regions, the forests of a land contribute so largely to man's well-being that without them he can hardly maintain the structure of his civilization. The distribution of American forests is peculiar. All the Appalachian mountain system and the shore region between that system and the sea, as well as the Gulf border as far west as the Mississippi, were originally covered by the finest forest that has existed in the historical period, outside of the tropics. In the highlands south of Pennsylvania and in the western table-land north to the Great Lakes, this forest was generally of hardwood or deciduous trees; on the shore land and north of Pennsylvania in the highlands, the pines and other conifers held a larger share of the surface. The parts of the land bordering on the Mississippi on the west, as far as the central regions of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, are forest clad, Michigan and portions of Wisconsin and Minnesota have broad areas of forest, but the cis-Mississippian states of Indiana and Illinois, and the trans-Mississippian country west to the Sierra Nevada, is only wooded, and that generally scantily, along the borders of the streams. Data for precise statements are yet wanting, but there is no doubt that this area is untimbered over about seven-eighths of its surface, and the wood which exists has relatively small

eight-volume *Narrative and Critical History of the United States*, which he partially wrote and edited throughout with exhaustive bibliographies, and which every serious student of this subject must examine. Those who find an interest in historical geography will appreciate the value of the many contemporary maps published in this work.

value for constructive purposes. North of the regions described, except along the Pacific coast, where fine softwood forests extend from near San Francisco to Alaska, the forest growth rapidly diminishes in size, and therefore in value, from the forest resources it affords." The great cone-bearing forest of the lake states, running northward from the central part of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, extends not quite to the western boundary of the last-named state.¹ It is scarcely necessary to remark that this great mantle of forest directly affected the progress of the white man in America. It is estimated that on the average about a month of unremitting labor is required to clear an acre.² Allowing for all the natural clearings, the student may yet realize some of the expense involved in the conquest of this continent. To make this clear shade with close light parallel lines, preferably with a green pencil, the area described. Black dots should be used to indicate the regions of the evergreen.

The European immigrants had more to meet than forests, desert wastes, and roving beasts; north of Mexico there were a half million human beings, the Indians, now classified into fifty-nine linguistic families. By referring to Map 6 we can indicate the position of some of these which affect our early history—the Athapascan, Shoshonean, Caddoan, Siouan, Muskogean, Iroquoian, and Algonquian. Each of these divisions, of course, includes a number of tribes, often showing great disparity in culture, the particular location of which will be a concern of later studies.

¹ Cf. I. Bowman, *Forest Physiography* (New York, 1914), p. 124.

² Shaler in *op. cit.*, vol. iv., p. xii.

MAP STUDY No. 4

THE PATHFINDERS: SPANIARDS AND FRENCHMEN PENETRATE THE WILDERNESS

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 37-39; Bourne, *Spain in America*, chaps. x-xiv; R. G. Thwaites, *France in America*, chaps. i-iv.

MAP: The United States.

THE first white men extensively to explore the vast exterior of America were Spaniards. They had found the land something more than an irritating barrier on the way to the Indies. Mines had been discovered in the Cordilleras which yielded such treasure as to dazzle the world and make no tale of wealth or wonders seem incredible. Ponce de Leon, the region of whose exploration should be shown (Map 5), was an example of the romantic-mindedness which urged on much of this inquiry. These enterprises, which, one by one, may now be traced, were doomed to disappointment after heavy cost of human life, but they did drive forward daring men for thousands of miles over plain and mountain and through dense forest thicket, revealing to the world the character of the southern part of what is now the United States. They had not the happy fortune of the grim *conquistadores* who rifled Mexico and Cuzco, but they are honorably remembered in historical geography.

Pamfilo de Narvaez, in 1528, determining to take possession of a great grant on the Gulf, landed with six hundred men near Tampa Bay and started into the interior; his numbers were terribly reduced by starvation and disease, his ships were lost, and finally a few poor craft fabricated on the beach brought a handful of survivors to the Texan coast. One of these was the treasurer, Cabeça de Vaca, who now became the leader of the castaways, and after five years' forced sojourn, during which time they saved their heads by cleverly practicing the arts of medicine men, he and his companions escaped and made their way for three months across the Mexican plains and highlands to the Aztec capital. His account, conveniently avail-

able in J. F. Jameson's *Original Narratives of American History*, though disfigured by patent exaggerations, was written with spirit, shows keen observation, and is one of the first to describe the social organization of the natives. It was this narrative which stirred the resolution of Hernando de Soto, who had served under Pizzaro as de Narvaez had under Cortez. With his six hundred and twenty followers he set forth from Tampa Bay on the long laborious route marked out on our map, ever fortifying the spirit of his dwindling little army by his own indomitable will. Though he himself was buried in the Mississippi, the survivors did not immediately halt the exploration; but they were, in July, 1543, forced to turn their way south toward the Spanish settlements. "Thus ended the most remarkable exploring expedition in the history of North America. Its only parallel is the contemporary enterprise of Coronado."¹

Acting on a story that the fabled Seven Cities of Cibola lay to the north, the governor of Mexico sent Friar Marcos to investigate. He gained a distant view of the Zuñi pueblos, and returned for aid, but was superseded by Francisco de Coronado. With three hundred Spaniards and eight hundred Indians he set out along the route which may be drawn after study of the map. Disillusioned as to "Cibola," he pressed on over a great distance to further disappointment in the meager village of Quivira, which had been described to him with fantastic embellishments. Meantime de Soto's men were breaking through along the Arkansas, and a Shawnee woman who had run away from Coronado's little army came upon these other

¹ E. G. Bourne, *Spain in America*, p. 163.

Spaniards nine days later, so near to meeting had these two parties unconsciously approached. In 1542 Cabrillo explored the coast of the Pacific from Lower California to a cape he called Mendocino. In half a century Spanish enterprise had penetrated the continent almost from sea to sea; though deeply disappointed at the apparent lack of mineral wealth, they had yet revealed a land of unsuspected size and variety. Four centuries after Columbus, a mighty nation, nourished from these hills and plains, was to crush the Spanish power almost in a single blow.

Men left Spain for riches. But in other European countries Christian unity had been shattered, and minorities who dared reject state creeds were so harassed that they sought a refuge even in the western wilderness beyond the sea. The first were French Calvinists, the Huguenots, a small group of whom a fitful royal favor allowed to leave and settle at Port Royal (Maps 5 and 6b) in 1562. This was soon abandoned, and two years later the leader of their sect, Admiral Coligny, sent another colony to the mouth of the St. Johns (Map 34), in the Florida region. Though the prospect seemed prosperous to them, the new settlement around Fort Caroline was stamped out, in 1565, by Menendez, a Spanish official who resented this intrusion by Frenchmen and heretics, and who about the same time began the building of St. Augustine (Map 5). He had really marked the end of Protestant colonization under the French flag, for during the civil wars that followed, and afterward, the government forbade it.

But it was certainly not to be expected that the vigorous Henry IV of France, when internal peace had returned to that country in 1589, would sit by contentedly while his royal "cousins" of Spain, and possibly England, carved out the New World between them. A few attempts at settlements at Tadoussac (Map 13) and in Acadia, later called Nova Scotia, were hardly successful, but Samuel de Champlain, in 1608, supported by the court of France, had better fortune in founding a town on the rock of Quebec. Instead of playing the beneficent peacemaker among the Indians, however, he joined the Hurons and Algonquins against the Iroquois Confederacy, and in May, 1609, the com-

bined war party set out, starting from the mouth of the Richelieu and working their way to the long lake that was soon christened with the name of the French leader. There near modern Ticonderoga they met and easily defeated the Iroquois, stunned and terrorized by the thundering weapons of the white men. Thus the leader from Quebec gained prestige with the Algonquins, but planted in the hearts of the Iroquois an undying prejudice against the French. Champlain is to be remembered as an explorer as well as the captain of the little colony. He was fascinated by the silent sublimities of the forest, moved by religious zeal to reach as many Indians as possible, anxious to discover the long-sought waterway to the Pacific, and resolutely determined to mark out a goodly province for his royal master. These and the desire to develop the fur trade were the chief motives of the French exploration.

In 1603, before Quebec was founded, Champlain had gone some forty miles up the Saguenay, but his longest journey, covering about fifteen hundred miles, was that taken by his party in the expedition against the Iroquois in 1615. Starting from Quebec, they went up the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa and, by Mattawan River and three small lakes, to the portage to Lake Nipissing. This carry is very short; geologists have shown that a depression of about a hundred feet at this point would turn the waters of the upper lakes into the Ottawa, shortening the route for navigation 270 miles. Champlain's forces made their way over the lake, down French River to Georgian Bay. After paddling along the eastern shore of this body of water they struck southeast by means of lakes and creeks and carries till, on reaching the Trent River, they floated into Lake Ontario in the Bay of Quinte behind the Prince Edward peninsula, easily identified on the map. Skirting along the islands, they crossed to the eastern shore and traveled overland to an Onondago fort just south of Oneida Lake (Map 11a), where they were repulsed and obliged to return without success. Such was a typical war raid. Champlain frequently found traces of traders and was entertained by Récollet priests working among the Huron Indians, though this was scarcely seven years after Quebec

was founded. "Long before the ice-crusts pines of Plymouth had listened to the rugged psalmody of the Puritan, the solitudes of western New York and the stern wilderness of Lake Huron were trodden by the iron heel of the soldier and the sandaled foot of the Franciscan friar."¹

A true pathfinder was Jean Nicolet, whom Champlain sent into the West in 1634, a century after Cartier's exploration of the gateway of New France. We may trace his route from Lake Nipissing along the northern shore of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron to Sault Ste. Marie, as the rapids of the river leading from Lake Superior came to be called. Keeping close to the land, he paddled to and through the Straits of Mackinac. He soon went on past the Chippewa country into that of the Winnebagos, with whom his knowledge of the Algonquin language availed him little. He pushed forward his canoe the length of Green Bay, up the Fox and across Lake Winnebago into the Mascoutin country, but apparently did not take the portage to the Wisconsin. After circling into the south through the upper Illinois and Potawatomi lands, he again embarked on Green Bay, and by July, 1635, was at Three Rivers.²

Nicolet, as far as we know, had not seen Lake Superior, and it was over twenty years before the Sieur de Groseilliers wintered with the Sioux on its shores. He returned the following year, 1659, with his brother-in-law, the Sieur de Radisson, with whom he explored the southern and western borders of the lake. About a dozen years later, in 1672, Louis Joliet, who had previously made some investigation for the provincial government as to the extent of the Lake Superior copper mines, was selected to explore the region of the great river of the West, of which the Chippewas and Sioux had eloquently spoken and which was believed to flow into the Pacific. At Michillimackinac Mission he found and interested Father Jacques Marquette,

¹ Francis Parkman, *Pioneers of France in North America* (Boston, 25th ed., 1891), p. 179. The Récollets were Franciscans.

² There is some disagreement as to the date and extent of Nicolet's journey; the text here follows Justin Winsor's *Cartier to Frontenac* (Boston, 1894), pp. 149-153, which account is very likely correct. See also Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*, p. 166; William Kingsford, *History of Canada*, vol. i, pp. 213-214.

who was given permission to accompany him. The following day the trader and the missionary, together with five others, started over the same route taken by Nicolet nearly forty years before, but, unlike him, did not stop at the headwaters of the Fox. They found an easy portage here to the Wisconsin, only two miles away; indeed, the latter river, being five feet higher than the Fox, sometimes in flood season poured its waters over the shallow divide to mingle with those of the St. Lawrence basin.

On July 17th the little party floated into the great river which Joliet called La Buade, after Governor Frontenac's family, and which Marquette piously christened the Conception; it later became generally known as the Colbert, and finally by the Indian name, the Mississippi. As they paddled downstream for a full month, past rocky bluffs and river mouths, green isles and wooded banks, from the region of the fir and northern oak to that of the holly and the pecan that grow about the Arkansas, they rightly divined that the great river emptied not into the Gulf of California, but into that of Mexico, but they could scarcely realize the vastness of the basin which it drained. The St. Lawrence system, with the lakes, affords some two thousand miles of navigable water, but that of the Mississippi, draining a basin of two and a half million square miles of territory, makes this seem small indeed. "With forty or fifty considerable tributaries, and a hundred thousand affluent streams in all, the great current carries to the Gulf a marvelous precipitation. These waterways offer sixteen thousand miles of navigable water, and it has been said that its great body of tributaries is more generally serviceable for transport service than that of any other river, except perhaps the Amazon."¹

Joliet and Marquette, having satisfied themselves as to the river's course, paused at a point now in southern Arkansas which Joliet placed at 33° 40' north latitude, and turned again to the north. They made their laborious way to the mouth of the Illinois, over whose placid and well-shaded surface they paddled northeast to the Des Plaines. A little eminence about forty miles southwest of

¹ Justin Winsor, *The Mississippi Basin* (Boston, 1895), pp. 4-5.

modern Chicago they named Mount Joliet, and a community begun near here in the 1830's, on second thought, in 1842, adopted Joliet as its name. The portage to the Chicago River was hardly a mile and a half, so slight is the divide between the great river systems, and the explorers easily made their way to Lake Michigan and the north.¹

The name of René Robert Cavalier, the Sieur de la Salle, is forever associated with the exploration of the Mississippi system.² In the summer of 1669 he started upon his career as an explorer. Leaving his seigniory by the Lachine Rapids, about eight miles above Montreal, with certain Sulpitian priests he proceeded up the St. Lawrence and along the southern shore of Lake Ontario, stopping for a conference with the Senecas near the mouth of the Genesee in Irondequoit Bay (near modern Rochester; Map 11a). He continued to the western extremity of the lakes and here fell in with Joliet, who, returning from his investigation of the copper region, had been the first white man to pass from Lake Huron to Lake Erie, from which, by way of the Grand River and the land of the Neutral Indians, he had come to Lake Ontario. The Sulpitians left La Salle and, after waiting on the shore of the lake to the south, they were the first to reverse the route of Joliet, reaching Sault Ste. Marie in May, 1670. Meanwhile La Salle crossed to Lake Erie and thence in some way reached as far west as the Illinois. According to one account he went by way of the Allegheny (Map 17), and the Ohio to some point beyond the falls near modern Louisville (Map 47), and then overland; according to another, by way of the lakes and the Chicago portage. In 1675 La Salle received his patent of nobility and a grant of Fort Frontenac, which had been set up in 1673 and in consideration for which he was to explore the West.

In 1678 his preparations were complete. A party was sent ahead to construct a fort at Niag-

¹ In an unfortunate upset in the rapids above Montreal, important papers were lost, and the account had to be written from memory. Marquette's narrative appears in the *Jesuit Relations*, a great series of records now translated into English and published in seventy-three volumes, available in most large libraries.

² The most readable account of La Salle's adventures is undoubtedly that of Parkman in his *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Boston), 1869.

ara, where La Salle soon joined them near Grand Island, above the falls, and began the building of a ship called the *Griffon*. When this was done the party bore west under a spread of canvas and, taking aboard La Salle's lieutenant, Henri le Tonty, at the Detroit River, sailed on to Green Bay in Lake Michigan. The *Griffon* was dispatched thence with a cargo of furs, to return, but the crazy ship, ill fabricated of green timber, disappeared in a gale before it reached the Straits of Mackinac. La Salle and Tonty, taking opposite shores of Lake Michigan, proceeded to the St. Joseph River. After carrying to the Kankakee (Map 34), they floated past the mouth of the Des Plaines and on down the Illinois to some settlements of Indians, where La Salle set up Fort Crèvecoeur.

The leader now determined to send a party to explore the upper waters of the Mississippi, while he himself investigated the lower, and Michel Accault was put in command, with Father Louis Hennepin, a Récollet friar, detailed to accompany him. The detachment thus directed made their way to the great river and up to a point a little distance beyond the mouth of the Wisconsin, where they were captured by a party of Sioux. As prisoners they continued upstream to the vicinity of the Falls of St. Anthony (St. Paul; Map 47), where the canoes were hidden, and the company proceeded overland to Lake Buade, about seventy miles due north. After a sojourn here Hennepin received permission to leave, and, reaching the Mississippi, was able to float down to the falls, which he named. Near here he and his boatmen fell in with a party of Sioux, with whom Accault was found, and the parties were joined.

We must now turn attention to Daniel Greysolon Duluth (or Du Lhut), who had set up standards of the Grand Monarch of France throughout the western shoreland of Lake Superior, and had constructed the rude Fort Kaministiquia (Map 13), in 1769. Starting from this country in June of the following year, he soon reached the St. Croix, where a stockade was built. He floated down this affluent of the great river, which the Indians had described to him and which he believed would lead to the Gulf of California in the South Sea. Stories of

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

white men among the Sioux urged him forward and he fell in with Hennepin's party on the Mississippi. But instead of pressing on to the Pacific, after hunting through the neighborhood the leader decided to return. With six other Frenchmen he took the Wisconsin route to Green Bay, proceeded to Machillimackinac and finally to the Eastern settlements, to recite the story of their hardships and achievements.

La Salle returned to Fort Frontenac, and in 1680 made a fruitless visit to Fort Crèvecoeur, which he found in ruins, with Tonty and the rest fled to Machillimackinac to escape the warring Iroquois. In the winter of 1681, with some fifty French and Indian companions, he came again to cross the Chicago portage and work along the frozen Illinois to the Mississippi, down which they sped, past the region of the Arkansas, where Joliet and Marquette had turned about, and finally to the mouth.

The explorer, who had carried the French arms from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico and named Louisiana in honor of his sovereign, afterward, in 1684, enlisted royal patronage for a settlement at the great river's mouth. But fumbling along the coast of Texas, he mistook Matagorda Bay (Map 41a) for such, and on a little river there set up a colony and a Fort St. Louis. Disappointment and distress resulted, and near the Trinity River, inland from Galveston Bay, La Salle was assassinated. The colony wasted away and the French attempts to gain a hold in Texas were abandoned. The Spanish soon followed La Salle in this region, beginning in 1690 to establish their missions, of which five now remain in ruins at San Antonio.

But French ambitions for control of the Mississippi Valley were still cherished; in 1699 Pierre le Moyne d'Iberville led out an expedition to the

Gulf coast, and, after building a fort at Biloxi, set up another on the Mississippi about forty miles from its mouth (Map 14). Mobile, named after the neighboring Maubila Indians, a Muskogean tribe (Map 6), was founded in 1702 and was for a time the capital of the province. But in 1718 the "Western Company," headed by John Law, who had excited France with his financial scheme to exploit the natural wealth of Louisiana, sent Jean Baptiste le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, to found the town of New Orleans, which, with a discouraging beginning, became the most prosperous French city in America.

The French had carried their flag over a noble domain, and yet their conquest had been slow compared with that of the Spaniards who followed Columbus. And the French posts, so impressive on the map, were generally but straggling groups of cabins, each with a knot of bickering traders, two or three priests, and a tiny guard of soldiers. There were few homes. The priests, though the Récollets, Sulpitians, and Jesuits sometimes checked one another, performed a mighty service for France as well as for religion. "Men steeped in antique learning, pale with the close breath of the cloister, here spent the noon and evening of their lives, ruled savage hordes with mild, parental sway, and stood serene before the direst shapes of death."¹ A few representative missions will, if located (Map 13), serve to indicate the extent of this service—those of the Récollets at St. Croix by Tadoussac (1600), and Three Rivers (1634); those of the Jesuits at Sault Ste. Marie (1639), La Pointe (1665), St. Francis Xavier on Green Bay (1671-72), St. Ignace (by Marquette in 1672), and St. Francis de Sales (1683); and that of the Sulpitians at Quinte Bay on the northern shore of Lake Ontario (1668).

¹ F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in North America*, p. xiii.

Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto

MAP STUDY No. 5

THE TOBACCO COUNTRY: VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 45-58; L. G. Tyler, *England in America*, chaps. iii-vii.

MAP: South Atlantic States.

WHILE King James I of England sought a Spanish wife for his son Charles, the customary plundering of the galleys of Seville was regarded inappropriate and the capital hitherto employed in privateering became available for other enterprises. Two groups of merchants, called, respectively, the London and the Plymouth companies, were granted patents for plantations in the region vaguely known as Virginia, the former to have the coast land from 34° to 38° as exclusively its sphere, and the latter to have that between 41° and 45°. The country between was open to either, it being understood that a settlement in this intermediate zone kept out rivals for a distance of a hundred miles on each side. The companies did not get possession of the whole of their regions, but only the right each to stake out within its assigned area a colony extending along the coast fifty miles north and south of its first plantation and inland one hundred miles.

When Capt. Christopher Newport, in 1607, sailed through the fifteen-mile strait between the capes he named for the Princes Charles and Henry, and after cautiously traversing the shallows came at last to rest in the deep water of Hampton Roads, he called the land near by, Point Comfort (Map 7a). Here he recognized a place far more opulent and eligible for settlement than those which Raleigh's men had found some twenty years before at Roanoke and Croatoan, the former indicated on Map 7b and the latter lying directly southwest of Cape Hatteras.¹ The ship-worn colonists surveying the banks of the James saw a smiling country beautiful in May foliage, a month ahead of that at home, and abounding in game and

fish, the latter so numerous in many of the rivers and creeks that they could be killed with sticks. "We attempted," writes Captain Smith, "to catch them with a frying pan; but we found it a bad instrument to catch fish with."² Besides the deer, small bear, opossum, raccoon, and other beasts whose flesh was good to eat, there was every bird that flourished in England, except the peacock and the chicken.³

But more interesting were the Indians: those of the Powhattan Confederacy scattered along the coast, and the Piscataways by the Potomac—both Algonquian (cf. Map 6); the Iroquoian Nottaways to the south of the Appomattox; and the Siouan tribes, the Monacans on the upper James, with the Manahoacs to the north of them and the Ocaneechis to the south. It would be some years before Virginia came into contact with the Cherokees who roamed the country beyond the Blue Ridge nearly as far north as the sources of the James.

Tidewater Virginia, described by the geologists as but lately risen from the sea, is divided into three terraces; the first, beginning just behind the shore strip, is composed of light sands and clays, most fertile on the Norfolk and Accomac peninsulas (Map 7a); the second has many beds of coarse gravel interspersed with yellow and blue marl; the third is higher, but of the same formation. "Under the influence of a mild climate and the moisture of the sea, the soil is prolific in many forms of vegetable life, but soon loses its fertility."³ It was easily adapted to tobacco culture, but was exhausted in many places before Virginia became a state. Better land was found in strips along the

¹ *Works of Capt. John Smith* (edited by Edwin Arber, New York, 1884), p. 418.

² P. A. Bruce, *Economic History of Virginia* (New York, 1896), vol. i, pp. 123-124.

³ P. A. Bruce, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 76-77.

¹ Raleigh's Virginia patent had been vacated because of his attainder of treason for having supported a rival of James to the English throne.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

James, the York (with its two affluents, the Pamunkey and the Mattaponi), the Rappahannock, the Potomac, and scores of smaller streams which rise in the Blue Ridge or cut through from the Shenandoah Valley. On these alluvial banks were placed the principal plantations, leaving wilderness between the rivers. From Map 7a the thirteen counties which had been formed by 1652 may be shown with dates by using numbers and a key. These, it may be seen (Map 8), are mostly, but not entirely, within the frontier line. The conflict of interest between the coast towns and the back country was later, in 1676, illustrated by the rebellion of Nathaniel Bacon, a planter living near the falls of the James, the site of modern Richmond (Map 16).

Jamestown, the first settlement under the London Company's charter of 1606, was on a low island, ill chosen, contrary to directions. Not only was it indefensible against the Indians, but lay open to the evil winds from the numerous malarial marshes, the largest of which, the Great Dismal Swamp, may be indicated as southeast of the Elizabeth River. The colony was first reckoned as a hundred miles square, but in 1609 new lines were drawn for the new Virginia Company. It was then ambiguously stated that this territory lay two hundred miles along the coast each side from Old Point Comfort and "up into the land throughout from sea to sea, west and northwest." This uncertainty gave rise to controversies; some law officers maintained that the southern line should run northwest and the northern line due west, but

the company and the colonists chose to interpret it the other way, which, instead of a small triangle, gave them constantly diverging lines, including even parts of the great lakes. This helps us to understand why Virginia sent Washington to warn off the French in 1754, and George Rogers Clark to clear the West of British in 1778.

The charter for Maryland, issued to the son of the Catholic Lord Baltimore in 1632, superseded part of Virginia's claim. The Potomac, with a line east from its mouth, across Chesapeake Bay and the peninsula called the Eastern Shore, formed the southern boundary; on the west it had, unlike Virginia, a definite land limit, a line due north from the westernmost head of the Potomac; the northern line was the fortieth degree of latitude. It was not until 1767 that the present boundary of 39° 43' was surveyed by two English engineers, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, thus ending a long controversy between the proprietors of Maryland and Pennsylvania. Using Maps 8 and 10, one may find Kent Island (where Claiborne had taken possession under a Virginia grant), the principal Maryland settlements, the counties, and the frontier line by the middle of the seventeenth century. It will be noticed that the town of Baltimore was not founded till 1729 (Map 16), but it grew so rapidly that in Revolutionary time its population numbered eight thousand, profiting, as it did, by the trade of the Susquehannah Valley of Pennsylvania, just as Norfolk controlled much of the commerce of North Carolina.

Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto

MAP STUDY No. 6

NEW ENGLAND: THE HOME OF A MARITIME PEOPLE

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 59-71; Tyler, *England in America*, chaps. ix-xvi.

MAP: New England.

IN this map study attention is directed to the rocky coast which stretches from the St. Croix River nearly to Manhattan Island, pierced with many a navigable inlet and estuary, as if devised by nature as the home of a maritime people.

Portuguese, Frenchmen, and Englishmen had sailed along this coast during the sixteenth century, but Bartholomew Gosnold, in 1602, was probably the first to sail straight across the Atlantic in these latitudes, thus avoiding the Spaniards in

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

the southern waters. He made a temporary settlement at the western end of the Elizabeth Islands opposite Martha's Vineyard (Map 9). This latter name, applied at first to a smaller neighboring island, was probably in its original form, "Martin's Vineyard," called after one of Gosnold's crew. There were numerous other voyages and probably several unremembered trading settlements.

The exploration of the Kennebec by Weymouth searching for the northwest passage, in 1605, as reported in England, made such an impression that Sir Ferdinando Gorges and other patrons furthered exploration, and the London and Plymouth companies were organized and assigned areas for patents. That of the latter extended from Long Island to Passamaquoddy Bay, and under it Chief-Justice Popham sent out a colony, which set up at Sagadahoc, at the mouth of the Kennebec (Map 8). Though this was abandoned because of cold and famine, the company, reorganized as the Council for New England in 1620, continued to bestow rights to settlement.

In 1614 this company employed John Smith to explore the coast of the great bay lying between 40° and 44° north latitude, which he named New England because of certain similarities to the home land. Of the local names bestowed by him, Capes Elizabeth and Ann, Ipswich, Plymouth, and the Charles River yet remain, and may be indicated on the outline map together with a letter S in parentheses.

About the time of Captain Smith's visit the Indians along the coast were decimated by a pestilence, a fact which encouraged colonial enterprise and facilitated settlement. It was found when communities had come to be established at some distance from the shore that the upland Indians were a more formidable foe. The position of the principal tribes important in relation to the whites may be located as follows: the Abenakis in the Kennebec and Penobscot Valleys (Map 43a); the Pennacooks or Pawtuckets of New Hampshire; the Massachusetts along the Charles; the Wampanoags south of Plymouth; the Narragansetts in the north of modern Rhode Island; Pequots and Niantics along the shore between the Connecticut and Narragansett Bay; the Nipmucs in central

Massachusetts; the Wappingers from the lower Connecticut across the Hudson, with their kinsmen of the Mohicans to the north.

The boundaries of the New England colonies were frequently in dispute. Massachusetts's extreme northern claim, as "three miles north of the Merrimac," is shown on Map 8. This explains the northern extent of the claims of that state preferred later in western New York and the region of Lake Michigan (Map 21a). Connecticut's bounds were long disputed. Her controversy with Rhode Island was too complicated for discussion here, inasmuch as the final line was fairly regular. The oblong indentation in the northern boundary, observable on large maps, is a reminder of the ignorance of two "mathematicians" who, in 1642, made a survey for Massachusetts, for that colony claimed a line running just north of Windsor, and Connecticut finally reclaimed all but this oblong. The odd-looking extension at the southwest is thus accounted for: Connecticut settlers, because of a temporary boundary understanding in 1664, made their homes along the Sound almost to Mamaroneck, and in 1683 New York agreed that most of these towns should stay in Connecticut, allowing them the eight miles of depth.¹ New York, however, whose boundary was supposed to be about twenty miles east of the Hudson, obtained in recompense a strip two miles broad from Connecticut and running to the Massachusetts line; this was called the "equivalent tract."

The extent of the settlements by the middle of the seventeenth century, together with the chief natural features, should be shown; and twelve towns, connecting with each some historical fact, by means of a key sheet. Show also the frontier line in 1689. There are no such waves of movement up a river as we see along the Hudson and the James. Had the *Mayflower* come to land in the mouth of the Connecticut River, the history might have been different; but the lines of human development actually were transverse rather than longitudinal.² This was a condition valuable for political solidarity as well as for defense.

¹ Our Map 9 fails to make this indication; see Map 24.

² A. P. Brigham, *Geographical Influences in American History*, p. 59.

MAP STUDY No. 7

THE DUTCH AND QUAKER COLONIES: GREAT GRANTS AND SMALL FARMS

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 72-76, 83-88; Tyler, *England in America*, pp. 291-295; C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Self-government*, chaps. v-viii, xi, xii.

MAP: Middle States.

THOUGH settled slowly in the seventeenth century, the middle group of colonies, partly because of their geographical position, were of great importance, and were finally, by 1825, to surpass the other groups in population. On four considerations New York was fit to be the "seat of empire." Its well-protected harbor, admired by Verrazano and Hudson, with deep water clear to three different shores, would of itself have given it a noble destiny. It was of great strategic value because the Hudson and Champlain Valleys made an easy road from or into Canada, which was for over a century in the hands of a hostile power. In Map Study No. 3 it was observed that here alone, along the Mohawk trough cut through by the glacier, does the Appalachian system lapse in all its parts, making thus a gateway to the great interior of North America, a road for wealth and people. And New York would have been important, if for no other reason, because it was the land of the Iroquois, "the Romans of the West."

The location of the five "nations" of the confederacy may be indicated from Map 11a. In 1713 the Tuscaroras, of North Carolina, who are shown on Map 6 to be of Iroquoian stock, were badly beaten by the whites and soon afterward came north to settle with their kinsmen near Oneida Lake. Though not very numerous¹ the Iroquois were recognized as the most effective savage fighters on the continent. The Mohicans

extended to the upper Hudson, while the Wap-pingers, of the same stock, occupied what is now Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Rockland and Orange Counties, reaching to the Munsees, who held the region south of the Mohawks. On Long Island, the Canarsees held the west, the Shinne-cocks the center, and the Montauks the east. About the middle of the eighteenth century, the Iroquois drove the Delawares, or Lenapes, out of the river valley that bears their name (Map 13) into eastern Ohio (Map 15b). The French constantly attempted, without permanent success, to attach the Iroquois to their interest, and sent them missionaries as well as soldier-diplomats. Father Isaac Jogues came to the Mohawk country in 1642, giving the name of Lac St. Sacrament to the body of water later, in 1755, called Lake George. The mission of the Abbé Picquet, founded about a century later at Fort de la Présentation (now Ogdensburg), is shown on Map 13.

The frontier line drawn on Map 8 indicates approximately the extent of Dutch settlement in the Hudson Valley, though in 1652 a settlement was made at Roundout Creek and in 1661 Wiltwick (Kingston; Map 9) was chartered, while Schenectady was founded in the same year. The names on Map 9 show that northeastern New Jersey was within the sphere of Dutch settlement, whereas those on eastern Long Island bear quite as unmistakable witness to New England origin, most of them from Connecticut and New Haven.¹ But other stocks were represented in the seventeenth century; indeed, the first settlement had been made

¹ About 1670 the warriors of the Five Nations were reckoned by the French and English as 2,000 (see G. W. Schuyler, *Colonial New York*, New York, 1885, vol. i, p. 309), while nearly a century later, because of wars and famine, Sir William Johnson believed that there were no more than that number (*Documentary History of New York*, vol. iv, p. 428).

¹ Between 1650 and 1654 Connecticut claimed jurisdiction of eastern Long Island; see the account in Richard Hildreth's *History of the United States* (New York, 1849), vol. i, p. 438; vol. ii, p. 44.

in 1614 on the site of the Brooklyn Navy Yard by Flemish Protestants known as the Walloons, while in 1677 New Paltz was founded by Huguenots who had been some time in the colony, and New Rochelle was bought and settled by others who came shortly after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.

The Dutch West India Company, after its permanent settlement of Manhattan Island in 1623, hesitated between a policy of maintaining a mere trading post and one of colonization. A partial victory for the latter brought out the scheme of 1629, in which provision was included for patroons. Six such were constituted, holding lands in what is now Delaware and New Jersey as well as New York, but only Van Rensselaer was finally successful with his great estate of Rensselaerswyck. At the time of the Revolution this had grown to a tract of 1,132,000 acres, or 1,770 square miles—an area sixty times the size of Manhattan Island—running south on both banks of the Hudson from the mouth of the Mohawk, in what is now Albany and Rensselaer Counties. Besides this there were 200,000 acres in Columbia County in the hands of the family.¹ The English governors continued the unfortunate practice of granting huge patents, so that, about 1700, three-fourths of the province was alleged to be in the hands of some thirty persons. The grant to Johannes Hardenburgh, patented in 1708, of what is now Sullivan County and the southeastern half of Delaware, together with substantial parts of Greene and Ulster (Map 11a), may stand as an example of their large holdings. The southern third of Columbia County was the Livingston Manor. These patents, with their uncertain boundaries and, where settled, their peculiar restrictions on the tenantry, combined with the frontier situation of New York and the presence of the Iroquois to discourage the growth of that colony.

The Swedish settlement on the Delaware, especially Fort Christina (Wilmington) and Fort New Elfsborg, should be shown, while Fort Nassau and ill-fated Swaanandael (now Lewes, Delaware) recall the overlapping Dutch claims based

¹ See Cadwallader Colden's map reproduced in Justin Winsor, *History*, vol. v, pp. 236-237.

on Hudson's discovery of the "South River." Fort Good Hope, on the Connecticut, built in 1634 near modern Hartford, placed the Dutch as traders on that river as well as on the Hudson, the Mohawk, and the Delaware.

Although New Haven Puritans were on the Delaware in 1641 (two years later ejected by the Swedes, who built New Elfsborg), and at Newark in 1666, the English settlement of the peninsula of New Jersey did not make headway until the later 'sixties. Then Sir George Carteret began to develop the eastern part of the peninsular of New Jersey, which the Duke of York had granted to him and Lord John Berkeley in 1664. Ten years afterward the latter conveyed his part to certain Quakers, of whom William Penn was the leader. The following year the settlement of Salem (Map 10) was made, and in 1677 that of Burlington. In 1676 the "quintipartite deed" fixed the line between East and West Jersey as shown upon our map. In 1682 East Jersey also came into the hands of prominent Quakers and others, though it was separately ruled, with its capital after 1686 at Perth or Perth Amboy.¹ Although, in 1692, after the fall of the Dominion of New England of which the Jerseys were a part, the two provinces had a common governor, and from 1701 were united as one government under the governor of New York till 1738, when a separate governor was assigned to New Jersey, the old sectional difference between the east and west persisted throughout the colonial period. The eastern settlements from their New England origin used the township system of local government, while the western used the county. Until 1790, when Trenton was selected as the capital, the legislature met in alternate years at Burlington and Perth Amboy. The southern part of New Jersey was settled slowly and to this day the south central portion, known as the "cranberry country," is very sparsely populated.

The early settlements of Pennsylvania were confined to the region of the lower Delaware, and were, of course, made chiefly by Quakers at or near Philadelphia in 1682. From the beginning, how-

¹ This curious name demands explanation. The original Indian name was supposed to be Amboy; in 1684 the proprietors called it Perth after James, Earl of Perth, one of their number. Soon the names were combined.

ever, the colony was cosmopolitan; on our map are shown Merion, settled by Welsh as part of their "barony" in 1682, and Germantown by Mennonites in 1683. Newcastle, Upland, and other settlements of Swedes, Finns, and Dutch were there when Penn arrived. But the regions subsequently settled by the Germans and Scotch-Irish we shall have occasion to consider in a later map study.

Penn's controversy with Baltimore over the southern boundary we have mentioned; he likewise disputed with the Duke of York as to whether the northern line was at 42° or 43°, and with Virginia at the west (see Map 16), which question was not settled finally until 1784 in Penn's favor.

When after the temporary reconquest by the Dutch, in 1672-74, the old jurisdiction of their holdings was restored to the Duke of York, he determined that none should encroach upon Newcastle, his seat of government for the Delaware region, and fixed his boundary by an arc drawn with that place as a center and a radius of twelve miles. This was later retained as the boundary of the Three Lower Counties, New Castle, Kent, and Sussex, shown on our Map 10. Because of economic and political rivalries, in 1691 Penn gave a deputy governor to these counties; in 1704 they obtained a separate assembly, and in 1710 a separate council. They remained until 1776 under the authority of the governor of Pennsylvania.

Department of

University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto

MAP STUDY No. 8

THE SOUTHERN PLANTATIONS: THE CAROLINAS AND GEORGIA

Supplement: *Attempt at Government System*

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 81-83, 106-110, 71, 92-98; Andrews, *Colonial Self-government*, pp. 129-161; Greene, *Provincial America*, pp. 249-269.

MAP: South Atlantic States.

THE early settlers of the southern colonies had to contend with tribes of fierce and cunning Indians. Relations, sometimes of trade, sometimes of war, were kept up with the Yemassee in the valley of the Savannah (Map 7b), the Catawbas on the Wateree (Map 11b), and the Tuscaroras on the Neuse (Map 7b), while occasionally they came into contact with the Creeks, who reached around the southern spurs of the mountains to beyond the Altamaha (Map 11b); the Seminoles of Florida (Map 15b); the Chickasaws, who ranged the middle course of the Tennessee; and the Iroquoian Cherokees, whose dominion ran along the valleys well up into Virginia (see also Map 6).

King Charles II in 1663 and 1665 conveyed to eight favorites the rights of property and jurisdiction between 29° and 36° 30' north latitude. By 1669 the proprietors were ready to begin the

colony, and, gathering up their colonists in England, Barbadoes, and Bermuda, islands which may be observed on Map 12, but cannot well be indicated in this study, they established a settlement on Albemarle Point at the mouth of the Ashley River (Map 7b). This situation proving somewhat unfavorable, many soon removed to the neck between the Ashley and Cooper Rivers, both named for Anthony Ashley Cooper, a proprietor, beginning there a community now known as Charleston. The older settlement was abandoned in 1680, when the new Charles Town was made the seat of government. Colleton, Berkeley, Craven (next to the the north), and Clarendon Counties, all bearing names of proprietors, were marked off, the colonists keeping close to the coast.

The configuration of the land as well as the spirit of John Locke's "Fundamental Constitutions," prepared in England for the noble proprietors, sug-

gested large plantations. The sea islands, with a coast land some ten miles broad, of similar sandy loam, stretching from the mouth of the Savannah to that of the Pedee (Map 11b), were later famous for their cotton. Behind this is a band about thirty miles in width, abounding in fresh-water swamps by which great quantities of rice were soon to be produced; and farther inland a narrow belt of pine and grass where cattle were pastured. Within these districts the colonial activity of southern Carolina was largely confined, the coastal region being disproportionately represented long after the back country was fairly well peopled. The settlement naturally followed the coast and the rivers, as illustrated by the Huguenots along the Santee.¹

Besides the communities near Charles Town, in Albermarle County there was a settlement far to the north, near the Great Dismal Swamp (Map Study No. 5), where conditions were quite different. "But for the peculiar conformation of its coast, North Carolina, rather than Virginia, would doubtless have been the first American state. It was upon Roanoke Island (Map 7b) that the earliest attempts were made, but Ralph Lane, in 1585, already came to the conclusion that the Chesapeake region would afford better opportunities. First and foremost, the harborage was spoiled by the prevalent sand bars. Then huge pine barrens near the coast hindered the first efforts of the planter, and extensive malarial swamps imperiled his life. . . . It was only by the coast that the conditions were thus forbidding."² This description applies to the coast land south, but not north, of Albemarle Sound.

Although the province of Carolina was in theory one, the settlements on either side of the Cape Fear River had separate governments from the beginning, and from 1713 were practically two provinces. A boundary line was attempted in 1732, but was not finally agreed upon until 1815. Because of the failure of the proprietors to provide defense against the Tuscaroras in 1711, and against the Yemasseees in 1715, and on other grounds of

¹ W. A. Schaper, "Sectionalism in South Carolina," *American Historical Association Report*, 1900, vol. i, p. 269.

² John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*, vol. ii, pp. 309-310.

inefficiency, the proprietary rights of government were surrendered in the southern province in 1719 and in the northern in 1729, after which the Carolinas were ruled as royal provinces.

As the country of the Iroquois and of the Abenaki tribes in Maine was disputed with the French, so the region south of Charles Town was claimed and fought for by the Spanish. There had been war along this southern coast and through the woods in 1686, and from 1703 to 1706. Although no attempt was made by the Carolina proprietors to colonize as far as their boundary line of 29° (Map 14), which was really south of St. Augustine, the provincial government built several forts, the chief of which was Fort George on the Altamaha River. The project of a barrier colony brought forward by James Edward Oglethorpe in 1732 was, therefore, well received by the English ministers, though personally he seems to have had in mind no more the protection against the Spaniards and the development of English trade than an asylum for debtors and others—a "place of refuge for the distressed people of Britain and the persecuted Protestants of Europe."

The charter to Oglethorpe and other trustees in 1732, when supplemented by a conveyance from a Carolina proprietor, gave them control of land between the Savannah and the Altamaha "and westerly from the heads of the said rivers respectively, in direct lines to the south seas," but Oglethorpe soon pushed his settlements to the St. Johns (Map 34). The early population of Georgia reflected the purposes of its founders. Savannah (Map 11b) first laid out was occupied by "decayed people," *i.e.*, debtors released from English prisons; Waldensian Protestants recently driven from Salzburg, then in Bavaria, built the town of New Ebenezer, twenty-five miles up the river; Frederica was established as a military garrison on St. Simon Island just southeast of the mouth of the Altamaha, while on the other side of this little sound was Darien, or New Inverness, settled by Scotch Highlanders; Augusta, far up the Savannah River, was a trading settlement set up by Carolinians. Forts William and St. Andrew, and St. George at the mouth of the St. Johns, stood as sentinels against the Spanish at St.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Augustine. The extent of the Spanish claim may be indicated from Map 14.

SUPPLEMENT

ATTEMPTS AT GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM

From your reading mark with a black C the colonies included in the New England Confederation of 1643,

and with a black D those in the Dominion of New England (1688-89) indicating the portion under a deputy governor. Show the form of government of each colony after 1729, making note of the change in Georgia in 1753. The English Revolution of 1688 and 1689 certainly influenced American affairs; locate places where there were violent readjustments in those years.

MAP STUDY No. 9

SOCIETY AND COMMERCE IN THE YOUNG AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 134-158; Tyler, *England in America*, pp. 210-228; Andrews, *Colonial Self-government*, pp. 304-336; Greene, *Provincial America*, chaps. xiv, xvi-xviii.

MAP: Eastern United States.

AMERICA has grown great and won the world's regard by welcoming to her shores men of every race, creed, and class. Though the early immigrants were mostly from England, they lived as neighbors with the steady, thrifty Dutch and Swedish settlers on the Delaware and Hudson Rivers, and now were joined by ambitious poor or refugees from religious and political persecution in many parts of western Europe.

The Huguenots came from France in the reign of Louis XIV, although some had first sought refuge in England and the German Palatinate. They settled most numerous in South Carolina along the Santee River (Map 11b), though some made their homes on the James near Henrico (Map 7a) in Virginia; in New York City, New Paltz (Map 9), and New Rochelle (Map 18b); in Rhode Island; here and there in Pennsylvania; in Orleans, on Cape Cod, and, to a small extent, in Boston. They seem unimportant in the census records, but in proportion to their number theirs was the most valuable stock that went into the making of America.

Germany planted no colonies, as it had no political unity or national government until the nineteenth century, but because of the devastation of the Palatinate by the land-greedy Louis XIV, the hopeless economic position of the peasants, and the discrimination by the princes against

certain pietistic sects, many companies and individuals came to America. On the map of Pennsylvania we have recorded the Mennonite settlement made in response to Penn's invitation. In 1709 and 1710 Palatine refugees in England were sent by that government to New Berne, North Carolina (Map 16), and to New York. In the latter province they were located near modern Newburgh and along the eastern bank of the Hudson from Rhinebeck up to Germantown (Columbia and part of Dutchess County (Map 11a), on land bought from the Livingstons, and set to work preparing pitch for the English navy. Finding this irksome, most of them crossed to the Schoharie Valley (Schoharie County), but their land titles were disputed and a considerable number of them again moved on about 1725. Some went to the Mohawk, settling for nearly fifty miles along the river, where their settlement is recalled in names like German Flats, Mannheim, Minden, Palatine, Frankfort, Oppenheim, Newkirk, and Herkimer, although those places need not be located. More made their way into Pennsylvania, settling on Tulpehocken Creek near the site of modern Reading (Map 21a).

The Palatines were the first large group of German-Americans, but were only one. Moravians, Mennonites, Dunkards, and Schwenkfelders, whose beliefs as to baptism and whose peculiar manners could be studied by the help of an ency-

clopedia, as well as Lutherans, Catholics, and others, came as immigrants, many of them indenturing themselves to service to pay their passage. They did not linger in the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia, where, in the old Quaker country, land was highly priced, but spread in all directions, so that the region southwest of the Blue Mountains of the Kittatinny Range—that is, the territory which any *modern detailed map of Pennsylvania* will show as the counties of Northampton, Lehigh, Montgomery, Berks, Lebanon, Lancaster, Adams, Cumberland, and Franklin—is still famous as the home of the “*Pennsylvania Dutch*.” Some crossed the Delaware and became a part of the population of northwestern New Jersey; but many more families went on into Maryland, the Virginian piedmont, here and there through the Shenandoah Valley and along the up-country of the Carolinas west of the great pine barrens. Salem, North Carolina (Map 34), the center of the old Moravian colony of Wachovia, and Saxe-Gotha, near modern Columbia, and Orangeburg, South Carolina, among other places, recall the German settlements.

The Scotch-Irish, in the early part of the eighteenth century, found their position in the province of Ulster growing more intolerable. Their land titles were challenged and the English government harassed them, along with other Irishmen, with religious regulation and discriminating tariff laws. Many emigrated to America, some settling in Maine, where Belfast (Map 34) stands as a reminder, some at Londonderry, New Hampshire (a little southeast of Chester; Map 34), and some in the valleys of the Berkshires; others made their homes along the Mohawk and Schoharie Valleys. But most of them landed in Philadelphia and, passing over the lands of the Quakers and the Germans, settled sparsely through the Alleghanies, but closely in Pittsburg and vicinity. From Pennsylvania they spread rapidly through the piedmont and southern valleys, soon outnumbering the Germans, whom they generally flanked to the west, and at times, in the Carolinas, the English. Though the majority came in thus by the “back door” of these southern colonies, another stream of this same immigration ran from Charleston

into the hill country. “In 1700 the foreign population in the colonies was slight; in 1775 it is calculated that 225,000 Germans and 385,000 Scotch-Irish, together nearly one-fifth of the entire population, lived within the provinces that won independence.”

There were other groups that helped to vary the blood of English America. The Welsh settled on the “*Welsh Barony*” of 40,000 acres just west of Philadelphia, where the names of modern suburbs attest their origin, such as Merion (once Merioneth Town), Radnor and Haverford (Map 10), and, near by, Bryn Mawr, Bala, Ardmore, Wynnewood, Narberth, Cymwyd, Pencoyd, etc. Swiss sectaries found a home in New Berne, North Carolina (Map 16), and Jews expelled from Portugal and Spain especially in New York City and Rhode Island. Catholic Irish in small numbers scattered themselves throughout the colonies.

Oftentimes succeeding waves of immigration left population seemingly in strata, as in New York. Here are Indian names, like Ontario, Oswego, Oneida, etc.; Dutch names, like Schenectady, Cohoes, and Spuyten Duyvil; German names, like German Flats and Palatine; French names like those of the northern rivers, Racquette, DeGrasse, and St. Regis, or of the Huguenot town, New Rochelle; the names of English towns or of pioneers, and later, in the national period, those of American statesmen. But place names in a new country, rapidly settled, will not, as a whole, mean as much as in Europe. A glance at the map suffices to show the resort to artificiality in the wholesale naming of townships. The classics and the capitals of the world were called upon to furnish names in great numbers.

The desire to worship God in some way that chanced to violate the mandate of the state Church was undoubtedly a powerful motive in the minds of many emigrants to America. New Englanders, however, objected not to the principle of an establishment, but only to the errors which they thought distinguished that in England; consequently, in all their colonies, except Rhode Island, taxes were collected for the Puritan-Congregational Church until the nineteenth century. In the South, Vir-

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

ginia and the Carolinas maintained the Anglican or Episcopal Church with public money from the beginning until the Revolution, although in North Carolina there was but one settled minister till after 1721, and the law was enforced hardly at all, because of the overwhelming proportion of dissenters. The situation was similar in Georgia; though grants were made for religion at the foundation of the colony, there was really no state Church until 1758, about five years after it had become a royal province, and by 1769, shortly before it succumbed in the Revolution, there were but two churches in the establishment. The following extract describes the situation in Maryland: "The first assembly convened by the royal government passed the act, in the year 1692, for the establishment in Maryland of the Church of England. . . . [After some time] Doctor Bray's bill became a law in the year 1701-02, and with but few amendments it remained in force until the Revolution of 1776."¹ The arrangement in New York (Map 11a) was embodied in "The Ministry Act, 1693: 'An Act for settling a ministry and raising a maintenance for them in the City of New York, County of Richmond, Westchester, and Queens County. Passed September 22, 1693 (Chapter 33).'"² But the act specified merely that a "good sufficient Protestant Minister" was to officiate in each parish, and it was never agreed that this excluded others than Anglicans. A stiff contest was fought by Presbyterians at Jamaica (Map 9) to wrest control of their church property away from the governor's clergyman. In New Jersey a weak claim was made that the Anglican Church was established, because it came under the same governor as New York, and under the law whose ambiguous phrasing we have just remarked.

Sectarian enthusiasm was responsible for the foundation of all the colonial colleges but one, the College of Philadelphia, now the University of

¹ N. D. Mereness, *Maryland as a Proprietary Province* (New York, 1901), pp. 437-439.

² *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York* (Albany, 1901), vol. ii, pp. 1076-1079. Queens County included modern Kings.

Pennsylvania. They can be located, with dates, from the following table:¹

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Sect</i>	<i>Date</i>
Harvard College	Cambridge, Mass.	Puritan	1636
William and Mary College	Williamsburg, Va.	Anglican	1693
Yale College	New Haven, Conn.	Puritan	1700
Nassau Hall (Princeton)	Princeton, N. J.	Presbyterian	1746
College of Philadelphia (U. of P.)	Philadelphia		1749
Kings College (Columbia)	New York, N. Y.	Anglican	1754
Rhode Island College (Brown)	Providence, R. I.	Baptist	1764
Queens College (Rutgers)	New Brunswick, N. J.	Reformed	1766
Dartmouth College	Hanover, N. H.	Puritan	1769

From your reading, especially from C. M. Andrews's *Colonial Self-government*, Chapter XVIII, show what towns had become important commercial ports early in the eighteenth century, and indicate within parentheses the names of any said already to have declined. It is interesting to reflect upon the causes of the lessened importance now of Salem (Map 34), for example, which once led the shipping of English America; or Providence, which at one time far surpassed New York. The extent of settlement of the hinterland, and the facilities of communication, often changed the trend of trade. One reason why Boston developed as a port, more than the coast cities of the South, was that it was nine degrees of longitude nearer to England. What city is not mentioned in Professor Andrews's book dealing with the seventeenth century, which became one of America's chief ports by 1776?

Mark with initial letters localities which produced tobacco, indigo, naval stores, rum, rice, hats, ships, wool, fish, and iron goods.

¹ Place names can be found on Maps 9, 14, 18c, 34. For Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, the year 1749 is sometimes claimed as the date of foundation on the ground of continuation from an academy founded in Augusta County, Virginia, in that year. It did not become a college until 1813. It will be noticed that the collegiate movement had as yet made little headway in the South. DeBow, the Southern economist, estimated that one-third of the white people of the country in 1775 lived south of Mason and Dixon's line (Map 38). The United States Census Bureau, omitting the figures of the University of Pennsylvania, estimates the attendance in the colleges north of the line as 687, that of those south, 30; see *A Century of Population Growth* (Washington, 1909), p. 32. We shall see a situation quite changed in our survey of the "Plantation Empire."

MAP STUDY No. 10

LATIN OR SAXON? THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 112-130; Tyler, *England in America*, pp. 284-291; Greene, *Provincial America*, 119-165; Thwaites, *France in America*, 72-280.

MAPS: North America; Eastern United States (2).

IN the first decade of the seventeenth century two rival European peoples set up outposts on the edge of a vast new continent of incomputable size and wealth, and feebly held by savages. By the end of the century these colonies had grown sufficiently to annoy each other, so that their second hundred years was mostly spent in conflict, though unsteady and often purely local. They competed for the fur trade, urged on the savages to massacre frontiersmen, took advantage of the wars in Europe to harass each other's commerce, till, with the growth of population, they looked out toward the great West, and it was realized in European capitals, by those who knew, that a final struggle must be fought. What stock would come to rule the continent of North America, which could sustain as great and highly civilized a population as that of all Europe? Would it be Latin or Anglo-Saxon? This question and its settlement have an important place in the history of the world.

On the outline map should be shown the European claims, occupation, and settlement in 1689 (Map 12), although it should be remembered, as the English frontier line is drawn, that the 200,000 settlers comprised within were chiefly concentrated very near the coast in thirteen different colonies, more or less self-governing and somewhat jealous of one another. While the Appalachian highland set a bound to English territorial growth, the northern waterways gave the French easy access to the West and encouraged a settlement far-reaching, but scattered and thin. The French area in 1689, impressive as it is on our map, contained less than a tenth as many people as the English. But they showed a larger proportion of adult men, they were under a single autocratic government, and,

with one important exception, stood on better terms with the Indians.

The Iroquois (Map Study No. 7) were useful to the French holding back the English settlement from the western river valleys, but after the Church and the eastern traders had forced Frontenac's recall in 1682, these Indians sallied almost unopposed into Canada and massacred the village at La Chine, near Montreal. Frontenac, now sent back, determined to impress the savages and thereby control the Hudson-Mohawk route to the West, as well as those of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. In the winter of 1690 he formed war parties at Montreal, Three Rivers, and Quebec, and struck at Schenectady, Salmon Falls on the Piscataqua (Map 9), and Casco (later known as Falmouth; Map 14). In return the same year New England sent out forces which took Port Royal in Acadia (Map 12); then representatives of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Plymouth co-operated with New York, which was to furnish half the troops in an expedition against Montreal, but, the Iroquois failing to support, most of this expedition was abandoned at Lake George (Map 11a). Massachusetts was so encouraged by the Acadian ventures that it sent out a fleet under Sir William Phips to take Quebec. Sir William, on arriving at the French fortress, let slip his opportunity through delay, and returned without success. After these activities of 1690, hostilities lapsed into a *petite guerre* along the frontier until the indecisive Peace of Ryswick was announced.

The second period of formal struggle began in 1702, but for the next seven years consisted chiefly in border forays in northern New England, of which the famous raid at Deerfield (Map 14), in 1704, may serve as an example. In that year

and in 1707 there were two unsuccessful attempts to retake Port Royal, which had been returned to France in 1697. Colonial agents now interested the mother country in an expedition, and sufficient naval aid was given to make possible this capture of the Acadian town, which now became Annapolis and has remained English to the present day. The following year Massachusetts co-operated with an English fleet and army in another attempt against the famous fortress on the St. Lawrence, while a land expedition supported by the middle colonies, Connecticut, and the Iroquois was planned against Montreal by the former route selected, up the Hudson, along the waters of Lake George and Lake Champlain, and down the Richelieu. The failure of the former through the cowardice and stupidity of the English leaders, after they had sailed into the mouth of the great river, entailed the abandonment of the latter, which consisted of some 2,300 men, before it passed the head of Lake Champlain. There soon followed the Treaty of Utrecht (Map 14), whose American arrangements should be indicated on the second map.

That the fighting in America had but a loose connection with that in Europe is illustrated by the fact that Spanish ships, using St. Augustine as a base, had raided the Carolina settlements on the Edisto (Map 7b) and the Scotch colony near Beaufort (Map 11b), and that, before the War of the Spanish Succession had been declared, the governor of Florida had planned to drive the English from the whole disputed district (Map 12). The Carolinians, being warned, beat off their foes in a battle on the Flint (Map 11b) and this success encouraged them to attack St. Augustine, in 1702, by expeditions on land and sea. But though the town itself was destroyed, they could not muster enough artillery to smash down the fort, and returned with little of significance accomplished. In 1703, to atone for this disappointment, the English made their way in force from Charleston through the woods to some fortified settlements about eighty miles northwest of St. Augustine, and destroyed them. The Spaniards of St. Augustine retaliated three years later by joining with a French fleet from Martinique in an attack on Charleston; but, though wasted by disease, the

citizens drove off the invaders and, indeed, made many French and Spanish prisoners.

The Spanish again raided the Edisto region in 1727, continuing to urge the Yemassee against the English, as they had in 1715 (Map Study No. 8). Likewise, it was before the "War of Jenkins's Ear" had been announced in America that the Spaniards attacked the English on Amelia Island (Map 28). The safety of the southern frontier now rested with the buffer colony of Georgia and its organizer, General Oglethorpe. In November, 1739, he directed an attack by land and sea on the capital of the Spanish province, which was a complete failure. But when the Spanish governor, in 1642, sailed against him, he won a small naval victory near Fort William, and shortly afterward by an ingenious ruse scared away 5,000 men moving on Frederica (Map 11b).

Meanwhile, in the period of truce that followed the Peace of Utrecht, the French and English continued their diplomatic contest for the Iroquois support. The former, to bar one door to the West and to strengthen their prestige among the Senecas, set up a new fort at Niagara in 1721 (Map 13), while Burnet, the enterprising governor of New York, in 1726, fortified the trading post at Oswego, lying, as the map demonstrates, within the region claimed by France and commanding the Ontario-Mohawk route from Fort Frontenac to the English settlements. The French soon answered with Fort Frederic at Crown Point, protecting Montreal and menacing New York. But the most important fortress was at Louisburg, begun in 1720, at the little fishing town of Cape Breton Island (Map 14). This, second only to Quebec in strength, was especially annoying to New England as a base for privateers and for raids upon cod fisheries, almost as important to them as the fur trade was to Canada. When, in 1745, the European War of the Austrian Succession had made regular the fighting in America, these colonies gathered all their strength and, aided by an English fleet, set out from Boston. They retook Canseau, at the eastern point of Nova Scotia, whose seizure by the French had been the immediate provocation of their enterprise, and then sailed on to Louisburg itself, which, after a siege, to everyone's

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

astonishment, they captured. But their satisfaction was soon marred by the restoration of the fortresses in the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748.

Our maps have indicated the disputed claims as to the land beyond the Alleghanies (Maps 12 and 14). Those of the English were restated from the early charters, Virginia's of 1609 being most inclusive (Map Study No. 5); the French claims, based on exploration, were not so valid for the upper Ohio country as for the region farther west (Map Study No. 4). By the middle of the eighteenth century English traders had penetrated to such Indian settlements as Logstown, seventeen miles down the Ohio River; Pickawillany, on the upper waters of the Miami, near the site of modern Piqua (Map 28b), and Sandusky on Lake Erie (Map 16); and by underselling their rivals they acquired some prestige. But the French with their single energetic government in Quebec, actively imperialistic and unchecked by any popular assembly, were better fitted to strike for this fair country of woods and rolling prairies. They had but 60,000 people, while the English numbered over 1,500,000; but, as we have observed, they were 60,000 servants of the French Empire, and more effective than the vastly greater population of democratic home builders, concerned with local liberties. They had established soldiers, priests, and traders at ports such as Detroit (Map 14), which, founded a half century before, had lately come to boast a thousand whites; Fort Miami, near the mouth of the Maumee (Map 15b); Vincennes, in 1735; and Fort Ouiatanon, in 1719, on the Wabash. The valley of the Ohio demanded attention. "If the English should seize it," says Parkman,¹ "they would sever the chain of posts and cut French America asunder. If the French held it and intruded themselves along its eastern limits they would shut their rivals between the Alleghanies and the sea, control all the tribes of the West, and turn them, in case of war, against the English borders—a frightful and unsupportable scourge."

In 1749 the French governor sent Céleron de Bienville to take possession of the region by burying engraved lead plates at the confluence of

streams and nailing sheets of tin, emblazoned with the royal arms, to trees conspicuously situated. He landed near the site of modern Westfield on Lake Erie, made his way eight miles over a ridge to Lake Chautauqua (Map 13), and thence by its outlet to the Allegheny, considered by the French as part of the Ohio, which they called *La Belle Rivière*.¹ Along this stream he proceeded to the mouth of the Great Miami (Map 29b), up which he went, and, crossing to the Maumee, returned to Lake Erie. Occupation followed. The landing for the Chautauqua portage was rocky and difficult, and the next expedition found a better route from Presq' Isle, now Erie (Map 15b), to French Creek (Map 13), twenty-one miles away, where Fort Le Bœuf was built, in 1753, on the site of modern Waterford. At the juncture of French Creek and the Allegheny, the following year Fort Venango (now Franklin) was set up. Forts Toronto and La Présentation had already been built, in 1749, to hold the Indians about Lake Ontario. It was clear that they soon would occupy the strategic point at which the Allegheny joined the Monongahela to form the Ohio.

Meanwhile the English had not been entirely idle. Their method of expansion was not by forts and mission stations, or by lead plates and standards, but by actual settlement on the soil; and in 1749 two land companies were formed of Englishmen and colonists. The Ohio Company, made up mostly of Virginians, obtained a grant of 500,000 acres on the river between the Monongahela and the Great Kanawha (Map 17), on consideration that they settle seven hundred families within fourteen years. Pennsylvania, determining to circumvent their southern neighbors, filed rival petitions and organized rival expeditions. Reference to Map Study No. 7 will recall that the land about the headwaters of the Ohio was claimed by both these colonies. The companies sent competing agents into the West, and the Indians, believing tales of each against the other, came to give even more confidence to the French.

Several of the Virginia governors had considered

¹ The French name for this stream, *La Rivière aux Bœufs*, or the River of Buffaloes, reminds us that the bison at that time ranged as far east as parts of New York and Pennsylvania.

¹ *Montcalm and Wolfe* (Boston, 1884), vol. i, p. 40.

making good the western claims of that province; in 1716 Governor Spotswood had said, "We should attempt to make some settlements on ye lakes, and at the same time possess ourselves of those passes of the great mountains which are necessary to preserve a communication with such settlements." It was Governor Dinwiddie who, in 1753, sent young Major Washington, then twenty-one years old, to warn off the French. Starting from Will's Creek, or Cumberland (Map 15b), which the Ohio Company had made a trading base, he passed through the ridges and intervening meadows of the Alleghanies to the Monongahela (Map 17), and the Ohio to Logstown. Thence he went across the country to Venango where some French officers were spending the winter preparing the materials for a fort, and then to Fort Le Bœuf, hearing nothing but the boasts of the widening dominion of the French. The following year, after he had reported, he was sent with a small command to take charge of a fort at the forks of the Ohio, which the Ohio Company had begun. At Will's Creek he learned that the French had been before him and built Fort Duquesne, but, pressing on, he fought a victorious skirmish with a party of the enemy just beyond the mountains. He then erected Fort Necessity (Map 15b) at this place; but here, on July 4th, he was attacked and beaten by a superior force.

Dinwiddie's pleas brought an English force to America under Gen. Edward Braddock, who was to take the "offensive defensive"; and at a conference of governors at Alexandria (Map 30), a plan was unfolded. Besides Oswego, which the British had held since 1726, the four gates to Canada were to be secured. That to the Ohio Valley, at Fort Duquesne, Braddock was himself to take. Governor Shirley was to strengthen the fort at Oswego, and then move on Niagara. Col. William Johnson, the New York Indian Agent, was to take Crown Point. Lt.-Col. Robert Monckton was to drive the enemy from Fort Beauséjour on the northern arm of the Bay of Fundy (Map 16), which may be indicated on the continental map. These key points were all on ground claimed by the English; but French occupation had weakened the claim.

In early summer Braddock led out the first British military command that ever penetrated a wilderness, followed close to Washington's former route, and fell at Fort Duquesne before the experienced French bushfighters leading the American red men, the most formidable forest warriors the world had ever seen. The frontier was terror-stricken by this tragedy, and many rude stockades were built along the eastern mountains in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Shirley's and Johnson's men rendezvoused at Albany. The Indian leader took about two thousand farmers and Mohawks to the shores of Lac St. Sacrement, which, with the instinct of a courtier, he renamed Lake George, and there at a fortified position in a wooded swamp, called Fort William Henry, after one of the king's grandsons, he beat off a French force that had come from Montreal. Shirley cut his way to Oswego with three regiments of colonials, but, because of difficulties in transportation through the wilderness, the prospect of the winter storms, and the present menace of the French across the lake, his forces got no farther, and dwindled by disease to a small remnant.

The fourth objective of this quadrilateral campaign, Fort Beauséjour, lay in a country where the French inhabitants annoyed the British government.¹ Halifax had been founded a half dozen years before, and four thousand colonists brought from England as a counterpoise to Louisburg. But the old French settlers made known their resentment in many ways, and, though professedly neutral, aided the French in Fort Beauséjour, which threatened the English to the west. Monckton's force made its way from Boston, easily captured this clumsy work, and renamed it Fort Cumberland, after the king's brother. They had isolated Louisburg; but the ruling power was not patient. The *habitants*, who refused to be subordinate to the British, especially in Grand Pré (Map 14), were now deported to the number of six thousand, and allowed to find their way, possibly to Cape Breton Island, or, like Evangeline, to Louisiana.

¹ The boundaries of the land transferred in 1713 were very vague and both sides claimed what is now New Brunswick and upper Maine.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

England and France declared formal war in the spring of 1756; we have seen that frontier fighting was regarded as somewhat beyond the law of nations, and, like that of privateers, continued in times of peace. Shirley was intrigued out of the command which had been left by Braddock, and his successor, the Earl of Loudoun, was so ineffective that the new French leader, Montcalm, crossed from Fort Frontenac to what is now called Sackett's Harbor (Map 28), and, dragging his cannon overland, easily took Oswego. The following year, with French regulars, Canadian militiamen, and a heterogeneous force of Indians, he came up the Richelieu-Champlain route to Crown Point and the new work at Ticonderoga, and then by land and water to the destruction of Fort William Henry. The outpost of the English now became Fort Edward (Map 18a) on the upper waters of the Hudson, which Johnson had built two years before to control this much-disputed land. This frontier region, from the Mohawk to Lake George and Lake Champlain, saw far more drilling and fighting from 1609 to 1778 than any other part of America.

When Pitt came to power, in 1757, the war ceased to be a struggle for certain limited rights and places in the world, and became an unlimited war for the final destruction of the French Empire, involving, of course, its complete expulsion from America. First-class generals were now sent to America; Amherst and Wolfe, and Admiral Boscawen, in 1758, took the "impregnable" fortress of Louisburg, which was soon afterward destroyed and disappeared from history. Abercrombie misled a gallant army to defeat before Ticonderoga, but Col. John Bradstreet somewhat offset this disgrace by taking a force of provincials and Indians up the Mohawk and to the site of Oswego, whence he crossed the lake, captured and destroyed old Fort Frontenac (Map 13), and all the near-by shipping, thus seizing the Ontario gateway and weakening the French hold on Niagara.

The Pennsylvania frontier had suffered through the indifference of the Quaker Assembly, but, after sundry losses, Governor Morris had, in 1756, sent Col. John Armstrong with a force of Scotch-Irish

borderers to demolish a nest of savages on the Allegheny, between Forts Venango and Duquesne. His success explains the name of Armstrong County, and suggests what Pennsylvania might have done had its government been active. Now, in 1758, General Forbes, with twelve hundred Highlanders and many militiamen, struck out across the mountains to Fort Bedford (Map 15b), where he was joined by Washington, who had led a force from Cumberland. The army now pushed forward by way of Fort Ligonier to Fort Duquesne, where a victory wiped out the stain of Braddock's defeat and, in the words of Parkman, "opened the Great West to English enterprise, took from France half her savage allies, and relieved the western borders of the scourge of Indian war."¹ The French were now distinctly on the defensive.

Pitt had planned a triple attack on Canada, all concentrating on Quebec. Wolfe, with Admiral Saunders in support, was to lead up the St. Lawrence a command composed in part of New Englanders, recruited in great numbers and at heavy cost to the colonies; Amherst, with a larger army, was to take Ticonderoga and Crown Point and march to Montreal. Colonel Prideaux was to transport about 5,000 men from Oswego along Lake Ontario to Fort Niagara, which reduced, he was to join Amherst and move with him to merge all forces in a final stroke against the citadel of New France. Prideaux's errand was accomplished and Amherst was successful, but the Lake Champlain campaign consumed so much time that Wolfe was forced to act alone. The British navy had so closed the sea to reinforcement and supply that the town was in hard straits, and on September 13, 1759, the French succumbed upon the Plains of Abraham, just west of Quebec. Canada had fallen, though the French attempted the following year to retake their city, till driven off by English ships. In September, 1760, General Amherst, commanding 17,000 men, took the last stronghold, Montreal, and a general capitulation was concluded. The final arrangement can be indicated on the map (Map 16).

The frontiersmen of New York and Pennsylvania were not the only ones who saw the reddened

¹ *Montcalm and Wolfe*, vol. ii, p. 162.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

tomahawk. The Cherokees, in 1759, proved unreliable allies of England, and, believing they had grievances, went on the warpath along the Carolina border. To provide against such a possibility, the governor of South Carolina had built Fort Prince George in what is now the western corner of the state, and Fort Loudoun (Map 15b) was likewise soon erected on the Little Tennessee. Partisan warfare, with cruel attacks and reprisals, waged through this country for two years, training soldiers who were to lead similar bands against the British twenty years later. Several expeditions, including regulars and provincials from Virginia and North Carolina, made war from a base on the Congarees, near modern Columbia (Map 59a), and finally Colonel Grant, furnished by Amherst with a force of Highlanders and colonists and with Chickasaw and Creek allies, freed the back settlements of the Cherokee menace.

A far more serious Indian war was that organized by a chief of the Ottawas, an Algonquian tribe. When, after the capitulation of 1760, Maj. Robert Rogers with his two hundred rangers, on his way west to receive the French posts, put in at the mouth of Cuyahoga, now Cleveland (Map 28), he was met by this savage leader, demanding that this intrusion be explained. Rogers seemed to satisfy him and went on to take possession of Detroit, Forts Miami and Ouiatanon (Map 13), and, the

following year, the forts at Michillimackinac, Sault Ste. Marie, Green Bay, and St. Joseph. But cautiously and thoroughly Pontiac was enlisting all the western tribes into a conspiracy, preaching with the fervor of a prophet and planning with the skill of an accomplished strategist. Parkman has described his secret service, his smooth and treacherous professions, and his cruel thoroughness; we need here only to notice that in 1763 Forts Sandusky (Map 15b), St. Joseph, Miami, Ouiatanon, Le Bœuf, Venango, and Presq' Isle, and the forts at Bedford and Carlisle, Pennsylvania (Map 34), fell into the Indians' hands. Detroit and Fort Ligonier (Map 15b) succeeded in holding out till help arrived. Bradstreet's journey to relieve the former is recorded in our map, and also that of Col. Henry Bouquet, who, with a small force, raised the siege of Fort Ligonier, fought the famous battle of Bushy Run, and saved the garrison at Fort Pitt. These victories sealed the fate of Pontiac's conspiracy, and the following year Bouquet went on to the Muskingum country to receive the submission of the tribes and 200 captives whom the Indians had taken. Thereafter there was no important frontier fighting until the Revolution, except that which Lord Dunmore, the governor of Virginia, carried on in 1774, against the Cherokees along the Great Kanawha River.

MAP STUDY No. 11

AMERICANS FOR AMERICA: FROM IRRITATION TO INDEPENDENCE

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 130-132, 161-181; Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution*; Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, pp. 3-49.

MAPS: The World; Eastern United States.

DURING the ten years of war in America begun at Fort Necessity and ended at Bushy Run, the population grew larger by a third, according to the customary rate of increase for a century past, and in 1763 stood above one and three-quarter millions. Contemplating their huge war

debt, the Ministers at home listened with interest to the tales of British soldiers and officials as to how the colonies had prospered, and resolved to impress them with a sense of imperial obligation.

Let us imagine ourselves seated beside the hard-working Chancellor of the Exchequer, George

Grenville, in the winter of 1764, with a map of the world spread out before us. On the American continent we indicate the territorial settlement of the year before, reflecting upon its possible consequences as we extend England's color north across the Lakes and the St. Lawrence. Possibly Grenville has heard comments like that of Vergennes, the French diplomat, that he was "persuaded England would ere long repent of having removed the only check that could keep her colonies in awe." He formulates a plan to maintain soldiers in America, to be supported by a stamp tax, not only for protection against the Indians, but against a possible return of the French. Grenville is vaguely aware that the region beyond the Alleghanies has some possibilities, for he has, no doubt, heard of the proposal, made by some speculators the previous autumn, to erect a colony of great area along the Mississippi, to be known as *Charlotiana* (Map 17), and of the petition of Colonel Washington and others for a Mississippi Company to settle the land about the mouth of the Ohio, and of the plan of New York business men to develop a region overlapping both the others.

But the Ministry desires to quiet the fears of the Indians, who are reported to be on the warpath (Map Study No. 10) to protect their hunting grounds from English settlement. On this account the Ministers have issued, in October, 1763, a proclamation closing to all white men, excepting licensed traders, "for the present" all land "beyond the heads or sources of any of the rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from the west or northwest." They originally expected by careful surveying to reserve the southern Ohio country, but the fierceness with which Pontiac has made war has led them to select a well-marked natural boundary, and we can easily trace the line from Chaleurs Bay to the St. Marys River (Map 16). The proclamation, as if in compensation, mentions the advantages, including the protection of English law, which settlers may enjoy in Nova Scotia, the two Floridas, and Quebec. But the inclusion of the last among those coming under the legal system, some may be wise enough to see, will have

to be corrected later.¹ Perhaps the Chancellor notices that no provision has been made for governing the old French settlements along the Mississippi and the Wabash. Georgia, now beginning rapidly to grow in population, has been extended by the line to the St. Marys, yet probably Grenville knows that this southernmost colony of the old thirteen has determined to claim all west to the Mississippi from the sources of the Savannah and St. Marys.²

But the Chancellor's mind is not chiefly occupied with the subject of boundaries, but with that of revenue. If on our map we indicate the region north of Mason and Dixon's line (Map 37) as "farm colonies," and that to the south as "plantation colonies," we represent Grenville's opinion of them respectively as "useless" and "useful" as far as English customs and trade are concerned. He thinks much of the trade of New England and we can easily show with lines upon the map the course of his concern. Ships laden with staves, lumber, and provisions put out from these towns—for example, Newport—to Newfoundland, where some of the foodstuffs are exchanged for "refuse" fish (the European Catholics get the better grades). These are taken to the West Indies for the slaves; and the return is made with cargoes of molasses, which can be more cheaply distilled into rum in New England than in the Caribbean islands, where all energy goes into the fields of cane. Some of the rum is consumed at home, especially among the fishermen, but some is carried past the West Indies, on the next voyage, to the Guinea coast of Africa, from Sierra Leone to the River Congo (Map 4b), where it plays an ugly part in the kidnaping of negroes, and these are carried to the sugar plantations for sale. Some of the high profits thus realized are invested in cargoes of dye woods, cotton, tobacco, sugar, cocoa, etc., which the Yankee skippers take to England, for other European ports have long been closed to these commodities by the Act of 1660 and others. Here they further improve their fortune by taking

¹ In 1774.

² The line of 1767, which placed the West Florida boundary north nearly to the mouth of the Yazoo, 32° 28', north latitude, cut off some of Georgia's claim beyond the Appalachian-Chattahoochee River.

on good loads of English manufactured goods, and put sail for home.¹

What annoys the Chancellor is that the New Englanders do not import their molasses solely from Jamaica, or Barbadoes, and the English Leeward Islands (Map 12), but also, and more largely, from Guadaloupe, Martinique, and other French possessions in the Caribbean; and, most important, they generally evade the high duty of sixpence a gallon, imposed in 1733. Grenville even now is preparing soon, in March, to introduce a bill dropping the duty to threepence, but with provision for rigid enforcement. We leave him, therefore, unwittingly about to precipitate a crisis that will disrupt the old British Empire.

The colonies were not internally at peace during the years that followed. On a more detailed map we can locate the upper waters of the Cape Fear River (Map 19a), where the Scotch and Scotch-Irish settlers felt themselves neglected in protection, but not in taxes; without due voice in the legislature, these "Regulators" unsuccessfully made war, from 1767 to 1771, against Governor Tryon and his "tidewater" supporters. Intercolonial disputes may be illustrated by that between Virginia and Pennsylvania over the Fort Pitt region (Map 16). In 1774, Lord Dunmore, governor of the former province, led out a force to occupy these valleys, but the outbreak of an Indian war on the Kanawha induced him to take it southwest along the Ohio to that region (Map Study No. 10).

No one had paid much heed to the Proclamation Line of 1763, as it was considered temporary. North Carolina settlers had moved to the valley of the Holston (Map 19b), and, defying Governor Tryon, had set up a government for themselves known as the Wataugua Association. After Boone and others had made a number of journeys along a trace which became famous as the Wilderness Road, and through Cumberland Gap (Map 34),

¹ Many ships stopped, en route from the Caribbean, at the "Wine Islands," the Madeiras and Canaries (Map 4b).

Judge Richard Henderson acquired a huge tract from the Indians and attempted, in 1775, to erect a proprietary government of "Transylvania" (Map 17). But dissensions and the opposition of North Carolina and Virginia prevented his success and these far-western colonists remained under the jurisdiction of the older governments. Some time before, prominent speculators, among them Franklin, had obtained from England, in 1768, the great Vandalia grant in what is now West Virginia and northeastern Kentucky. In this fashion the land rights of Virginia were disregarded, but a number of companies were being formed by that colony's consent as well as that of England. This was the situation when, in 1774, Quebec was extended to the Ohio and the expansion of the coastal colonies curbed apparently for all time.

From his reading the student should be able to locate, with date, on the outline map, the place of meeting of the Stamp Act Congress, inferring from its geographical position which large section of the colonies was more interested in united protest to England. If he recalls that opposition to the Sugar Act was closely bound up with that to the stamps, this will help in explanation. If he will indicate, with dates, the location of the First and Second Continental Congresses, he will notice some apparent shifting of the center of interest. By marking with a black C those colonies which early appointed intercolonial Committees of Correspondence, he will gain some notion of the comparative degree of feeling up and down the seaboard in 1773 and 1774. The Gaspé affair, which had a relation to the origin of these committees, will be better understood if its location is regarded in connection with the trade routes recently drawn upon the world map. What ports refused the tea? And what was the chief port of Massachusetts during 1774 and 1775?

By the use of Roman numerals, rate the colonies and the cities in 1770 according to the following estimates taken from the United States Census Report of 1900:

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

N. H.....	60,000	Salem.....	5,000	N. Y... By City and (some) County Delegates
Mass.....	399,000	Boston.....	15,520	N. J... " Provincial Congress
R. I.....	55,000	Newport.....	9,000	Pa.... " Legislature (Unicameral)
Conn.....	175,000	New York.....	21,000	Del.... " Provincial Congress
N. Y. (inc. Vt.)	185,000	Philadelphia....	28,000	Md.... " " "
N. J.....	110,000	Baltimore.....	5,000	Va.... " " "
Pa.....	250,000	Charleston.....	10,000	N. C... " " "
Del.....	25,000			S. C... " Lower (Popular) House of Legislature (approving nominees of a mass meeting)
Md.....	200,000			Ga.... Unrepresented
Va. (inc. Ky.)..	450,000			
N. C.....	230,000			
S. C.....	140,000			
Ga.....	26,000			
	2,205,000			

Draw the frontier line of the colonies at the beginning of revolutionary movement (Map 16). Then, using the following data, by a system of shading, with key, indicate the method by which representatives were selected for the First Continental Congress, noting its decidedly irregular and revolutionary character.

N. H. .	By Provincial Congress
Mass. .	" Lower (Popular) House of Legislature
R. I. .	" Legislature
Conn. .	" (with help of Committees of Correspondence)

With the aid, when necessary, of Jameson's *Dictionary of United States History*, Appleton's, Lamb's, or the *National* biographical encyclopedia, or a general encyclopedia, show by initials the home colonies of the following leaders, mentioned by Bassett in his Chapter VIII: Samuel Adams, Christopher Gadsden, Patrick Henry, Thomas Hutchinson, Benjamin Franklin, James Otis, John Dickinson, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Jay, James Duane, Edward Rutledge, Joseph Galloway, Cadwallader Colden, John Hancock, and Josiah Quincy. Also the following, mentioned by Carl Becker in his *Beginnings of the American People*, Chapter VI: Jonathan Mayhew, Daniel Delaney, R. H. Lee, Joseph Warren, and Samuel Seabury.

MAP STUDY No. 12

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 183, 188-214; John Fiske, *American Revolution*, vol. i, pp. 147-170, 198-238, 249-252, 258-276, 280-339; vol. ii, pp. 59-66, 75-81, 104-115, 149-157, 163-193, 244-290, C. H. Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, chaps. vii, viii, x, xvi, xviii.

MAPS: Middle Atlantic States; South Atlantic States.

THE American Revolutionary War was fought for seven years and over a great extent of territory. It is true that, judged by modern standards, but few men were employed and little money was spent; yet heroism is not measured by statistics. The campaigns of Washington and his generals, with their record of sacrifice and determination, have become a part of our national tradition, and the pleasures of literature and

travel, as well as a true understanding of our national beginnings, are enhanced by a knowledge of them. The most natural and effective method of gaining such an understanding would include the use of outline maps.

In the previous map studies the data have been carefully suggested and the method of presentation often prescribed. But by this time the student should realize the possibilities of the map, and,

with such a subject as this, be able to devise and execute a complete and intelligible illustration by himself.

Besides the routes of march, year by year, there are many other things that can well be noted, and the final product will be a test of originality no less than thoroughness. The maps of the campaigns (Maps 18a, 18b, 18c, and 19b) will aid, but can be improved and elaborated on the larger outline maps available to the student. He will find a good concise summary of the war in Bassett's *History*, but, if time can possibly be found for about two hundred and fifty pages, he will be richly repaid in reading John Fiske's *American Revolution* in the citations above. He will be unlike most Americans if his pulse does not quicken as he follows this clear

and vigorous narrative, even though many interesting episodes, like the frontier warfare and Arnold's treason, are omitted. There are, however, many other good general accounts, such as that of C. H. Van Tyne's *American Revolution*.

On the world map used in Map Study No. 11 may now be indicated the site of John Paul Jones's adventures; the European nations fighting against England in 1780, those neutral, and those belonging to the League of Armed Neutrality which objected to England's maritime code; and the final residence of many Loyalists or Tories who emigrated at the close of the war—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Upper Ontario (north of the lake), the Bahamas, Jamaica, and the Leeward Islands, as well as England.

Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto

MAP STUDY No. 13

ORGANIZING A NATION: FROM JEALOUSY TO CONFIDENCE

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 226-254; McLaughlin, *The Confederation and the Constitution*.

MAP: Eastern United States.

IN the peace negotiations at Paris, in 1782 and 1783, the Americans expected to get at least all the British lands south of what had formerly been acknowledged as French Canada (Map 14) as far as the Floridas. But John Jay had reason to believe that the French allies, represented by Count Vergennes, were recommending an arrangement which might limit the new nation to the Atlantic coastal region (Map 20). Partly on this account the American commissioners negotiated separately with England and obtained a favorable boundary (Map 21a), though one which, as we shall see, gave rise later to disputes, notably in the case of Maine and West Florida.

During the year immediately following the Revolution the name "United States" was more a prophecy than the description of a fact. Among other causes of misunderstanding were overlapping land claims. New Hampshire had resigned her claims to Vermont in 1780, but New York retained

hers for another decade, and the Green Mountain boys had many a violent altercation with "York-state" sheriffs and surveyors (Maps 20 and 21a). Adventurers from Connecticut, the mother state of many emigrants, had early settled along the east branch of the Susquehannah in northeastern Pennsylvania (Map 16), and until 1790 Connecticut supported their claims to the jurisdiction of the Wyoming Valley, against the law of the Philadelphia legislature. The so-called "Pennamite Wars" were the result. Beyond the Appalachians there were conflicting claims, which were based on colonial charters (Map 21a), but these, fortunately, were ceded to the nation, as may be indicated with dates. Virginia, desiring to reward her soldiers, retained a large tract between the Scioto River and the Little Miami, which runs some twenty-five miles east of and parallel to the Great Miami (Map 28b).

New York had claimed most of Ohio and north-

ern Kentucky, as may be shown with a heavy dotted line, because those lands were occupied by tribes acknowledging the overlordship of the Iroquois, but had abandoned this contention in 1780. General Sullivan's raid, in 1779, crushed the power of the Six Nations and brought about the Treaty of Fort Stanwix (Map 16), in 1784, by which the extinction of the Indian land titles was begun. This made of interest to prospective settlers the claim of Massachusetts to the western part of New York, which she maintained was beyond the line of the Duke of York's grant and hence fell within her prior right (Map Study No. 6). This was settled in 1786 by giving to New York the political jurisdiction, and to Massachusetts the fee in the land, which was now sold to private speculators. Connecticut had sent out settlements to southern New York as well as to Pennsylvania, but finally, in 1800, she renounced all her claims beyond her own acknowledged western limits, giving up even her "Western Reserve" along the shore of Lake Erie which she had retained after cession of 1786 (Map 21a). When New York yielded her rights in the West in 1780, she placed her own boundary on the meridian of the western end of Lake Ontario; this left outside the "Erie Triangle," at the north-

west corner of Pennsylvania. After Connecticut had ceded her claims in 1786 this was clearly in possession of the national government, which later disposed of it to Pennsylvania so that that state might have a harbor on Lake Erie.

After reading Bassett, pp. 235-236, indicate with the letters P.M. the states where paper money was issued, and mark those districts where the conflict on this question, in 1786 and 1787, was particularly acute. Locate the site of important interstate conferences or conventions held in 1785, 1786, and 1787 (Bassett, pp. 241-242). Using Roman numerals, rank the most populous five states, and with a large letter L mark the states comprising the "large state group" in the Convention (*Ibid.*, pp. 243-244). Using Maps 22a and 22b, show the distribution of votes on the ratification of the Constitution. It will be observed that, in general, the commercial districts and those where large-propertied men desired Federal protection against any possible democratic uprising (as in South Carolina) were in favor and the small farmers opposed. Some frontier districts, like western Virginia and Georgia, desired the military power of a strong government to be directed against the Indians.

MAP STUDY No. 14

THE NEW GOVERNMENT IN ACTION

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 256-263, 267-269, 277-282; Bassett, *Federalist System*, pp. 3-41, 56-68, 101-116, 218-251.

MAP: Eastern United States.

WE have already noticed (Map Study No. 11) that the valleys of the Kentucky, the Cumberland, and the upper Tennessee were reached by pioneer farmers before the Revolution. Most of the settlers had trudged along the Wilderness Road from Fort Chiswell (Map 15b), where roads from Pennsylvania and from Richmond converged, to and through the Cumberland Gap in what is now Tennessee not far from the present southwest corner of Virginia (Map 34). By the end of

the war there was available the Tennessee Path, starting at the new town of Abingdon (Map 34), some seventy miles beyond Fort Chiswell, but crossing the headwaters a little south of the Wilderness Road and leading westward to the cabins of the settlement founded by James Robertson, in 1780, as Nashboro (Map 19b), but renamed Nashville in 1784.¹ This fairly level road was as

¹The town was named in honor of Gen. Francis Nash, a North Carolinian killed in the battle of Germantown.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

convenient for the Cumberland settlers as that through the Gap for the Kentuckians. The Watauga Association (Map 19b and Map Study No. 11) took advantage of a temporary cession of western claims by North Carolina to the nation in 1784 to organize a "state of Franklin" and apply for admission to the Union; but, on North Carolina's resuming jurisdiction, other westerners overthrew Governor Sevier's "state," and Tennessee, though undeniably restive, continued under the eastern state government till 1794, when organized as a territory. It became a state in 1796, four years after Kentucky and five years after Vermont.

We have also observed that the early settlers of the West went through the southern mountains, but by 1790 another stream had begun to pour into the Ohio Valley through Pittsburg, which had been laid out as a town in 1764. "Three routes met at Pittsburg: one from Philadelphia by the west branch of the Susquehanna (Map 19b), a forty-mile portage over the divide, and Toby Creek to the Allegheny at Kittanning; a second farther south, also from Philadelphia, by the Juniata tributary to the Susquehanna (Map 34), or by a more direct trace known as Forbes Road (Map Study No. 10) from Carlisle through Shippenburgh, Fort Lyttleton, and Fort Bedford (Map 19b), and thence by an easy mountain pass to Fort Ligonier and on down the Allegheny or across a low dividing range to the forks of the Ohio; and a third up the Potomac to Fort Cumberland and thence by Braddock's Road over the divide to the Youghiogheny (Map 17) on to Redstone Old Fort (given as Brownsville on Map 34) on the Monongahela."¹

"In our entire region of the Appalachians," remarks another writer,² "from the Berkshire Hills southward, practically every old-time pathway from

¹ E. C. Semple, *American History and Its Geographic Condition*, p. 65. If one is desirous of following this description in complete detail he will find the map under "Pennsylvania" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* quite satisfactory. There is an excellent map of the early roads to the West in Seymour Dunbar's *History of Travel in America* (Indianapolis, 1915), vol. i, p. 152. The illustrations in this work are from a remarkable series of rare pictures of ways and means of travel on this continent, and are cordially recommended to the student.

² A. B. Hulbert, *The Paths of Inland Commerce* (New Haven, 1920), p. 20.

the seaboard to the trans-Allegheny country was occupied by an important railway system, with the exception of the Warrior's Trail through Cumberland Gap to central Ohio and the Highland Trail across southern Pennsylvania, and even Cumberland Gap is accessible by rail to-day, and a line across southern Pennsylvania was once planned and partially constructed, only to be killed by jealous rivals."

The Northwest Territory, organized in 1787, may be indicated roughly from the dotted area on Map 37. Two settlements had been made almost immediately: Marietta (Map 26), by New Englanders under the Ohio Company, at the mouth of the Muskingum and close to Fort Harmar, which had been built three years before; and Cincinnati, opposite the Licking River, in 1789, by John Cleves Symmes, who with a company of New Jerseymen had recently bought about a million and a quarter acres lying west from the Great Miami River. Chillicothe, the most important town of the Virginia military lands (Map Study No. 13), was founded in 1796, while a little band of Connecticut people under Moses Cleaveland began the settlement of Cleveland in the Western Reserve in the same year.

The earliest settlers were harassed by Shawnees and Delawares (Map 13 and Map Study No. 7), who were encouraged by the British still remaining in the western posts, Oswego, Fort Niagara, Erie, Fort Miami,¹ Detroit, Fort Mackinac, and others. (Maps 28 and 28b). The Indians on their expeditions so plagued the Kentucky frontier that many pioneers joined the force of Gen. Josiah Harmar, who, in 1790, met the enemy near the site of Chillicothe, on the Scioto. He was defeated, but the soldiers and settlers eagerly renewed the attack the following year under the governor of the territory, Gen. Arthur St. Clair. The new army of 2,000 men marched from Fort Washington (Cincinnati), intending to establish a chain of forts from the Ohio to the Maumee. It reached the headwaters of the Wabash, with numbers

¹ There were three Fort Miamis: one in what is now northern Illinois, one where Fort Wayne was later erected, and one built at the falls of the Maumee by the British in 1794, and which figured in Wayne's battle of Fallen Timber. The reference above is to the second.

lessened by desertions and detachments to 1,400, and there was ambushed and disgracefully routed.

The frontier, now all but terrorized, awaited effective aid from the national government. Forces were maintained at Forts Harmar and Washington, and at Vincennes. In 1792 Anthony Wayne, general in chief of the United States army, arrived in Pittsburg and began drilling a force which he led out from Cincinnati the next year. On the field of St. Clair's defeat he built Fort Recovery (Map 28a), and with his little army, strengthened by Kentucky militia, who now arrived, he struck north to the Maumee, where he set up Fort Defiance at the mouth of the Au Glaize. He then followed down the river to the falls, where the British had illegally built a work called Fort Miami (a short distance up the Maumee from its mouth), and here Wayne's disciplined troops completely defeated the Indians in the battle of Fallen Timber, August 20, 1794. Now falling back along the road that he had cut, the general proceeded to the confluence of the St. Marys and the St. Joseph Rivers, where he erected a stockade, named in his honor, and then, retiring to the south, he made his winter quarters at Greenville. In this place was signed the Treaty of Fort Greenville, 1795, running a line east from Fort Recovery and finally north to the site of Cleveland, as is shown upon our map, beyond which, with the exception of the forts, was recognized as belonging to the Indians. But our map also makes clear that Indian tenure seldom long endured; they parted with this land in 1805 and 1807. After the Treaty of Fort Greenville the northeastern region was settled much more rapidly; the territory was divided in 1800 (Map 24), and Ohio, with its western boundary rectified, was admitted as a state in 1802 (Map 27).

As the Indians had egged on the northern Indians, so the Spanish carried on intrigues among those of the south, more numerous and hardly less formidable. "The warriors of the four great southern confederacies—the Cherokees, the Creeks, the Chickasaws, and the Choctaws—were estimated to be 14,000, giving a total population of about 70,000. The Chickasaws, inhabiting that portion of the present state of Tennessee west of the

Tennessee River, and the Choctaws, dwelling principally on the headwaters of the Pearl . . . and extending thence to the Mississippi,¹ being too far from the frontier to be exposed to collision with the back settlers, had always been on good terms with the Anglo-Americans, and the friendship established with those tribes by the treaties of Hopewell (1786) still remained unbroken. The case was very different with the Cherokees and the Creeks, brought into immediate and irritating collision with the frontier settlers of the Carolinas and Georgia. The Cherokees claimed the Cumberland River as their northern boundary, their territory embracing the larger portion of the present state of Tennessee, with parts also of the Carolinas and Georgia."²

Neither the whites nor the Indians paid much attention to the treaties; the warriors again and again attacked Robertson's settlers at Nashville, while by 1789 the Tennesseans had fought their way far into the Cherokee lands, despite the remonstrance of Congress. The Georgians made three treaties with the Creeks, in 1783, 1785, and 1786, yielding them a considerable tract of Creek land south and west of the Oconee, which they granted as military bounties. But they had no right thus to usurp a congressional function; and according to Alexander McGillivray, the half-breed Creek leader, the negotiating Indian chiefs had likewise no adequate authority. The savages, well armed by the Spaniards, were waging a devastating war upon the whites at the time the new government of the United States was instituted, but negotiations begun on the Oconee and continued in New York supported the Creek position, which the government at Savannah accepted with bad grace. In spite of a pension from Congress, however, McGillivray, when back in his town, soon resumed his intrigue with the Spaniards.

Georgia, in 1794 and 1795, granted to three companies the title to the land indicated on our Map 21b, but because the grant was issued under influence of corruption the succeeding legislature declared it void. The United States claimed the

¹ Follow Map 15b or 34 for the location of the Indians.

² Richard Hildreth, *History of the United States*, Second Series (New York, 1851), vol. i, p. 140.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

jurisdiction of the land, especially below the latitude of the Yazoo mouth, where it had acquired England's rights in 1783 (Map Study No. 13). There were, therefore, three claimants—the companies, Georgia, and the national government. The two latter settled their dispute in 1802, as is shown upon our map, and the national government made an arrangement in marking off lands for the Indians, which was satisfactory for the time, though it left some within the bounds of Georgia (Map 39b). The companies' rights as against Georgia were upheld by the Supreme Court in 1810, and in 1816, after much debate, in which the speculators and their friends were denounced as preying on the government—the so-called "Yazoo fraud"—Congress bought their claims. The treaty with Spain in 1795 had fixed the southern boundary of the United States as the 31st parallel of latitude (Map 21b); in 1798 the Mississippi Territory was organized (Map 24); and shortly after the arrangement of 1802 this was enlarged to include all land to Tennessee (Map 27).

There were other and even more important questions than frontier defense, especially that of financial policy. Hamilton, in his desire to strengthen American credit in general and to align the moneyed men with the central government, proposed that the nation assume the debts of the states. Those south and west of New Jersey and Delaware, except South Carolina, had paid a good part of theirs and were, therefore, quite opposed to this on economic as well as political grounds. On the outline map the vote of July 24, 1790, may be indicated with shaded areas from the follow-

ing data: For—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, South Carolina; against—New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia; evenly divided—New York; not in the Union—Rhode Island. The student will recognize a connection between this question and that of the location of the successive capitals of the United States.

The Excise Law of March 3, 1791, was especially resented by the Scotch-Irish farmers of the western counties of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, who were accustomed to convert a part of their corn and grain into whisky for easier marketing or as a medium of exchange. In Pennsylvania, the inhabitants around Union, Washington, and Pittsburg (Map 34) were especially disaffected, and in July, 1794, organized themselves against the government agents and committed acts of violence. The President, finding that the state government did not act, displayed the power of the new nation by calling out 15,000 troops, which needed only to assemble to awe the rioters into submission.

It was charged that the Whisky Insurrection had been fomented by the so-called "Democratic Societies," which had been formed after the arrival of Citizen Genêt, who landed in Charleston, April, 1793. Bearing in mind that the vote on the Assumption Bill roughly corresponded to the division into Federalists and Jeffersonians, a line tracing his route by land to Philadelphia (Map 34) may indicate one reason for Genêt's confidence in the sympathy of America. Would not his impressions have been different had he landed at Boston and from there journeyed to the capital?

MAP STUDY No. 15

AGRARIANISM AND EXPANSION: ATTENTION TURNING TOWARD THE WEST

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 288-300, 306-320, 355-357; Channing, *Jeffersonian System*.

MAP: The United States.

NO less an authority than John Marshall informs us that the Federalists were chiefly men with business interests to protect and foster, and with accumulated wealth to loan. They favored laws and policies that seemed from this point of view to serve the country, and, being men of executive experience and high notions of order, they not only built up an efficient government, but tended to overemphasize the importance of control. This was resented by the self-reliant planters and farmers, and especially by those who had borrowed money to outfit themselves. By drawing lines which represent, in the main, the boundaries of the area settled by six or more to the square mile, respectively in 1790 and in 1800 (Map 23a), it will appear that this inland element was growing. This restive population complained of strong government as savoring of England, and admired the French as the modern exemplars of liberty and equality. They, therefore, were opposed to war with France, which threatened on account of diplomatic insults recently received, and bitterly complained of the Alien and Sedition laws, passed by Federalists to curb French propaganda.

In the vote on the proposed repeal of these obnoxious laws in the House of Representatives, February 25, 1799, all New England, including the District of Maine, voted against, except Vermont, equally divided, and three small portions of Massachusetts—Cape Cod; the district southeast of the bend in the Merrimac River; and Berkshire County, a strip along the New York border. Likewise New York, except the southern part, was for the laws, and New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, but for the region from Baltimore south to the Potomac. The rest of the nation favored

repeal, with the following exceptions: the vicinity of Philadelphia; the districts on the lower Susquehanna; the Virginia piedmont; the southern portion of the Yadkin Valley in North Carolina (Map 24), and a strip along the northern bank of the Savannah. Now if the student, after illustrating this division, will represent by the letters J and A, as initials of the candidates, the vote by states in 1800 (Map 23b), he will observe a correlation, and will also note how far the agrarian interest favored Jefferson.

So marked was the preference of the new President, on his part, that the nation was not surprised to hear, in his inaugural address, an expression of his view of the comparative importance of the farmer and the merchant, desiring "the encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid." The location of the homes of Jefferson's cabinet officers shows the regions where he desired to recognize or to encourage support: James Madison, Secretary of State, at Montpelier, near Orange Court House (Map 57b); Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, at Geneva, Pennsylvania, on the east bank of the Monongahela, a few miles from the state boundary (Map 24); Henry Dearborn, Secretary of War, near Augusta, Maine, then part of Massachusetts (Frontispiece); Robert Smith, Secretary of the Navy, at Baltimore (Map 25), and Levi Lincoln, Attorney-General, at Worcester, Massachusetts (Map 16). The President's own home at Charlottesville, Virginia (Map 19a), of course, should also be indicated.

Our western settlers, who by 1800 had spread along the Ohio almost to the Cumberland, and who were rapidly increasing in Tennessee, were often irritated that their doorway to the world, New Orleans, was in the hands of the king of Spain.

When, in 1802, the right of deposit, or landing and loading, was for a second time denied them there, they made loud complaint; and when it was learned that Louisiana had passed to the empire of the powerful Napoleon, the government echoed their cry of apprehension. But there were those who realized that the acquisition of that territory was more than a matter of defense; that the natural expansion of our people would sometime crowd out all the claims of European monarchies, whose distance made the competition quite unequal. Rivers do not make good boundaries; conquest and settlement make transverse lines across them, so as to make the river a highway of successive culture areas, rather than a permanent political barrier between them. All this is quite apparent to one who has read the history of the Rhine, the Danube, or even the St. Lawrence.

By 1800 the American settlement had not only become predominant in the region about Natchez and Bayou Pierre (Map 21b), but, on invitation from the Spanish governor, it had gone on before the flag and become important in such places as St. Louis, St. Charles, Cape Girardeau, New Madrid (Map 34), and Ste. Genevieve (Map 15a), across the Mississippi, while some had reached Natchitoches on the Red and Baton Rouge in West Florida (Map 21b). Jefferson highly valued the western pioneers, who thus brought acres under cultivation, and hoped that as soon as possible they might carry republican institutions indefinitely westward. Therefore, in the crisis of 1802 he set about to buy Louisiana, soon realizing that, as settlement and commerce had made clear, New Orleans and the inland region beyond the Mississippi were interdependent and must be brought together. The purchase was made, and by a subsequent act the land now included in the state of Louisiana, except its portion east of the Mississippi, was made the territory of Orleans, while the rest retained the old name, Louisiana (Map 27).

But the boundaries of the purchase were not clearly stipulated. The natural limits, which may be indicated from Map 27, show the area of our country beyond the Appalachians as like a funnel with a narrow spout at New Orleans. Now "rivers

and nations strive equally to reach the sea,"¹ and great pressure might be expected on both sides of this constricted outlet. As our Map 30 shows, the United States for sixteen years claimed all the land to the Rio Grande, on a broad historical definition of the ancient province of Louisiana, but the whole of this was not obtained for another generation. On the east, Jefferson maintained that the purchased region had at least once been supposed to reach to the Perdido River (Map 26b), and accordingly, in 1804, he had the environs of Mobile Bay, together with some other territory, organized as a revenue district. But he cautiously located its customs house at Fort Stoddert (Map 26a), on land agreed by all as belonging to the United States.

This "Mobile Act" brought such able and severe remonstrance from Spain, however, that the President retreated, declaring that he had been misunderstood. The first permanent annexation of West Florida lands came in 1810, when a revolution carried through by Americans resident near Baton Rouge established a "commonwealth" of West Florida. On application from its officers, President Madison, without pausing until Congress reassembled, authorized Governor Claiborne of the territory of Orleans to march troops as far as the Pearl River, the region intervening between that and the Perdido being still claimed, but not now to be occupied. Madison justified this summary addition of four new districts to the territory of Orleans on the presidential interpretation of the treaty of 1803, but, inasmuch as the Spanish claim had heretofore not actively been challenged, the President's action has generally been considered as somewhat aggressive. Later, Spain's improper hospitality to British troops about Mobile provided an occasion for the occupation of 1813 alluded to on Map 26b.

About a year after the purchase of Louisiana, Jefferson sent out a scientific expedition under Capt. Meriwether Lewis and Lieut. William Clark to explore the western country as far as the Pacific. This accorded with the President's desire for expansion quite as much as with his genuine devotion to natural science, for the journey, whose

¹E. C. Semple, *American History*, p. 107.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

routes may be traced from Map 25, was later used as one claim to Oregon. Interest in the West was further evidenced and fostered by the expedition of Capt. Zebulon M. Pike, who in 1805 and 1806 followed the Mississippi from St. Louis almost to its source, and during the next two years led a party from the same place up the Osage River (Map 36), thence to touch the Republican, and almost due south again to the Arkansas, up which he followed till he reached the region of the peak that bears his name. He then went on to Santa Fé, the second oldest town within the present limits of our nation, south to cross the Rio Grande, where now stands El Paso (Map 83), and, curving through the region to the south, around to Natchitoches. Several times in the latter portion of his journey he was roughly treated by the Spanish officials, who felt they had good reason to suspect the curiosity of the American government.

It was natural that Spain should resent the sale of Louisiana to the United States, contrary to Napoleon's express engagement, and that she should seek to hold the new proprietor, if possible, to the Red River as a boundary. War seemed imminent in 1806; and the West was ready. It was doubtless this anti-Spanish feeling that brought many

to support the mysteriously veiled schemes of Aaron Burr. Following Map 26a, the student should indicate his route in 1806 and 1807, and the region of his land claims.

Time showed that Spain had ceased to be a menace; she could not hold her Indians to peace, it was true, but she no longer urged them on to war. But the citizens of the Northwest had reason to believe that the British in Canada had never abated their zeal in stirring the savages against American frontiersmen. Using Map 27, the political division of the Northwest Territory by 1809 may be indicated, and using Map 28a, some lines may be drawn which help us to understand the Indian point of view. Oftentimes the treaties were extorted by a show of arms and plentiful disbursement of strong liquor; but the white men seldom waited even for these treaties. The battlefield of Tippecanoe, in 1811, about eighty miles up the Wabash from Fort Harrison, should be indicated. It will be remembered that England's interest in this battle contributed to the irritation felt against that government, along with other incidents: the *Leander* affair of 1805 in New York harbor, the *Chesapeake* and *Leopard* in 1807 off Cape Henry (Map 34), and the *President* and the *Little Belt* also off the Virginia coast.

MAP STUDY No. 16

THE SECOND WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 320-333; Babcock, *Rise of American Nationality*, pp. 50-201.

MAP: Eastern United States.

THE men of business in the seaboard cities, venturing heavily in foreign commerce, were averse to offending the Mistress of the Seas. With Europe at war they enjoyed a great increase of the carrying trade and preferred to risk occasional indignities and loss at England's hands, all of which they could more than offset in their prices, rather than take a firm stand for national self-respect that would severely cut their profits. Many of them, too, especially in New England, were old

Federalists who added to their business concerns a sentiment of admiration of British ways and institutions. By tradition they abhorred any policy of Jeffersonians. They opposed the embargo; they were against the war. But the small farmers, many of them debtors, had little to lose in such a turn and readily followed the leaders of the exuberant West with their limitless ambitions of expansion.

Let us indicate upon the outline map the vote of the House of Representatives on the declaration

of war, June 4, 1812. Maine, which was yet a part of Massachusetts, was divided into three congressional districts, growing smaller in area from the east; the middle district from the lower Androscoggin to the Penobscot (Map 43a) voted against the war, the others in favor. New Hampshire, which elected its Representatives on a general ticket, went three to two for war, as may be shown by including within the state boundaries three marks of one kind and two of another. In Vermont the northwestern quarter only voted against. In Massachusetts the Berkshire district and that around Fitchburg (Map 41b) did not vote; the eastern counties, except Essex, in the northeast, and Boston and vicinity, voted for the war, with the rest of the state against. Rhode Island and Connecticut were solidly against. In New York, Columbia County (Map 11a) and the west were not represented in the voting, and in the remainder four sections are discernible, three voting for and one against. The former were: (1) modern Franklin, Essex, Clinton, Warren, and Saratoga Counties; (2) Oswego, Onondaga, Madison, Cortland, Chenango, Broome, Tioga, and Chemung; (3) New York City (then represented by Tammany Republicans) and Long Island, except modern Kings and Queens Counties. The broad area left, comprising about half the state, was in opposition (Map 11a). New Jersey, with a general ticket, went four to two against. Pennsylvania, east of a line drawn from the southwestern corner of Chemung County, New York, approximately straight to the northern point of Delaware, showed three to one for, with all the country west of the line also in favor. Delaware was against, likewise Maryland, except for three sections: (1) north of the Choptank River on the "Eastern Shore" of Chesapeake Bay (Map 10), and around to Baltimore (Map 41b); (2) old Calvert, Charles, and St. Marys Counties (Map 10); and (3) the mountainous region (Map 41b). In Virginia most of the northern part of the Shenandoah Valley was not represented in the voting, but the southern part, reaching to a point some sixty or seventy miles from the North Carolina border, together with most of what is now West Virginia, and a strip along the Potomac from almost the western point

of Maryland to Alexandria, went against. The rest of the state went for, except a small area in the extreme south-central part, half of which was unrepresented and half against the war (Maps 47 and 57b). In North Carolina only the south-central part voted against, with two small areas, in the northern corners, not voting. South Carolina was entirely for war, like Tennessee and Ohio. Georgia, with a general ticket, showed three districts for, and one not voting. Kentucky, except for a small area near the center, was for the war. Contemplating our result, we observe that a war declared professedly for "Free Trade and Sailors' Rights" was favored by nearly everybody but the traders and the sailors.

With the aid of Maps 28b, 29, and 31b, the student should locate all the places and routes mentioned in Bassett, pp. 321-326, 329-335, or any other fairly detailed account, attaching, when possible, a date (year) to each place. Notice that the whole war was fought on the rim of the country, frontier and coast, leaving the great interior to develop that economic independence which the war's necessity called forth. With farm lands unharried and manufactures grown considerable, the country speedily recovered in 1815. This was possible, of course, only in a country of such great extent as ours, where neither economic nor political energies were wholly focused in a single place and which had no all-important gateway fortress like Quebec. The United States as yet had no military key. Notice the advantage for defense which the St. Lawrence system afforded the English, as it had the French a half century before. It offered easy access to the sea and supplies from home, while, frostbitten in the winter, it held off serious attacks until these supplies could arrive securely. As long as England held the two peninsulas at the ends of Lake Erie, she controlled the northwest of our country.

But these could not be captured and retained, nor could such distant posts as Fort Mackinac and Detroit be held, without the control of the Lakes, especially Lake Erie. General Hull, whose prompt surrender was no doubt indiscreet in consideration of moral effect, had, nevertheless, correctly read this situation and earnestly but vainly had prayed

the government for naval support early in 1812. Harrison's invasion would have been of no permanent effect without Perry's victory at Put-in-Bay. Dearborn, who started in 1813 from Sackett's Harbor, might have gained complete control of Lake Ontario if he had not swung off to York, instead of attacking the stronger position of Kingston. McDonough's victory off Plattsburg, in 1814, closed the way to invasion from Canada in that quarter. Water routes were then more important, when the alternative was threading the wilderness.

"The importance of the lakes to military operations must always be great," writes Admiral Mahan,¹ "but it was enhanced in 1812 by the undeveloped condition of land communication. With the roads in the state they then were, the movement of men, and still more of supplies, was vastly more rapid by water than by land. Except in winter, when iron-bound snow covered the ground, the routes of Upper Canada were well-nigh impassable; in spring and in autumn rains wholly so as to vehicles. The mail from Montreal to York—now Toronto—three hundred miles, took a month in transit. . . . The [British] Commander in Chief himself wrote, 'The command of the lakes enables the enemy to perform in two days what it takes the troops from Kingston sixteen to twenty days of severe marching.'"

The poor showing of the American forces was not due entirely to incompetent generalship, but

¹ A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812* (Boston, 1905), vol. i, pp. 301-302.

to factors of physical geography as well. The trials of transportation overland long distances through the forest raised the price of flour at Detroit by sixty dollars a barrel. "These conditions partly account for the ineffectiveness of our land campaigns on the frontier; and the demand for internal improvements, that became strong after the War of 1812, received an impetus from the same circumstances."¹ It will be noticed that under these conditions the best fighting was done by seasoned frontiersmen under Harrison and Jackson. The motives for attacks on Washington and New Orleans are obvious. Observe the value set upon the three gateways of Detroit, Niagara, and the Champlain region.

After reading Bassett, pp. 335-338, or the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th edition) under "Hartford," show with the letters H. C. what states or communities sent representatives to the Hartford Convention. Note the places in Vermont and New Hampshire with relation to what is said in our introduction on "American History and the Map." In 1813 the New York Assembly had been won by the Federalists, but Governor Tompkins was re-elected. Bearing in mind the great importance of the New York frontier and the situation toward the east, consider what would have been the result if a Democratic candidate personally less attractive than Tompkins had been running in that critical year.

¹ Albert H. Sanford, *Teachers' Manual* accompanying the *Sanford American History Maps*, pp. 36-37.

MAP STUDY No. 17

THE SETTLING OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 341-349, 363-371, 394-396; Turner, *Rise of the New West*.

MAPS: Eastern United States (2 or 3).

A STUDY of the military record of the War of 1812, or even of the articles of peace, leaves one in doubt about our claim to victory; but victory is a state of mind, and we felt that we had vindicated our rights among nations. One result

was a wave of national feeling, general and intense, if somewhat temporary. Our nascent industries, which were planted largely in the Northeast, commanded support throughout the Union for their necessary protection by high tariff in 1816; this

may be indicated by placing the letter T. in those states voting for, and the letters A. T. in those voting against, after consulting Map 31a. Desire that the nation should in no future crisis be without the aid of a strong financial institution produced the fairly general support of a national bank in the same year.

In 1818 the northern boundary of the Louisiana purchase was settled with Great Britain (Map 30) by the artificial line of 49° north latitude, intersecting the natural mark of hills. But a far more irritating border controversy was that with Spain, especially as to Florida. The colonial officials had been unable or unwilling to prevent Amelia Island (Map 31b) being used as a resort for smugglers operating throughout the years of embargo, nonintercourse and war, or to keep the Seminoles (Map 15b) from kidnaping Georgia slaves, or to exclude the English from their ports during the late hostilities (Map Study No. 15). After reading J. W. Burgess, *The Middle Period* (pp. 25-34), Allen Johnson, *Union and Democracy* (pp. 259-265), or Bassett, pp. 368-371, with preference in the order named, indicate the places mentioned as the scenes of conflict between 1812 and 1819 (Map 31b). Using Map 30, show the boundary line of 1819.

As another evidence of national aggressiveness, Maps 32 and 39b will show, in general, the amount of Indian land acquired by 1834. This made the settlement of the West and Northwest safe, and helped to bring about the admission of Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, and Alabama, which should be indicated with dates (Map 30). The fact that these states in their first fundamental law gave suffrage to practically all white men¹ undoubtedly had influence upon the older communities in the East. Comparing Maps 27 and 30, note how the Michigan territory had been enlarged at the time of the admission of Illinois. From Map 42 indicate the admission dates of Louisiana, Missouri (with its addition of 1836), Maine, Michigan, Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

¹Three of these states granted universal manhood suffrage, but Mississippi required the payment of a tax or militia service. "As enrollment in the militia was compulsory and the qualification simply mentioned 'a' tax without fixing the amount, the restriction did not amount to much in practice."—K. H. Porter, *History of the Suffrage in the United States* (Chicago, 1918).

Turning to Maps 40a and 40b, the student may indicate with shading the area in the old Northwest Territory settled by more than six inhabitants to the square mile in 1830, and then the area similarly settled during the next decade. The first section, with the exception of the Western Reserve (Map 24 and Map Study No. 13), was cleared and planted chiefly by pioneers from Kentucky and the upland regions of Virginia and the Carolinas. Many came by steamboat or other craft on the Ohio River, for water routes became increasingly important until about 1850 (see Maps 47 and 60), while many others came in by the National Road as it grew longer year by year. The road may be traced, with the aid of Maps 38 and 34, through Union, Brownsville, Wheeling, Zanesville, Columbus, Indianapolis, to Vandalia. Cincinnati, their metropolis, was famous for their corn and pork shipped downriver to New Orleans. (From Map Study No. 14 do you remember any early settlement along the Ohio made by another stock?)

The later settlers came during the 'thirties, largely from New England by way of the Erie Canal, the route of which should be traced. Locate Buffalo (Map 38), which began its larger growth when the first lake steamer, the *Walk-in-the-Water*, left her wharf in 1818, and developed after the completion of the canal in 1825. Other towns, like Rochester, owed their prosperity to this waterway, which served the fertile valleys of western New York. Cleveland, though founded in the eighteenth century (Map Study No. 14), did not become important until 1834, when the Ohio Canal (Map 47) connected it with the Ohio River. Later it was developed as a port for iron, coal, and oil for the Pittsburg district. With the wasteful farming then practiced in nearly all parts of the country, these New Englanders had exhausted much of what thin and stubborn soil their bowldery slopes afforded, and had made their way either to the industrial towns or struck out to the fertile Western plains and valleys. They now came in such numbers that shrewd observers prophesied that the great center of the West would not be Cincinnati or St. Louis, after all, but Cleveland, the Maumee town (Toledo; Map 47), or Chicago, which had

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

been begun in 1830 at Fort Dearborn, finally, in the early 'forties, agreeing upon the last. These emigrants had, by 1840, set up scores of towns, among them some which became famous as educational centers, like Oberlin, Ohio (Oberlin); Ann Arbor, Michigan (U. of M.); Crawfordsville, Indiana (Wabash); Galesburg (Knox), Beloit (Beloit), and Rockford, Illinois (Rockford); and Madison, Wisconsin (U. of W.), which, if the student has sufficient time, may be located from an indexed modern map such as those in an encyclopedia.

Show, from Map 34, how, in 1830, one could have gone, perhaps, in a Conestoga wagon, from Maryland to the Tombeckbee (or Tombigbee) Valley in Alabama, or likewise, from Maine to Erie, Pennsylvania, indicating a few important places passed through on each route. The first important stone road in America had been finished in 1794, between Philadelphia and Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Draw in lines to represent three canals that you judge to have been important in connection with this western emigration. But the trend of population in the early part of the nineteenth century will be much more vividly illustrated by tracing, from articles in an encyclopedia of American biography (Appleton's, Lamb's, or the National), the "residence line"—*i.e.*, the general direction taken in selecting a home—by five of the following: S. A. Douglas, Abraham Lincoln's father, Lewis Cass, T. H. Benton, Henry Clay, S. P. Chase, Zachary Taylor, Hugh McCulloch, Andrew Johnson, J. W. Grimes, James K. Polk, N. P. Tallmadge, your own parents or grandparents. Place names may be found in the index and maps of any large atlas or general encyclopedia.

The foreign immigration of the later 'forties and 'fifties was chiefly of Irish and German stock. The former seemed to prefer the settled East, but the latter took up their way to the Middle West,

centering in such places as St. Louis, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, etc. W. E. Dodd has an article in the *American Historical Review*, Vol. XVI, pp. 774-788, maintaining that the presence of Germans, enthusiastic supporters of the doctrines of liberty and nationalism, who came to northern Illinois because of the Illinois Central Railroad's sale of lands, made Lincoln's election possible in 1860. In 1861 Union leaders kept Missouri by the support of Germans.

Of course, all western emigrants took advantage of the railroads as fast as they became available, but they played but small part in the first half of the century, for it was not until about 1850 that the integration of local roads into trunk lines was to any considerable extent accomplished. They were preferred to rivers and canals throughout the North, because they could be used in the cold weather; in the middle 'forties winter travelers went from New York to Albany by ship to Boston and overland by rail. Trace the routes of three early railroads (Map 47) built to connect waterways; three typical short lines, each of less than a hundred miles in length; and two longer lines.

From the following table show, with stars, approximately the center of population as determined in each decade to 1860, noticing the more rapid westward course after 1830, due to better transportation ways, and the crossing of the Alleghanies by 1850:

Year	North Latitude	West Longitude
1790	39° 16'	76° 11'
1800	39° 16'	76° 58'
1810	39° 11'	77° 37'
1820	39° 6'	78° 33'
1830	39°	79° 17'
1840	39°	80° 18'
1850	39°	81° 19'
1860	39°	82° 49'

MAP STUDY No. 18

SECTIONALISM: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE EAST

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 384-388, 399-401, 407-410; McDonald, *Jacksonian Democracy*.

MAP: Eastern United States.

AS might have been expected, the settling of the Mississippi Valley was bound to introduce new controversies into American politics. From the days of the seventeenth century, the West and the East were sensible of a conflict of interest. As early as 1634 the Watertown protest (Map Study No. 6) had pointed out that political representation was likely to lag behind the westward spread of population, and this had been the perennial theme of upland farmers in the South. Bacon's Rebellion of 1676 (Map Study No. 5) was an early evidence that the frontier demanded more protection than the safe and comfortable East thought necessary, a matter of dispute in the nation till long after the Civil War. The West, glorying in its faith, borrowed heavily from the East, but was resentful when pressed by unsympathetic creditors desiring stringent laws against cheapening the legal tender (Map Study No. 13). The West was clamorous for government aid in building ways of transportation, which the East was slow to favor. The West eagerly desired more population to develop its prosperity, and urged with tireless zeal that the government lands beyond the Appalachians be virtually given away to settlers. On the other hand, the East believed that this common property acquired by the blood and treasure of all should be cashed in for the benefit of the old states as well as new, and employers in the cities near the coast were especially averse to making the West more attractive to their mill hands.

The first national question conspicuously to reveal the opposition of the sections after the conclusion of the second war with England was that of internal improvements proposed in the Bonus bill of 1817. Using a large B. to indicate those states which voted favorably through their Sena-

tors, A. B. for those voting against, and leaving unmarked those divided or not voting, the result of the vote may be illustrated from the following data: For—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana; against—Massachusetts (including Maine), Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, South Carolina, Tennessee. New England was as yet against the development of transportation to the West.

The antipathy was persistent. During the later 'twenties Senator Benton of Missouri repeatedly introduced his Graduation bill to reduce the price of government Western lands to twenty-five cents an acre, and, to settlers, actually giving outright parcels which were not bid in when offered at fifty cents. All land unsold at twenty-five cents after a year was to be given to the states wherein it lay. Using the letters G. and A. G. (preferably in a new color), there may be shown, as before, the result of the test vote on May 7, 1830: For—North Carolina, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Missouri; against—Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware. The East was much more populous, and the measure failed in the House. The Eastern Whigs, who had been suspected by the Westerners, took an Indiana man, W. H. Harrison, as their presidential candidate in 1840, and, as is shown on Map 40b2, captured all of that section except the incorrigible states of Illinois, Missouri, and Arkansas. In 1841 a permanent pre-emption law was passed giving a special low price to squatters, but the West was not wholly satisfied until the homestead law of 1862. It will be remembered that

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

it was the resolution offered by Senator Foote of Connecticut to suspend for a time the sale of Western public land that brought forth in support Webster's great speeches of January, 1830. His first antagonist was Benton, but he was soon supplanted by Hayne of South Carolina, showing that the South, feeling itself also an object of discrimination by the more populous Northeast, was anxious to join hands with the West.

The slave system of the South, where the plantations were growing larger, did not offer opportunity for the immigrant, and the section was conscious of a relative decline in population. This condition threatened to leave it at the mercy of the manufacturing East, which, with its power in the House of Representatives, could carry measures of protective tariff. Shading the areas lightly with lead pencil, the student should indicate the vote on the Tariff bill of April 22, 1828 (Map 35b), making mental note of the transfer of certain interests in New England from shipping to manufacturing, the gain of the opposition in Tennessee and Missouri, and its loss in western Virginia, which was disaffected toward the government at Richmond. With the letters F. and A. F., show the states for and against the Force bill (Map 39a2).

Calhoun and other Southern leaders labored earnestly in the early 'thirties to bind the West to the South, and the prospect of the alliance seemed to be favored by the circumstance that Northwestern farmers supplied the Southern plantations with foodstuffs, mules, and horses, floated along the river routes on rafts. Do you recall ever having read of a young man, afterward very prominent, who, in 1831, helped to pilot a flatboat down the Sangamon, Illinois, and Mississippi Rivers to New Orleans (Map 34)?

But the West could not be single-minded on this matter. The East, unlike the South, came to offer support to internal improvement, and to a tariff on raw wool, if the West¹ would help protect its manufactures. The farmer of the old Northwest depended on the East for manufactured goods, which he received by way of the canals and

turnpike roads, and which he paid for with his bills of exchange on the Southern planters. As the Eastern cities grew, he doubtless wished that he could cheaply and directly send his produce to their market, which would in some respects be more satisfactory than the South. The railroads of the 'fifties gave him this opportunity, and did much to set his allegiance toward the Union rather than the Confederacy. The old political division based on longitude now disappeared; manufacturing spread westward and both regions drew a plentiful supply of labor from the growing immigration. In contrast to the attitude of Foote and Webster, thirty years before, the Homestead bill of 1862 was brought in by an Easterner, Senator Justin S. Morrill of Vermont. In Map Study No. 17 we saw the few short railroads beyond the Alleghanies in 1850 (Map 47). Turn now to Map 49 and notice the astonishing development in the decade following. Indicate the railroad route from Syracuse to Milwaukee, and from Pittsburg to St. Louis. One historian has remarked: "If the great American novel is ever written, I hazard the guess that its plot will be woven around the theme of American transportation, for that has been the vital factor in the national development of the United States. Every problem in the building of the Republic has been, in the last analysis, a problem in transportation."¹ Although in this pronouncement there is enough of hyperbole to make it striking, there is also enough of truth to start a train of very useful reflection.

From Map 53 indicate with Roman numerals the comparative importance of the six states which, by 1860, produced more than \$75,000,000 each in value of manufactures. Locate Pawtucket, Rhode Island (Map 9), where, in 1790, Samuel Slater erected the first complete cotton-spinning mill in America; Lowell, Massachusetts (Map 38), founded in 1826 as the first of the new "mill towns," and named in honor of Francis Cabot Lowell, who had, in 1814, set up at Waltham the first plant in America to turn raw cotton into finished cloth. Most foreign travelers were surprised and delighted with the comfortable living and intelligence of the

¹ A. B. Hulbert, *The Paths of Inland Commerce* (New Haven, 1920), p. 7.

¹ See introductory essay on *American History and the Map*.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

farmers' daughters who "manned" these mills in the 'thirties and 'forties, before they were supplanted by the Irish and French-Canadian immigrants. Locate Oneida County, New York (Map 11a), the center of early textile manufacture in that state. Had we time to make a more elaborate indication, we would see that the early manufacturing towns were developed beside waterfalls, as near the sea as possible. Steam and railroads did not free the manufacturer from this necessity until nearly the middle of the century.

Locate Richmond, Virginia (Map 38), near which was found much of the soft-coal supply for the United States, early in the nineteenth century; the Lehigh Valley, in northeastern Pennsylvania, served by two canals (Map 38), and whose "stone coal," or anthracite, began to be used in industry about 1820, though not for smelting iron for another eighteen years; the Pittsburg district and southeastern Ohio, which were becoming industrially important just before the Civil War by reason of their growing production of soft coal and iron; New Bedford (Map 47), whose whalers were so numerous in 1845 as to make it the fourth

port of the country in tonnage; and Titusville, Pennsylvania, about thirty miles east of Meadville (Map 34), where, in 1859, Col. E.L. Drake sank the first oil well in America. The kerosene derived from the petroleum of northwestern Pennsylvania supplanted in the public demand the whale oil from New Bedford and the candles from Cincinnati.

On the back of your map sheet devise a simple graphic chart which will show the curve of immigration according to the following table:

<i>Decade preceding</i>	
1830.....	143,000
1840.....	600,000
1850.....	1,700,000
1860.....	2,600,000

On another similar chart show the curve of percentage of urban population in the country: 1790—3.35%; 1800—3.97%; 1810—4.93%; 1820—4.93%; 1830—6.72%; 1840—8.52%; 1850—12.49%; 1860—16.13%. It will be noticed that cities grew four times as important in the first six decades of the nineteenth century, but that the people of the United States were still overwhelmingly agricultural in their interests.

MAP STUDY No. 19

THE PLANTATION EMPIRE AND THE ANTI-SLAVERY CRUSADE

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 350-352, 371-375, 428-431; Hart, *Slavery and Abolition*.

MAP: Eastern United States.

WHEN, on the eve of the Civil War, that discerning traveler, Frederick Law Olmstead, summed up his observation of the South in his book, *The Cotton Kingdom*, he included a map of that broad domain, based chiefly on the census of 1850, the main features of which we may now reproduce. Starting from New Orleans, one notices an area which represents the field of heaviest production, about fifty miles broad, along the western bank of the Mississippi, almost to the boundary of Missouri and branching up the Red and the Arkansas. On the eastern bank this strip is twice as broad, and, turning east, to include the whole of southwestern Tennessee and northern Mississippi,

runs diagonally to southern Alabama and across through central Georgia and western South Carolina. The lower valleys of the Brazos and the Colorado, in Texas (Map 41a), were cultivated with similar intensity. The rest of Mississippi and Alabama should be shaded to show a little less importance in the cotton crop, as should also the area of Arkansas and Louisiana, except the northern and southern portions. A belt beginning about seventy miles from the Gulf coast and stretching back a hundred and twenty-five or fifty miles connected this region with the Texas valleys we have shown.

As loyal allies should be indicated the dominions

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

of tobacco, rice, and sugar. The parts of the former, as was the case with some states in old Germany, were not contiguous, but the interests of all those which lay south of the Ohio and the Mason and Dixon's line (Map 37 and Map Study No. 5) were largely identical. Maryland, from the Chesapeake to the narrowest part, was one province; Virginia, east of the mountains (except a narrow strip along the Potomac and the coast), was another, which curved as far south as central North Carolina; northwestern Tennessee, including the central part of the Cumberland Valley, together with all western Kentucky, was another; and the valley of the Missouri as far as Independence (Map 47), the fourth. From Map 53 may be shown the areas occupied by rice and sugar.

Such was the plantation empire resting on the broad backs of the slaves. Its freight highways were the rivers, as is suggested in Maps 47 and 60. Its society was stratified into castes in which the owners of the large plantations, on the river bottoms, though few in number, made up the ruling group, taking a lively and intelligent interest in politics themselves and speaking also through the clergymen, professors, physicians, and editors, allied with their families. Education came to be forbidden to the slaves; there were few free schools, except those kept from charity for the poor. But the master class were devoted to the classics and religion, and supported many colleges for the education of their sons. To emphasize the fact that the leading Southerners before the war were well schooled, let us locate some of the leading institutions.

The University of Virginia, founded in 1819 by Thomas Jefferson at Charlottesville (Map 58b), had perhaps the widest reputation and the highest prestige of all, but in the same state there were eight other colleges of excellent standing. Lexington (Map 58b) was the seat of Washington College (1813), which after the war was to enlarge its name in honor of its president, Robert E. Lee, and the Virginia Military Institute (1839), where "Stonewall" Jackson taught in the 'fifties. The first state university in the nation was chartered in 1784 at Athens, Georgia (Map 59a), but the first in actual teaching was that of North Carolina,

patterned after Princeton in 1789, at Chapel Hill, about half way between Greensboro and Raleigh (Map 58b), and which furnished twenty generals to the Confederate armies. After much debate between the coast and mountain districts, the College of South Carolina had been located, in 1810, in Columbia, at the head of navigation on the Congaree (Maps 59a and 47). In 1819, about the time of the admission of Alabama and Mississippi, Congress gave to each of these new commonwealths a grant of land which served as the basis of support of two state universities, that of the former opening at Tuscaloosa (Map 59a) in 1831, and that of the latter at Oxford (in the north central part of the state about fifty miles from the border) in 1848. These two antebellum institutions needed no other certification than the fact that for twenty-four years the distinguished Dr. Frederick A. P. Barnard played an important part in their teaching and direction. In Alabama there were nine other colleges. Beyond the Alleghanies, Transylvania University, at Lexington, Kentucky (Map 19b), was founded in 1798, almost the first in the Mississippi Valley.¹ Here Henry Clay was a professor from 1804 to 1807, and here President Horace Holley (1818-27) and others established Lexington's claim to be the "Athens of the West." Jefferson Davis was an alumnus of Transylvania. The leaders of the Old South, the "slavocrats," were cultivated men.

But the great majority of Southern whites did not hold slaves. The introduction of the cotton gin had made short-staple cotton profitable, and this could be raised on soil farther upland than the variety previously grown. Planter capitalists offered prices that practically forced the farmers to sell and move either to the Northwest (Map Study No. 17) or to the higher and less fertile slopes nearer by. In these latter districts they played a losing game, for in the old South the opportunity was small for the man who had no slaves. The hilly area shown in Map 61, together with some of western North Carolina, northwestern Georgia, and northeastern Alabama,² as well as

¹ This distinction belongs to Washington College, a small institution, chartered in Washington County, Tennessee, in 1795.

² The "piney woods" in southern Alabama were also inhabited by the poorer whites.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

that of northern Arkansas and southern Missouri, was peopled by those who had reason to dislike the plantation empire, and may be indicated as regions of some dissent. But they naturally had inferior leadership, they feared any change which would make the negro more nearly their social equal, and they half believed the earnest and sincere defenders of slavery, who declared it good for everybody. Only West Virginia (Maps 58b and 61) broke away during the war.

The rulers of the "empire" had not much to fear from foes within, but they were bitterly resentful of interference from without. If, following Map 42, the student will indicate the dates of emancipation in the Northern states, he will notice that there slavery had disappeared by 1827, except for a dwindling number in New Jersey. Then outline the boundary of slave-state area as it existed on March 4, 1845, the day after Florida's admission. Slaves were produced in Kentucky and Virginia beyond the need of the tobacco planters, and were taken south to the cotton, rice, and sugar lands by routes five of which may be shown from the map. These masters, feeling themselves the victims of unpleasant circumstances, often parted with their slaves with genuine reluctance. Economic selfishness but reinforced their natural human sympathy in caring for their slaves, and it is not surprising that the darkies carried to the sweltering fields of the lower South

have been represented as singing fondly of their old Kentucky home, or praying some kind fate to carry them back to "Ole Virginny." By which route was Uncle Tom transported?

It was this traffic, chiefly, which roused Northern sentiment to the formation of abolition societies. In the last of the 'forties societies existed along the New England coast and the Connecticut River, central and western New York, southeastern and northwestern Pennsylvania, Ohio (except the central and northwestern parts), Indiana (except along the Ohio River), and along the Illinois and Rock Rivers (Map 34) in Illinois. After 1833 the slave who reached Canada was free by British statute, and there were many sympathizers in the North who were willing to aid him on his way. Their efforts, of course, were secret, by reason of the fugitive-slave law, and their system came to be known as the "Underground Railroad." From Map 41b show five important routes. Notice the connection with abolition societies; comparison with Map Study No. 17 will show the effect of New England settlement, and with Map Study No. 7 the influence of the Quakers. Locate Warsaw, in Wyoming County, New York (Map 11a), where the Liberty Party was formed; the places of residence of Gerrit Smith, Wendell Phillips, and Harriet Beecher Stowe; six other places of interest in the abolition controversy, giving in a key your reasons for the selection.

MAP STUDY No. 20

MANIFEST DESTINY: SETTLEMENT, DIPLOMACY, AND WAR CARRY THE BOUNDARY TO THE PACIFIC

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 419-422, 433-450; Garrison, *Westward Extension*.

MAPS: Western United States; Texas and Mexico; United States.

BORDER Forays in the Northeast.—The United States and the British Empire have lived in peace for more than a hundred years, and their mutual good will has grown most cordial; but relations have not been unmarked, at times, with serious

irritation, for we disliked the "mother country's" aristocratic institutions as well as her reputed eagerness for land. In 1837, the year of young Victoria's accession to the throne, agitators in Upper and Lower Canada set up a standard of

rebellion, in hope of more popular self-government,¹ a movement heartily applauded on this side of the St. Lawrence and the Niagara. Enthusiasts from northern and western New York crossed the border and took part in the engagements at the windmill opposite Ogdensburg and at Navy Island in the Niagara River. In retaliation, loyal Canadians crossed to the New York shore and burned a ship, the *Caroline*, which had been used in this illicit ferriage, stirring up such animosity that the War Department reinforced Fort Montgomery at the point of our farthest claim on Lake Champlain, near Rouse's Point (Map 47).

A controversy over the Aroostook Country (Map 43a), claimed by Maine and by New Brunswick, dating back to the vague boundary arrangements of 1783, now grew more acute. There were altercations in the forest between opposing woodsmen, and in 1838 Maine built forts along the border, such as Fort Fairfield, on the Aroostook River, not far west of its juncture with the St. John. The lower portion of our eastern boundary had been agreed upon, in 1798, by a joint commission planned for in Jay's Treaty, but Great Britain maintained that the northern watershed, mentioned in 1783, began at Mars Hill, while the Americans argued for the highlands where the Metis River has its source. The treaty of 1815 provided for other commissions; but, these failing, the king of the Netherlands as referee, in 1831, drew an artificial boundary line unsatisfactory to this country. There was some question as to what was the source of the Connecticut, and as to the exact position of the forty-fifth parallel of latitude. The Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 drew the line accepted, which made the St. John the boundary for a considerable distance, determined the highland ridge and the Connecticut, and took the American view of latitude. Oddly enough, an accurate survey would have left Fort Montgomery on British soil, and it was derisively called "Fort Blunder," but now transfer of the necessary parcel was amicably arranged. All this can be illustrated on the map. It is interesting to note that a settlement of the

Creole question (Map 42) was provided for by arbitration.

Texas, the "Lone Star State."—In Map Study No. 15 we saw that Spain, exasperated by Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana, insisted on the Red as her northeastern limit, while the diplomats in Washington, upon a hopeful reading of the records, claimed to the Rio Grande. The treaty of 1819 (Map Study No. 17) brought a peaceful compromise, but American pioneers now, as before 1803 (Map Study No. 15), went on before the flag and made settlements in Texas. In 1821 Stephen F. Austin, who, after graduating from Transylvania University (Map Study No. 19), had served as a territorial legislator from Missouri, and as a territorial judge in Arkansas, secured from the new Mexican government a confirmation of a land grant which his father had received from Spain. Thereupon he gathered a company of adventurers and went south to form a colony on the Brazos River, where he gave law with patriarchal authority and where the principal town, San Felipe de Austin (Map 41a), was named in his honor. The immigrants from the United States increased in number until, in 1827, the apprehensive Mexican officials, disregarding the old Spanish boundary of Texas (Maps 41a and 45a), joined it with Coahuila, a strictly Mexican province stretching across the middle portion of the Rio Grande to the central part of the country.

A growing discontent with this unfriendly government among the Americans, who especially disliked laws against Protestant worship and slavery, finally led to armed rebellion in 1835. The command soon settled upon Sam Houston, an Indian agent from Tennessee, who had come to live in Nacogdoches (Map 41a), and a bitter war was fought. At first unsuccessful, the Texans were nerved to desperate resistance by the tragic butchery of the defenders of the Alamo Mission fort at San Antonio, among them such popular heroes as Capt. James Bowie and the picturesque Col. Davy Crockett. Finally, at San Jacinto, on an arm of Galveston Bay, the Mexicans were defeated, and their general, Santa Anna, accepted the Rio Grande as the boundary of an independent state, though the whole arrangement was soon dis-

¹The revolutionists complained especially of an arrogant ruling clique of United Empire Loyalists in Upper Canada (Map Study No. 12).

avowed in the city of Mexico. The capital of Texas was located at the new town of Houston (1836), but in 1839 removed to Austin (1838), where it has remained, except for three years after 1842, when President Houston brought it back to the place of his residence and name.¹

Although the actual authority of Texas was never extended beyond the Neuces, the Texas congress defined the western boundary of the republic as the Rio Grande to its source and thence north to the forty-second parallel, about the latitude of Boston, while the Arkansas and the meridian of its source were taken as the eastern and northern limits as far as the treaty line of 1819. The citizens of the "Lone Star Republic" petitioned for annexation to their home land, but antislavery opposition in the Northern states delayed the project, and it was not until March 1, 1845, when reports of British influence in Texas had aroused some apprehension, that the republic was invited by joint resolution of Congress to be a state. The annexation was completed on December 29th of the same year, Texas being the only state ever admitted without passing through a territorial stage, or being for a time under the jurisdiction of another state government.²

The Trappers and the Far Northwest.—Reference to Map Study No. 15 will refresh our memory of the routes of Lewis and Clark, 1803–06. Their reports of broad beaver meadows, the buffaloes of the plains, and the teeming animal life of the mountain woods aroused Americans to emulate the lucrative business of the Hudson's Bay and North West Companies operating under British license in western Canada. John Jacob Astor, having amassed a fortune in thrifty trade with the Mohawk Indians and the English companies, purchased the Mackinaw Company, and thus, with his post at the strait that leads from Lake Michigan (Map 28a), had acquired ascendancy on the American side of the Great Lake Basin. In 1808 he

¹ The capital was set up for a few months in 1838 at Columbia. In 1839 it was temporarily at Washington.

² Lincoln maintained, in his first message to Congress, that Texas was the only state that had ever been sovereign: "The original ones passed into the Union even before they cast off their British colonial dependence, and the new ones each came into the Union directly from a condition of dependence, except Texas."

organized the American Fur Company, and two years later sent out expeditions by land and sea to found Astoria, a post at the mouth of the Columbia River (Map 43b), which Capt. Robert Gray had discovered and named after his ship in 1792. The land party, under W. P. Hunt, pushed their keel boats up the Missouri as far as the villages of the Arikara Indians (Map 36), and then, proceeding south along the Grand River (indicated on our map as the second tributary southeast of the Yellowstone, now in South Dakota) by horse and foot, past the Black Hills, through the Crow country, and up the Wind River, the upper tributary of the Bighorn (Maps 36 and 25). Perforce abandoning most of their equipment, they then pushed through the ridge of the continent to the Snake, down which they floated in a few days' respite from their cruel toil. Passing by the region of the modern Yellowstone Park, however, they encountered the Snake River Desert, a thousand miles of rocky waste and sagebrush, where game was very scarce and where they could not make their way down cañon sides to drink the water of the river. "To appease the cravings of hunger they ate beaver skins in the evening at the camp fire. They even were at last constrained to eat their moccasins."¹

They struck out due west, and at last, worn and ragged, penetrated the Blue Mountains, near modern Walla Walla, and reached the long-looked-for Columbia. Thus by suffering hardships, at which we have scarcely hinted, the first commercial party had pioneered through that forbidding country. The sea expedition, also, had had its trials with swift currents at the river's mouth. Three years of hard work and sixty-five lives were used up in establishing Astoria, but during the War of 1812 the place became untenable, and at the beginning of 1814 was turned over to the North West Company, which, together with that of Hudson's Bay, was operating in the region.

But Astor's enterprise, thus thwarted in the land beyond the mountains, was only one of many undertaken by Americans. The Missouri Fur Company was the first such firm to enter the field, and hoped

¹ Gabriel Franchère, "Narrative of a Voyage to the Northwest Coast, 1811–14," in *Early Western Travels*, vol. vi, pp. 269–270.

for a monopoly in the great valley east of the mountains. They set up a post among the headwaters of the Missouri, but, driven out by the hostile Blackfeet, near Council Bluffs, they built Fort Lisa, named for their leader, and confined their operations to the region south of the Mandan villages, which may be indicated as their sphere of influence. Astor's company built Fort Union and others, and came to control the country of the Assiniboin and Blackfoot Indians, which may be shown as theirs, though this indication should include Fort Laramie and its vicinity, where they later gained control. It was in 1832 that the *Yellowstone*, the company's steamboat, first stemmed the river current from St. Louis to Fort Union, to the consternation of the Indians. In 1821 Gen. William H. Ashley and others organized the Rocky Mountain Fur Company, and a party of its traders two years later discovered South Pass, the easiest gateway of the Rockies. Ashley himself soon penetrated to Sevier Lake, in what is now southwestern Utah. The incredibly wretched Digger Indians, who inhabited the desert region between the Colorado and the Snake, could not be counted on for furs, but white trappers scoured the country regularly for Ashley's company, and it may be indicated as his area of operation.

Few American histories devote much space to Jedediah Strong Smith, a New Yorker associated with General Ashley, but if we trace the routes of his explorations we will be impressed with how much country he opened to geographical knowledge and to trade. First, in 1824, he traveled from South Pass up the Green and by the Snake to the site of Fort Boise. In the summer of 1826 he set out with a small party, followed the Sevier Valley till he reached the Virgin, down which he traveled to the Colorado, where he found Indians advanced in agriculture. He continued to the Mohave country and, turning due west, he made his way across to San Diego, to the astonishment of the Mexicans; he then crossed the Coast Range, went through the valley of Lake Tulare, penetrated the Sierra Nevada, wading through the snows of the Sonora Pass, and marched across the Great American Desert in twenty days.

But our map makes clear how, not content with this achievement, he scarcely waited to secure a new equipment before starting out on a journey of thousands of miles,¹ pushing up the Sacramento Valley, past Mt. Shasta, through fur regions unexploited, finally to the Hudson's Bay Company's posts, and to the Rocky Mountain Company's rendezvous at Pierre's Hole.

In 1821 the North West Company had been absorbed by its older competitors of Hudson's Bay, and the valleys of the Columbia system, coming to be known as Oregon, were really ruled by the suave, discreet, and generous Dr. John McLoughlin, the company's chief factor in the Far West. By the convention of 1818 joint occupation was provided for the region (Map 46), but the white-haired factor at Fort Vancouver on the Columbia was really autocrat. In the middle 'thirties Jason Lee, and other Protestant missionaries whose wives were the first white women to cross the continent, came to Christianize the Indians, settling in the fertile Willamette Valley (Maps 43b and 53). Their reports brought other emigrants and the Oregon Trail from Independence, Missouri (Maps 38, 36, and 47), began to be used for wagons. Hard times throughout the Middle West in 1841 and 1842 induced a considerable migration, especially from Illinois; in 1843 a provisional government was set up at Champoag (Map 43b), and Oregon City became the first metropolis (Map 47). Doctor McLoughlin could not well protest, as the "Honourable Company's" servants were now greatly outnumbered by settlers from the states; the trapper must retreat before the farmer.

With old Astoria in mind, the Democrats, in 1844, declared for the "reoccupation of Oregon," claiming a clear and unquestionable title as far as 54° 40', the boundary of the Russian trading region, Alaska. Their new President, Polk, like his predecessor, contented himself with offering the line of 49°, continued from the Mississippi Valley, but the British reiterated their demand for the land north of the Columbia from the intersection with that parallel to the sea. The agreement of joint occupation was now annulled and war might soon have

¹ Our map is incorrect in that Smith went from Los Angeles to Monterey by ship instead of overland to San José.

resulted, had not Great Britain herself, in June, 1846, made an acceptable offer of the forty-ninth parallel, reserving Vancouver Island and the right to navigate the Columbia, though the northern line at the ocean end was, unfortunately, left somewhat vague. In 1872 an arbitration by the Emperor of Germany divided the little islands in the straits of Juan de Fuca, throwing the island of San Juan to the United States.

The Latter-Day Saints.—The 'forties in America are remembered as a period of religious and humanitarian enthusiasms, some centering in western New York. In 1827, near Palmyra, in Wayne County (Map 11a), a farm hand named Joseph Smith dug up, as he said, certain gold plates bearing a new revelation. The fortunes of the converts to his theological beliefs demand our attention, because they founded a commonwealth and introduced a "problem" important in the history of the Far West. Their clannishness and claims of special virtue were obnoxious to their neighbors; they moved to Kirtland, Ohio, about twenty miles northeast of Cleveland, where, after violating the state banking law, they soon struck out for Independence, Missouri. But here they aroused animosity by disregard of "gentile" property titles, and after the "Mormon War," lasting from 1833 to 1838, the apostles led the brethren back to Nauvoo, Illinois, about fifteen miles up the Mississippi from Fort Edwards (Map 34). Here they greatly improved the land and set up stately buildings, but their presence and attitude provoked hostility, and, after their town had been cannonaded in 1846, they took up their trek across the rolling plains to the western bank of the Missouri, opposite Council Bluffs, Iowa (Map 36), which came to be used as the winter quarters for the "saints" in their progress.

The following year, under Brigham Young, a well-disciplined force set out to discover a Zion beyond the reach of persecution. Moving along the north bank of the Platte, somewhat better than the Oregon Trail on the other side, they crossed to Fort Laramie, pressed on through South Pass and across Green River to Fort Bridger (Map 47), and thence, despite the most disheartening reports, crossed through the other ranges, including the

Wasatch, to the Salt Lake Valley in Mexico, where they immediately irrigated the soil and planted grain for those to come. The success that follows practical intelligence and thrift came to the Mormons, and during the next thirty years, by means of thorough discipline and mutual aid, a hundred thousand people, the majority of them women and children, were led over a thousand miles of desert and mountain, with a minimum of loss in life and property. These companies were collected by missionaries in the British Isles and Scandinavia, and financed by an emigration fund, some coming overland from New York and Philadelphia, and others landing at New Orleans. Map 63 shows the extent of their early settlement.

The Mexican War.—The annexation of Texas aroused the undying resentment of Mexico, and she opposed with particular bitterness the extreme boundary claims of that state. Certain other points having been long at issue, President Polk attempted to negotiate, suggesting also the purchase of California, but his agent was not even received. Between the Neuces and the Rio Grande, a territory claimed by Texas and now by the United States, was the Mexican state of Tamaulipas, while beyond this and bounding old Texas on the west and northwest the disputed region was covered by Coahuila, Chihuahua, and New Mexico.

General Taylor was ordered to Corpus Christi (Map 45a, inset), and in March, 1846, marched toward the Rio Grande, near the mouth of which he built Fort Brown (now Brownsville), its guns commanding Matamoras across the river. An exploring party was ambushed and President Polk declared that war existed by reason of a Mexican invasion. Taylor repaired to Point Isabel (follow lower inset) to protect his stores, and on his return routed his foes at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma and crossed to occupy Matamoras. In September he marched forward, stormed and captured Monterey, but was soon obliged to part with many of his troops detailed to march to the mouth of the Rio Grande to join General Scott, moving by sea. Taylor went on to Saltillo, where he was joined by General Wool, who had marched from San Antonio. Thus reinforced, he hastened to meet, at Buena Vista, the Mexican general,

Santa Anna, whose forces, five times his own in number, he defeated.

Meanwhile Scott had proceeded to Vera Cruz (Map 45a, upper inset) and, having taken the town on March 27, 1847, began to cut his way forward along the national road to the capital. Cerro Gordo fell, April 18th, before his thinning army, Pueblo on May 15th, Cherubusco on August 20th, and on September 14th he was in the city of Mexico.

Our scene now shifts far to the northwest, the Mexican state of California. In 1769 the Spanish government, fearing the spread of Russian influence from Alaska, had begun to set up posts in this region, claimed for nearly a hundred and thirty years before. The original colonists at San Diego (Map 44a), "four officers, sixty-five soldiers, and seventeen Franciscans, with a suitable complement of servants, mule drivers, and converted Indians," were typical of the whole period of Hispanic occupation, in strongest contrast to the custom of the Anglo-Saxons. *Presidios*, or forts, were soon also established at Monterey (1770), at the gate to the great bay named for St. Francis (1776), and elsewhere. Many missions were established, such as those at San Carlos (1775), a few miles east of Monterey, and Dolores (1776), a short distance south of the *presidio* on San Francisco Bay. That at San Gabriel (1771), near Los Angeles, was the largest; in 1833 there were here 3,000 neophytes (converted Indians whose labor was controlled), who tended 105,000 cattle and raised 40,000 bushels of grain. Those at Santa Barbara (1786), and at San Luis Rey (1798), about forty miles to the northeast, are often esteemed the most beautiful. San José (1777) was the first pueblo or village settlement; twelve families were collected and settled, in 1781, at Neustra Señora de los Angeles, now the largest city of the Far West.

Life in old California was not "progressive." In 1833 the Mexican government ordered the church land to be sold, but the *rancheros*, who bought the land that the *padres* thus resigned, made little difference in the quiet aspect of the country that Richard Henry Dana so clearly pictured in *Two Years Before the Mast*. About 1840 Easterners began to appear, like John A. Sutter, who obtained

a grant a little way up the Sacramento River. Yerba Buena, founded in 1836, three miles north of the mission at Dolores, soon assumed the name of San Francisco, began to prosper and to attract some from beyond the mountains. "The ownership of California, like that of Oregon, was to be determined not by diplomats and battleships, but by settlers in actual possession of the land."¹ A party of Missouri pioneers, in 1841, came on from the Salt Lake Valley, across the desert, and over the lofty Sonora Pass (Map 44a); and others followed along the somewhat easier route by Lassen's Road and that through the Truckee Pass, so that, in 1846, there were seven hundred Americans in California. We have seen that President Polk already sought to gain these valleys for the national domain.

Col. John C. Frémont's glowing narrative, based on his explorations in 1843 and 1844, encouraged this migration, and the next year he was sent to seek out better roads for emigrants. Coming north from Walker Pass, he finally reached the neighborhood of Sonoma (Map 45a) and, despite contrary orders, aided a demonstration known as the "Bear Flag War." But word soon reached the rebels that hostilities had been begun between the United States and Mexico and that Commodore Sloat had occupied Monterey. California was easily won, and on the arrival of General Kearny's force, detailed to march from Fort Leavenworth, the conquest was already accomplished. California, therefore, as well as the old state of New Mexico and the disputed parts of Texas, was transferred by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848, to the United States (Map 46).

Those who signed this treaty did not know that about a week before, at Sutter's Mill, on the American Fork not far from Sacramento (Map 44a), a laborer had found the grains that were to make that territory indeed the Golden West. The "forty-niners" were not slow in coming, many daring the long way overland, especially by the northern pioneer route.²

The population so rapidly increased that im-

¹ Katharine Coman, *Economic Beginnings of the Far West* (New York, 1912), vol. ii, p. 227.

² Of course, many also came by sea or across Mexico, Nicaragua, or the Isthmus.

proved communication was clearly necessary. The Southern Pacific Railroad was projected by Jefferson Davis and others, but the most available route would lie through Mexican territory. Consequently, James Gadsden, a South Carolina railroad

man, then our minister to Mexico, was directed, in 1853, to buy the necessary strip (Map 46), paying \$10,000,000, or two-thirds as much as the sum paid for the whole Southwest in the recent treaty.

Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto

MAP STUDY No. 21

SLAVERY AND THE TERRITORIES: FROM THE MISSOURI
COMPROMISE TO SECESSION

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 450-518; Smith, *Parties and Slavery*; Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War*, pp. 3-69, 109-342; Hosmer, *Appeal to Arms*, pp. 3-18.

MAPS: United States (2).

THE great period of territorial expansion came to a close in 1848; a magnificent domain had been acquired, available for American homes. But were they to be homes of farmers, each driving his own plow through his various fields, or of planters administering their great estates where gangs of negro slaves performed the simple but laborious routine tasks of staple crops, like cotton or tobacco? This was a question which would not be ignored, for experience had proved that each system flourished only in the absence of the other. Many planters looked eagerly upon these virgin acres, for the methods of their tillage—more properly called agricide than agriculture—were peculiarly exhausting to the soil, and many saw new fortunes could come only with new fields. On the other hand, the Northern pioneers, with whom migration farther to the west had become an ineradicable habit, were quite as resolute that the land beyond the Mississippi should be held for individual “improvers,” like themselves and their sons.

But the Southerner, who had no plan of moving, was almost as much interested in the West as those who did, for his peculiar institution, confronted by a growing majority of industrial workers and small farmers in the nation, was politically on the defensive; he needed more states, and thus more Senators, to block unfavorable laws. In 1820

(Map 42) he had bargained away his opportunity in the major part of the old Louisiana Purchase in return for one state, Missouri. As in 1848 he looked upon the map, he saw for his future south of the 36° 30' line only a meager bit of Indian country; and he naturally resolved that the California valleys and the territories of Utah and New Mexico, shortly to be formed, should not be taken from him. When he read of the Wilmot proviso which would thwart him completely, he thanked fate for the Senate, where his statesmen used their veto. He was willing, perhaps, as a last retreat, to accept President Polk's suggestion that the line of 36° 30', permitting slavery to the South, should be extended to the Pacific, for southern California was the most adaptable of the new acquisitions to his system.

But as he heard of the territorial organization of Oregon and Minnesota (Map 48), and realized that “free” statehood would soon follow, he saw that possibly this would be too generous a concession. He applauded Texas in her insistent claims to hold within her own jurisdiction the vast area which we have indicated as contained within the

¹This line it is seen, was along the same latitude as the southern boundary of Kentucky, west of the Tennessee River. It was thought best to join to Missouri the entire group of settlements which had been formed southwest of the mouth of the Ohio, which accounts for this protuberance along the Mississippi.

limits she had drawn in 1836 (Map Study No. 20), even though the new President, General Taylor, had threatened to send soldiers. When Texas had been "reannexed," it had been agreed that the 36° 30' line should apply to Texas, and that as many as four states, if Texas wished, might be made from it. Hence it was important that her territory be as wide as possible. He was impressed with the menace of the Free-Soilers' vote, as he noted the unusual frequency of the word "plurality" in the record of the late election (Map 44b2). He took some interest in the convention called for June, 1850, at Nashville (Map 42), to threaten secession if the Polk plan were not taken, though he had more faith in Senator Clay's proposals, which were debated from January to September, and whose territorial provisions we may now indicate upon the map (Map 48). He saw, however, that the compromising sentiment was by no means universal, for though general in the border sections, there were many sections, north and south, where extremists seemed bent on following Seward or Calhoun (Map 45b).

Such was the situation in September, 1850, which many hoped might last forever; but an undeveloped country was not likely to remain in such legal assignments. Senator Stephen A. Douglas desired to build up the West. He preached the policy of land grants to the railroads, and especially desired a road to the Pacific, which would bring commerce to Chicago, such as was projected in the Union Pacific from Council Bluffs (Map 62). To make this a success it would be desirable to open the Indian country (Map 48) to settlement as soon as possible, for which political provision should be made. With David Atchison, of western Missouri, a proslavery leader who had gained control of that state and who coveted the plains of Kansas for the plantation system, he drew up a plan to open it to whatever kind of settlement might come, thus pleasing the Southern statesmen in his disregard of the Missouri Compromise.

This Kansas-Nebraska bill which thus organized two territories (compare Maps 48 and 55) on the principle of "squatter sovereignty"—*i.e.*, that the actual settlers might decide as to slavery when they applied for statehood—renewed and em-

bittered the discussion as to slavery in the territories and began the series of contentions directly leading to the Civil War. Our Map 51a reveals how marked this sectionalism had grown. In details it is instructive, showing, for example, that California was sometimes controlled by Senator Gwin's proslavery faction, though Senator Broderick finally kept it fast within the Union; that New Hampshire was still loyal to the Democratic party, as she had been since the War of 1812 (see Maps 33b1, 40b1, 40b2, 44b1, and 44b2), though, disturbed by this slavery question, she was to change the following year, and soon became almost as steadily Republican; that the people of Indiana were sufficiently Southern in origin to keep that state a "doubtful" one even to-day; and that Iowa had been won by Douglas's scheme of railroad settlement.

But the indignation throughout the North was widespread, and nowhere more intense than in the Northwest. "Anti-Nebraska" Democrats joined Whigs and Free-Soilers, for example, at Ripon, Wisconsin (about seventy-five miles northwest of Milwaukee; Map 48), to form a new party pledged to close the territories to any extension of slavery. On July 6, 1854, a mass meeting "under the oaks" at Jackson, Michigan (Map 48), representing several states, drew up the first platform of the Republican party. Many others, north and south, who desired to emphasize a less sectional issue, joined the American party, formed to combat foreign influence alleged especially to be wielded through the Catholic Church, and this organization the next year got virtual control of nine states (Map 52a), each of which may be marked with an A. But the great question of slavery and the territories was insistent, and the following year all but one of these was lost. With the letters J.B., J.C.F., and M.F., the initials of the candidates, indicate the states carried by Buchanan, Frémont, and Fillmore in 1856 (Map 52b).

The competition for Kansas between the farmers and the planters, each, to a small degree, encouraged by propagandist funds, was such as to lead to bloodshed. After reading the assignment indicate from Map 51b, with key, the principal "free state" and "slave state" communities in that territory.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Another issue was soon furnished in the case of Dred Scott, whose travels from St. Louis, through Rock Island, Illinois (Map 60), to Fort Snelling in the Minnesota Territory (Map 36), and back to Missouri may be indicated on the outline map. The decision by the Supreme Court that in these sojourns he had not lost his status as a slave, seemed to make slavery possible anywhere, despite the vote of legislatures. At Freeport (Map 48) Lincoln asked Douglas if this did not quite demolish his theory of popular sovereignty, but it was replied that, whatever was a negro's legal status, his freedom would actually depend in any place upon the local regulations. *If the student has sufficient time to read a full account of these famous debates in Illinois, such as that in McMaster's History, Vol. VIII, pages 318-337, he might indicate the whole itinerary, noticing the geographical propriety of the different subjects discussed to the various localities. Harper's Ferry, as the scene of John Brown's raid, should be shown (Map 58a).*

Using Map 54, indicate with candidate's initials who carried each state in 1860. Note, but do not record, the close vote in many states, and especially the strength of Bell's Constitutional Union party in the South.

Certain states seceded on hearing the result of this election: South Carolina, December 20, 1860; Mississippi, January 9, 1861; Florida, January 10th; Alabama, January 11th; Georgia, January 19th;

Louisiana, January 26th; Texas, February 1st. The conventions in these states, without waiting for popular vote, except in the case of Texas, sent delegates to Montgomery, Alabama (Map 59a), where the "Confederate States of America" were formed, February 8, 1861. These states may be indicated with a large black C. Comparison with Map Study No. 19 recalls that these states were mostly well within the "Cotton Kingdom," which seemed the most prosperous and confidently self-sufficient section of the South. There remained two tiers of border slave states; one group, consisting of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas, being adjacent to the seceding states, and the other, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, to the free states. When Lincoln actually attempted to coerce the seceding members into obedience, the former border group, together with Virginia, joined them in sympathy, and should be marked with a C in some other color. (Do you believe any consideration of "political geography" influenced the selection of Bates, Blair, and Smith as members of Lincoln's cabinet?)

In his famous pronouncement on New Mexico, in the "Seventh of March speech," Daniel Webster had implied that slavery could not go where nature had determined otherwise. As you survey your map, with Map Study No. 3 in mind, does it seem to you that the South could ever have preserved the balance of states?

MAP STUDY No. 22

THE CIVIL WAR

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 518-571; Hosmer, *Appeal to Arms; Outcome of the Civil War*.

MAPS: United States; Eastern United States; South Atlantic States.

THE student has now enjoyed, or, possibly, endured, the training of twenty-one map studies, and may be expected himself to devise and execute a map to illustrate, in a comprehensive way, the military events of the Civil War. The careful

reading of the entire assignment, or some equally concise and satisfactory account, if any can be found, is essential before a line is drawn; and it would next be well to make a close preliminary inspection of Maps 60 and 56a-59b. The study

should be carefully planned to show such essential matters as the routes of armies in the progress of campaigns, the part played by the navy, the railroad routes which made certain points of critical importance (*e.g.*, Vicksburg and Chattanooga), the obstacles which made so arduous the road to Richmond, the "wind gaps" in the Blue Ridge, making possible the intricate maneuvers in central Virginia. Why was Maryland necessary to the Federal government? How was the Shenandoah Valley used by the Confederates? Think constantly in terms of offensive and defensive strategy conditioned by rivers and mountains, and by rail-

roads, for the first time of military importance in the history of the world.

SUPPLEMENT

On a sheet of plain paper draw columns for operations in the West, operations in the East, civil affairs, and foreign affairs. Then draw transverse lines marking off divisions for 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, and 1865. After reading Bassett, Chapters XXIV-XXVII, indicate the events of those years in their proper columns. Particular attention should be paid to the process of emancipation. (See also Map 61.)

MAP STUDY No. 23

THE PROCESS OF RECONSTRUCTION

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 594-658; Dunning, *Reconstruction: Political and Economic*.

MAP: United States.

THE process of reconstruction was influenced by political and social theories and by party rivalries; not much by physical geography. This map study, therefore, is intended to fix in the mind, by this visual means, what was done with the conquered South.

From Map 63b indicate with letters L and J, where loyal governments were set up under Lincoln and under Johnson. The dates printed on this map, it will be seen, have nothing to do with the institution of these governments; they were all established by the end of 1866, and are seen to be in states which early fell under control of the Union armies, except Virginia, where Pierpont's government at Alexandria, later at Richmond, was recognized by the Presidents. Race riots at Memphis and New Orleans in the spring and summer of 1866, as well as the "black codes," were cited as evidence by radical Republicans to discredit the presidential plan; and Johnson personally lost support by his bad manners. His route in "swinging 'round the circle" can be indicated, with the aid of Map 62, from the following quotation

from Professor Dunning's *Reconstruction*, page 81: "Having accepted an invitation to be present at the laying of the corner stone of a monument to Stephen A. Douglas, at Chicago, on September 6th, Johnson employed the occasion to visit leading Northern cities and appeal directly to the people for the cause which he represented. With a party that included Secretaries Seward and Welles, Postmaster-General Randall, General Grant, and Admiral Farragut, he traveled, by easy stages, through New York state and southern Ohio to Chicago, and after the ceremony there, visited St. Louis and Indianapolis on the way back to Washington. From the outset the President's speeches at the various stopping places assumed a partisan character, abounding in self-praise and in denunciation of Congress; and at Cleveland and St. Louis interruptions of the crowd, apparently calculated, drove him to retorts and extravagances of expression which were in the last degree offensive to dignity and good taste." The result in the autumn congressional election, so disastrous to the President, may be shown from Map 63a by marking

with the letters A. and A.A. the states for and against the administration in the coming fortieth Congress.

Encouraged by this result, Thaddeus Stevens and his joint committee on reconstruction, acting on ill-defined war power supposed still to appertain to the unsettled conditions in the South, passed the drastic Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, and the new Congress which organized itself in extraordinary session immediately after the expiration of its predecessor, continued with the supplementary acts of March 23d and July 19th, all passed over the President's veto.¹ Reference to Map 63b will recall that the government of Tennessee, having indorsed the Fourteenth Amendment, had been accepted the previous year as a state in full membership. By the new acts Congress divided the remaining "conquered territory," whose governments it had refused to recognize, into five military districts, which may be indicated as follows: Virginia; North and South Carolina; Georgia, Florida, and Alabama; Mississippi and Arkansas; and Louisiana and Texas. A general was assigned to the command of each of these new districts.

After reading the text assignment, locate, using a key, a state serving as a model for the rest of the South in the intimidation of the negro; a state twice visited with military government after March 2, 1867; the birthplace of the Ku-Klux Klan (Map 60); five other places of interest in the reconstruction period, explaining your selection on the key sheet. From Map 65b show with a heavy broken black outline the sections voting for Hayes in 1876, with a similar line of another color those voting for Tilden. Show also the contested states with their twenty-two electoral votes. In this map there appears the "solid South," that has not forgotten, a political factor constant since the Civil War, as comparison with Maps 67, 70, 77, and 79 will suggest.

A study of the statistical data indicated here will explain why Ohio, New York, New Jersey, Indiana, and California have been called "doubtful states." These maps exaggerate Ohio's constancy to the Republicans, inasmuch as she has

chosen Democratic governors nine times since the Civil War; perhaps her Republican vote in national elections has been encouraged by the fact that in seven of the twelve campaigns since 1876 that party has presented an Ohio man as a candidate; Benjamin Harrison, who grew to manhood in Ohio, was a citizen of Indiana, while Roosevelt and Hughes were from New York. Blaine, the "gentleman from Maine," was the only candidate whose nomination could not be explained, in part, by his residence in a doubtful state. The Democrats have shown a similar discrimination of their nominees from 1868 to 1912, only Hancock and Bryan were not New Yorkers, Wilson is from New Jersey, and Cox from Ohio. Massachusetts, though Republican in elections where the tariff is involved, has frequently elected Democratic governors, which may be partially accounted for by the presence of a considerable Irish population (Map 75).

But as one closely examines these statistics, for example, in 1884 (Map 67), he may be surprised at the small vote in the "solid" Southern states in comparison with the number of presidential electors. This is due to the fact that the colored population, by reason of circumstances and Democratic devices, are not proportionally represented at the polls. When one learns that in all this section more than fifteen per cent. of the negroes are illiterate, one understands the argument of danger offered by the whites to explain why the negro should not be encouraged to exercise the franchise. In local elections they believe it would be quite disastrous in many districts, for the negroes are in the majority in an area approximately the same as that of the heaviest cotton production before the Civil War (Map Study No. 19), while along the Mississippi, and in the band of counties across south central Alabama, together with two counties in Florida, six in Georgia, and four in South Carolina, they constitute more than three-fourths of the population. The old cotton area is also precisely that now showing the greatest proportion of rented farms. The center of colored population has stood for two generations past in the vicinity of the boundary line between Alabama and Georgia, not far from Tennessee, though it

¹ See J. D. Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, vol. vi, pp. 498, 531, 536.

is probable that the 1920 census may disclose that it has recently moved somewhat north, due to the labor migrations during the Great War. An indication of all these data on the map will locate the negro problem. The drama of the Civil War has closed, but this after-pièce goes on.

There remain two other matters more or less remotely connected with the military events of the war, which can be fixed in the mind by means of the map. Napoleon III, Emperor of the French, had placed Prince Maximilian of Austria on an imperial throne in Mexico in 1864, thus taking advantage of our preoccupation to flout and violate our sensibilities represented in the Monroe Doctrine. In 1866 General Sheridan was ordered to proceed with 52,000 men to the Rio Grande in the vicinity of Brownsville and Point Isabel (Map Study No. 20), where his threatening attitude increased the effectiveness of Secretary Seward's diplomacy, and Napoleon abandoned his enter-

prise, leaving Maximilian to a tragic fate. Of quite a different character was another border demonstration. Great Britain's coolness to the Federal cause during the early years of the war made it even easier than usual for Irish veterans of our battles to draw together for a stroke to free their ancestral home. Most of the American Fenians, as they were called, to the embarrassment of our Department of State gave support, in 1866, to invasions into Canada. The first raid, planned to start from Eastport, Maine (Map 47), was prevented by prompt action of American and British officials and forces, but thousands of armed men did cross the boundary from Buffalo, at Rouse's Point, New York (Map 47), and St. Albans, Vermont (Map 34). The Canadian government soon checked these forays, though not till one or two so-called battles had been fought and about two and a half million dollars had been expended from the provincial treasuries.

MAP STUDY No. 24

CREATING WEALTH: MINES, RANCHES, FARMS, RAILROADS, MILLS

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 676-691, 731-734; Sparks, *National Development*, pp. 53-67, 251-264.

MAP: United States.

THE restoration of white government in the South early in the administration of President Hayes came as a relief to a country weary of the old moral issue of slavery and its consequences. It was toward the West that the eye of the new nation now was turned to see how it might best be developed, for the general good and, especially, for individuals. The old Far West of the early nineteenth century (Map 15a), knowing only the hoof-beat of the buffalo and the savage cry of the beasts of wood and plain now and then pursued by red men, had been penetrated and explored, as we have seen, by 1848 (Map Study No. 20). But the trappers who roamed the wilderness were not left undisturbed, and the West of Irving's *Astoria* and Parkman's *Oregon Trail* gave way to that of Bret Harte.

On the western slope of the Sierra Nevada, or snow-capped mountains, certain Mormon traders had gathered to sell supplies to the "Argonauts" en route to California. Too far away from Salt Lake City to enjoy the benefits of the territorial government of Utah (Map 48), in the later 'fifties the citizens of Carson City (frontispiece) and surrounding settlements attempted to form a separate territory to be known as Washoe, but without immediate success. In 1859 near by there was uncovered the Comstock lode, astonishingly rich in gold and silver. Virginia City and other similar pine-board towns were rapidly run up by miners in this Washoe region, a few miles northeast of Lake Tahoe, at the angle of the California boundary. Efforts toward statehood were now redoubled, the territory of Nevada was set off, in

1861, though its population was only 7,000, and, inasmuch as the Republican leaders in Congress felt that two more senatorial votes might be useful in their conduct of reconstruction, it was admitted as a state in 1864. Subsequently other mining areas were developed along the ridge just east of the southwest border, at Eureka (in 1869; the central part of the state), and at Tonapah (in 1900, about 150 miles southeast of Carson City), these being somewhat more distinguished for silver. Nevada remains the most sparsely settled state in the Union (Map 68).

The vast mineral resources of the Rocky Mountains as well began to be revealed about the time that great armies were clashing in battle thousands of miles to the eastward. In 1858 gold had been discovered on the plains not far from modern Denver (frontispiece), and a considerable emigration from the East began, stimulated somewhat by the hard times following the panic of 1857. Although within the area of the Kansas territory (Map 55), the miners, to preserve order, organized an extra-legal government of their own, which gave law as the "Territory of Jefferson" until 1861, when, dropping one degree of longitude claimed to the west and two of latitude to the north, it was given formal status under the name of Colorado, so called from the ruddy glow of the sunset on the mountains. The war halted, but did not wholly stop, this immigration, and with peace releasing many adventurous young men to carve their fortunes from these hills and gulches, the population was considerably increased. A Republican Congress attempted to admit it as a state in 1867, but failed before the veto of President Johnson, and eight years passed before the enabling act became law, Colorado, the following year, becoming the "Centennial State."¹

The miners on their way to Colorado oftentimes encountered the immense herds of beef cattle being driven on their dusty way between their winter ranges in Texas and those of the warmer months in the far-away territories of Dakota and Montana.

¹ The treasures of the earth have seemed quite inexhaustible; the opening of the Cripple Creek vein (a short distance south of the center of the state), in 1893, brought many to the state, and, indeed, a large proportion of Colorado's inhabitants have some connection with the mining industry.

The cowboys and their rivals, the shepherds, paid small attention to the boundaries of Indian reservations and had many a fierce encounter with the roaming braves. But in this they but shared the adventures of the miners who during the Civil War had rushed to the gold diggings in what is now southwestern Idaho and western Montana and on the Sweetwater River (Wyoming; Map 36). The War Department sent many of its best commanders to subdue the savages, especially those following Spotted Tail, Red Cloud, and Sitting Bull, but success came slowly and after heavy losses. The force of Gen. George A. Custer, for example, was annihilated by the Sioux near the juncture of the Bighorn and the Little Bighorn Rivers, in 1876. The Indian, the miner, the rancher, and wide unpeopled spaces—this was the "Wild West" of the generation following the Civil War, reaching its full development about 1885. But this isolation could not long continue.

The connection between the eastern coastal plain and the Mississippi Valley grew steadily better after the Civil War, as may be seen from Map 62. Show the route toward Chicago taken by the principal lines of the following systems: Vanderbilt, Pennsylvania, Erie, Grand Trunk, and the Mobile and Ohio together with the Illinois Central. Railroads, which in the East came as a convenience, connecting old-established towns, have paved the way for population in western America. Striking out across the prairies and cutting through the mountains, they have taken with them hundreds of thousands of farmers and business men who have created commonwealths. For such costly undertakings it was felt that government aid was indispensable, and great grants were made, especially between 1850 and 1871, in the shape of alternate sections along the routes surveyed. "It is estimated that under the various railway acts no less than 155,524,992 acres have been given to railways. . . . It has been profitable for them to develop population and industries along their lines, and they have accordingly used their grants for the upbuilding of the West." This area, so granted, totals to more than two and one-half times that of the New England states. Using both maps, 62 and 83, show the routes of the Union Pacific,

whose final spike was driven near Ogden, Utah, May 10, 1869, the Southern Pacific from New Orleans to San Francisco in 1883; the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fé, extending from the lower Missouri Valley, with St. Louis and Kansas City as important terminals, through southeastern Colorado, northern Arizona, and New Mexico, to the same goal in the same year; the Northern Pacific also in 1883; and the Great Northern, which Mr. Hill completed from St. Paul to Puget Sound a decade later. Indicate the roads receiving land grants, and twenty towns begun or developed because of the railroads. Consider the thought of the Indians as they watched the engineers and laborers.

The facilities of transportation made new mining areas important. The anthracite coal fields of the Lehigh Valley, in northeastern Pennsylvania, had produced a high-grade fuel since the 'twenties, and the great Appalachian area, stretching from west-central Pennsylvania into Alabama, had been more and more largely developed. The railroads made the fields of West Virginia and the Hocking Valley in Ohio particularly productive near the close of the century. At the same time deposits in southeastern Colorado and on the flanks of the high ridge of the Rockies in the northern part of that state were uncovered, and became, some years later, famous for bitter labor disputes or for the excellence of their product. Eastern Illinois, the adjacent part of Indiana, and, to a smaller extent, central Missouri, have also become famous for their soft coal.

The vicinity of Pittsburg, with its myriad smoking chimneys, attests the human benefit when coal and iron meet. The coal here has outlasted the iron, but, since it has cost more to transport, usually the ore has been carried to those furnaces from other fields. The Lake Superior beds along the northern peninsula of Michigan produced about as much as Pennsylvania in the later 'seventies, but though their production was increased about eight-fold in the next three decades, northeastern Minnesota, with its Vermillion (1884) and Messabi (1892) ranges, the latter the richest in the world, surpassed it at the beginning of the twentieth century. The ore boats ply their steady way

through the Lakes to the coal and smelting region. The hills surrounding Birmingham, Alabama (Map 82b), yield coal, iron, and limestone in close proximity, and in the last three decades have made that city famous for its steel, while Pueblo, Colorado, with less supply, but advantageous marketing position, has become the "Pittsburg of the West." The Adirondack region, early of importance, still produces a considerable tonnage of ore. The development of more and better railroads has made it possible, in late years, economically to bring fuel to the Lake ports, where it meets the ore brought from the Lake Superior fields, and in consequence such places as Chicago and near-by Gary, Indiana, as well as Cleveland and Buffalo, have become important in the steel industry. Two Harbors and Marquette (Map 82b) are important ore-shipping points.

In Map Study No. 4 we traced the route of Jean Nicolet, who in 1634 was sent by Champlain to investigate the reputed copper beds on the western shores of the Great Lakes. But seven generations of savage red men lived and died before the rich mines of the northern peninsula were opened to the world in 1845. The Calumet and Hecla mine in the central part was at one time probably the most profitable in the world, but about 1890 the discovery of the copper mountains in western Montana gave Butte (Map 83) and neighboring Anaconda the leading place, and by 1910 the field in southwestern Arizona had surpassed all others, its industry centering in such towns as Bisbee, near the Mexican border. Salt Lake County in Utah now produces enough copper to rank that state above Michigan.

The great areas of agricultural production are shown in Map 82b and have not changed in any marked degree in twenty years. It would be instructive to indicate from this same source, using a key, three areas producing each of the following commodities: cement, lumber, wool, and petroleum. Most of the zinc mined in the United States comes from northwestern Missouri and the adjacent part of Kansas, while most of the country's lead is found here and in the St. Francis field, also in Missouri, not far west of Ste. Genevieve, though the Utah mines have become important competitors.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The flaxseed industry is located in the eastern part of the Dakotas. Locate two cities in your own state important for some specialty. The following brief chronology of inventions illustrates the rapidity of the technical changes in the new industrial development:

- 1875—Bell's telephone between Boston and Salem.
- 1879—Brush arc street-lighting system installed in San Francisco.
- 1882—Edison's plant for incandescent lighting opened in New York City.
- 1885—Edison's electric street cars introduced in Richmond, Virginia, and Baltimore (see Map 24).¹

In 1890 (Map 68) the far-western frontier line, which bounds the unsettled area, was crowded off the continent, and thoughtful observers speculated as to the results upon American society of the passing of the American opportunity resting upon desirable "free land." In Map Study No. 17 we traced the westward course of the center of population to 1860; we may now carry it on from 1860 to 1910:

Year	North Latitude	West Longitude
1860	39°	82° 49'
1870	39° 12'	83° 36'
1880	39° 4'	84° 40'
1890	39° 12'	85° 33'
1900	39° 10'	85° 49'
1910	39° 10'	86° 32'

This last-named point, at Bloomington, Indiana, is still a great distance from the center of the area of the United States, a point midway on the boundary between Kansas and Nebraska. Indeed, it may never reach it, for although the development of

¹ See C. A. Beard, *Contemporary America* (New York, 1915).

the mines and the fields has pulled the people westward, and manufactures with them (in 1900 the center of manufacturing had already reached west-central Ohio), yet, such has been the growth of cities on the Atlantic coastal plain, that it is possible the final figures of 1920 will show a recession to the east. *If time permits*, it would be interesting to indicate the successive centers of population in your home state during the last generation. What has brought about this movement?¹

We shall have occasion, in a subsequent map study, to trace the progress of immigration since the Civil War, but it is desirable here to indicate from Map 75, in a general way, the distribution of the northern-European period, which ended in the 'eighties.² Notice that the South, for the most part, remained almost as much uninfluenced by foreign immigration in the second half of the nineteenth century as it had in the first.

Place in appropriate states, consulting the index, or an encyclopedia, the initials of the following leaders mentioned by Bassett, Chapters XXXIV-XXXV, as prominent in the 'eighties: Carl Schurz, John Sherman, R. C. Conkling, B. F. Butler, T. C. Platt, J. G. Blaine, T. Roosevelt, D. B. Hill, T. B. Reed, L. Q. C. Lamar, A. P. Gorman, Matthew Quay, R. P. Bland, T. V. Powderly. On a separate sheet, in sentence notes, explain the importance of each.

¹ Data may be found in plates 119-132 in the *Statistical Atlas of the United States, 1914*, published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C., and available at the nearest public library.

² The Scandinavian area given in northeastern Pennsylvania should extend north of the line to include Jamestown, New York.

MAP STUDY No. 25

THIRD PARTIES AND OTHER CRITICS OF "BIG BUSINESS"

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 707-715, 721-740.

MAPS: United States (3).

IT was the custom during the 'eighties and early 'nineties for American periodicals to print statistics of comparative national production in the main staples of the world, frequently catching the eye with rows of pictured grain bags, coal hods, steel rails, etc., beginning with those of giant size and dwindling down to dwarfs. The journalists were gratified to notice that the products of the United States demanded more and more space in this graphic presentation, crowding its competitors into smaller and smaller compass; and "captains of industry" increasingly supplied the theme for eulogistic editorials. That America was growing rich and powerful there could be no doubt, and statesmen rubbed their hands in satisfaction.

But there were many who dissented, many who expressed their admiration for the labor and intelligence that brought these things to pass, but maintained that the benefits were ill-distributed, that those who worked the hardest got the least, and that the government was managed by the special beneficiaries. The farmers who in the latter 'sixties had borrowed paper money to develop their homestead sections or "railroad lands," found, some years later, with deflation of the currency, that their debts must be discharged in specie, and clamored for more greenbacks, so that money for repayment might be found as easily as they had once found it to borrow. They bitterly complained of the freight rates charged by the railroads, and the taxes which they had to pay in order to retire the bonds that states and cities had once issued as subventions to these utilities. On these and other issues, a farmers' or "granger" movement became politically successful by 1873, in Illinois, soon followed by Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, which may be indicated with the letter G as states early important in the agrarian protest; it suffices

now to say that their organization spread throughout the Middle West, but collapsed, in part from indiscretions in co-operative manufacturing, and its members merged with other adherents of the Greenback party.

Agriculture in the South was reorganized after the Civil War with greatest difficulty. Small planters, who grew more numerous, found it necessary to pledge their crops to merchants, to pay a ruinous rate of interest, and almost invariably sink deeper into debt. Finding the dominant Democratic party cold to their appeals, during the middle 'eighties, another farmers' movement began in Texas and, after some false starts, spread, by amalgamation, through Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Mississippi. Though called the Farmers' and Laborers' Union of America, it was more widely known as the "Southern Alliance," the initials of which name may indicate the early development in those states. The movement spread through the entire South, but its followers remained in a comparatively small minority until after 1890. Meanwhile, in the old Granger states, hard times resulting from the competition with foreign grain fields reinforced old grievances, and a Northwestern Alliance was set up, extending its propaganda with success also into the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas. But these enterprises, like their predecessors, drooped, and were abandoned in discouragement.

In place of these social and nonpartisan associations, in 1890, came political activity. The sufferings of the farmers brought about a violent upheaval in Kansas, and were it possible to represent turmoil and excitement on a map, that state might be emphatically designated. At Omaha, Nebraska (Map 83), in 1892, a convention launched the People's party, soon to be known as the "Popu-

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

lists," and nominated General Weaver as a presidential candidate. Besides the usual declarations for government ownership and greenbacks, the convention demanded that silver be purchased by the government and coined in whatever amounts presented. This last proposal greatly pleased the silver-mining states (Map Study No. 24), as well as those who wished "cheap money," and may account, in part, for the Populist vote, which may be generally indicated from Map 70.¹

It will be noticed that six new states had been admitted since the last election, the two Dakotas, Washington, and Montana (1889) and Wyoming and Idaho (1890). A heavy outline might indicate these states. It was generally thought that the admission of so many states had resulted from a bargain between the Republicans and Democrats, but both parties refused support to the application of Utah, for, though her population was three and a half times that of Wyoming, the social control of the Mormon Church, despite the Edmunds-Tucker Act of 1887, was considered annoying, and the plural marriages, still celebrated in defiance of the national laws of 1862 and 1882, were considered scandalous.² Its statehood did not come until 1896, and may be so labeled.

Looking to the east, beyond the Mississippi, we find that the farmers were not the only Americans who felt themselves exploited by capitalists. The industrial laborers had formed great national unions, and with this mutual support had fought through more or less successfully a number of important strikes. After reading Bassett, pages 742-743, show the location of those mentioned, with sentence notes on the back of the map as to the significance of each.

On such an issue as the tariff, of course, economic geography goes far to explain the position of the contestants. The farmer is likely to see in a rise of customs duties, except on agricultural products, only a corresponding rise in prices, while the mill owner and the laborer see the possibility of a high scale of profits and wages. Different sections have

their special preferences; General Hancock, as the Democratic candidate for President in 1880, had not been so absurd as he was represented, when he declared that the tariff was "a local issue." On a fresh outline sheet indicate the vote in the House of Representatives on the McKinley bill of 1890 (Map 69), remembering the rates proposed on many farm products as well as manufactured goods. The irritation at the increased prices resulting from the operation of this law had a considerable effect upon the election of 1892, already shown in this map study. The bill proposed by Mr. W. L. Wilson of West Virginia, reducing the tariff, passed the House, but was amended upward by Senator Gorman and his colleagues in the other House. In the light of its schedules it will be instructive to observe the vote on the Wilson measure as first presented, August 13, 1894 (Map 71), though it need not be reproduced upon the outline map.

With all these conflicting interests in mind show on your tariff map with clearly printed initials M and B, preferably using different colors, the result by states of the electoral vote according to the following table, placing a small w in those states which gave some electoral votes to the Populist running mate of Bryan, Thomas E. Watson:

<i>State</i>	<i>McKinley and Hobart</i>	<i>Bryan</i>	<i>Sewall</i>	<i>Watson</i>
Alabama.....	..	11	11	..
Arkansas.....	..	8	5	3
California.....	8	1	1	..
Colorado.....	..	4	4	..
Connecticut....	6
Delaware.....	3
Florida.....	..	4	4	..
Georgia.....	..	13	13	..
Idaho.....	..	3	3	..
Illinois.....	24
Indiana.....	15
Iowa.....	13
Kansas.....	..	10	10	..
Kentucky.....	12	1	1	..
Louisiana.....	..	8	4	4
Maine.....	6
Maryland.....	8
Massachusetts..	15
Michigan.....	14
Minnesota.....	9
Mississippi.....	..	9	9	..

¹ Observe, but do not indicate, the large Populist vote polled in Oregon, Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, Alabama, and Texas.

² Mormonism is hardly less strong in Idaho, and is important in Arizona, Wyoming, and Nevada.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

State	McKinley and Hobart	Bryan	Sewall	Watson	State	McKinley and Hobart	Bryan	Sewall	Watson
Missouri.....	..	17	13	4	Virginia.....	..	12	12	..
Montana.....	..	3	2	1	Washington....	..	4	2	2
Nebraska.....	..	8	4	4	West Virginia...	6
Nevada.....	..	3	3	..	Wisconsin.....	12
New Hampshire.	4	Wyoming.....	..	3	2	1
New Jersey....	10	<hr/>	271	176	149	27
New York.....	36					
North Carolina.	..	11	6	5					
North Dakota..	5					
Ohio.....	23					
Oregon.....	4					
Pennsylvania...	32					
Rhode Island..	4					
South Carolina.	..	9	9	..					
South Dakota..	..	4	2	2					
Tennessee.....	..	12	12	..					
Texas.....	..	15	15	..					
Utah.....	3	3	2	1					
Vermont.....	4					

Compare this result with that of the election of 1892. The fusion with the Democrats had been, of course, a bitter pill for Southern Populists to swallow, and many voted for McKinley.

Place the initials of the following leaders, mentioned by Bassett, Chapters XXXIV-XXXVI, in the appropriate states: Richard Olney, T. F. Bayard, T. E. Watson, W. McKinley, E. V. Debs, B. F. Tillman, J. G. Carlisle, W. L. Wilson, and J. B. Weaver.

MAP STUDY No. 26

WORLD POWER

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 764-827; Latané, *America as a World Power*.

MAPS: World; Mexico and West Indies.

THE United States, whose "manifest destiny" had once seemed to require only its expansion straight westward to the Pacific coast, had no sooner accomplished that than it turned attention to other portions of the continent. Gouverneur Morris was asked, in 1803, what he had thought in the Constitutional Convention of the probable extension of the United States, and wrote in reply, "I knew as well as I do now, that all North America must at length be annexed to us."¹ The failure of our military scheme of conquest in 1812 had dimmed our hopes of planting the Stars and Stripes on Hudson Bay, but to the southward we met with no such rebuff. In 1848 some had desired all of Mexico, and in the 'fifties, Southerners, looking for plantation soil, supported schemes for annexation in Central America, to say nothing

of Cuba. The arrangement at Appomattox sealed the fate of slavery, but the victory rather whetted the national ambition to expand. Hence, in 1867, Secretary Seward found support for purchasing Alaska from Russia, whose friendliness during the late war was appreciated by the government. Russia, so distant from these shores, was, on her part, glad to sell, lest they be seized at any moment by her inveterate enemy, the British Empire, whose boundary here marched with hers. Though the new territory, which may be indicated from the frontispiece (noting its size compared with the United States of 1866), was derisively described as "Seward's Ice Box" and "Walrussia," it was declared quite habitable, Sitka having a lower average temperature than Ottawa. Its settlement, despite these reassuring accounts, was long delayed. Soon after the Civil War there were attempts to gain a foothold in the Caribbean, in the Danish

¹ J. Sparks, *Life of Gouverneur Morris* (Boston, 1832), vol. iii, p. 185.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

West Indies (now the Virgin Islands; frontispiece), and in Santa Domingo (Map 73), but they did not meet the approval of the nation.

Considerations of trade, a self-sufficient attitude toward European monarchies, and a genuine desire to be of service were all to be found in the policy of Secretary Blaine, first expressed in 1881, to draw all the American nations into closer relations. The knowledge of our citizens of the lands to the south was so insufficient as to lead many to consult a map in following the Secretary's notes. Lest this general ignorance be not yet entirely dispelled, the student is now asked to consult some modern map and, using a key when indispensable, to indicate on the world map the name of every country south of the Rio Grande. Notice the changes since 1823 (Map 35a), when the Monroe Doctrine was announced: Venezuela had been marked off from Colombia in 1829, and Ecuador in 1830; Bolivia, in 1825, had achieved independence; the Patagonian desert had been conquered by 1880, and the land divided between Chile and the Argentine Republic, though the boundary was not definitely settled until 1902. The three parts of Guiana still remain as European colonies. Locate the boundary between victorious Chile and defeated Peru, which Secretary Blaine attempted to adjust through mediation in 1881, and Valparaiso, where sailors from the U. S. S. *Baltimore* were attacked by Balmeceidists, October 16, 1892.

Secretary Blaine, eight years later, did have the pleasure of presiding over a Pan-American Congress at Washington, which led to several treaties of reciprocity in customs duties. The South American republics had come, for a time, to look to the United States as their champion in world affairs, and Venezuela had for some years appealed to the "Colossus of the North" to arbitrate a boundary dispute between herself and Great Britain (Map 35a). President Cleveland invoked the Monroe Doctrine, strengthened by tradition since 1823, and insisted upon this arbitration even to a threat of war. An international arrangement, in 1897, resulted in moving the boundary slightly to the northwest, as may be indicated on our map. Locate Puerto Cabello (a few miles west of Carácas), which President Roosevelt allowed Germany, Great

Britain, and Italy to bombard, in 1903, without remonstrance, since they proposed only to collect debts and not take territory.

Our federal system, by which police and property laws are within the jurisdiction of the state and foreign relations are in charge of the national government, might conceivably make inevitable a war undesired by the majority of Americans. After reading Bassett, Chapter XXXVI, locate the seat of the Mafia disturbances of 1891 and the area of anti-Mongolian feeling in the United States. Our world trade has made a large navy seem indispensable; but a navy effective for distant service is not possible without coaling stations. On this consideration, in 1878, our government obtained from native chiefs the right to use Pago Pago (pronounced Pango Pango) on Tutuila Island in the Samoan group (Map 80b, noticing inset) as a coaling station. Germany and England obtained similar rights in near-by ports. After civil wars among the natives, in which the Europeans were likely to become involved, a treaty was drawn up at Berlin between those powers and Samoa, providing for a joint protectorate which would nevertheless guarantee the autonomy of the native government. Continued friction between the Germans on one side and the Americans and British on the other made a partition seem necessary, and by a convention at Washington, in 1899, the United States withdrew from all islands west of Tutuila. In 1900, Great Britain, in consideration of compensations elsewhere, withdrew, leaving Germany with Savaii, Upola, and six smaller islands, while the United States has Tutuila and also five others, including the Manua group. The German possessions, it will be observed, are larger, and they are more populous; but the harbor of Pago Pago is the best in the group. These negotiations drew the attention of Americans to the Pacific and reminded them that, in 1867, Brooks, or Midway, Islands (Map 80b), lying 1,100 miles west of Honolulu, were occupied by the commander of the U. S. S. *Lackawanna*, and similarly Wake Island, thirty-two years later, was taken possession of by the commander of the U. S. S. *Bennington*. The interesting political incidents of the Hawaiian controversy

are familiar to the student from his reading, and he may now indicate these islands, with date of annexation. Honolulu, on the island of Oahu, is seen to be 2,100 miles from San Francisco, and about 5,000 miles from Manila. In 1900 the population of the group was 154,000, having increased 71 per cent. during the previous decade.

To illustrate the Spanish-American War, locate the place of the destruction of the *Maine*; the greatest naval victory of the war; Luzon, Mindanao, and Manila. Trace the route of Cervera, indicating the place of his destination, and the voyage of the *Oregon*. Show all the land acquired through the treaty with Spain, February 6, 1899 (Maps 73, 74, and 80b).

The United States co-operated in the international expedition to put down the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900, but this expeditionary force was only one of many in the history of America. With the help of Map 82a and an encyclopedia, locate three places outside of North America visited by American forces, omitting those mentioned in this study, stating on the other side of the map sheet the occasion of each.

Alaska, at first an object of jest and ridicule, was soon recognized as valuable. The boundary line, in 1867, had been run west of St. Lawrence Island (the largest island shown in the frontispiece inset) and southwest to beyond the western point of the Aleutian Islands. About the center of the marine area lying between this line and the mainland were the Pribiloff Islands, the greatest nursery of fur seals in the world. The government, as early as 1866, prohibited the killing of seals on these islands, or in "adjacent waters," without special license. In 1886 British ships engaged in pelagic sealing—*i.e.*, hunting with guns on the sea—were captured by an American revenue cutter, though they were sixty miles from land. There was much international discussion as to whether the United States had the right to enforce its law beyond the three-mile limit, and the case was finally, in 1893, submitted to an arbitration court. An ingenious argument was advanced that seals had some of the characteristics of domestic animals and could be considered American property,

even out at sea, but the verdict of the court was wholly in favor of the British.

It was soon known that Alaska contained some gold; indeed, prospectors had been rewarded as early as 1861. Juneau, which may be indicated, with its gold field, from the frontispiece, was founded in 1880. But it was not until 1896, when the Klondike mines were opened in the Yukon Valley (frontispiece) that a rush came, reminiscent of the days of the 'forty-niners. Four years later, Nome, on the Seward Peninsula, was the scene of a similar boom. The great wealth of the Klondike region made the question of the Canadian boundary, unsettled since the days of Russian occupation, one of keen controversy and considerable importance. From our Map 65a show as accurately as possible on the world map the claims of the litigants and the final line awarded by the joint board of adjudication at London in 1903. The main question was whether the language of the Russo-American treaties of 1825 and 1867 had meant that the line should run across the fiords or around them. It will be seen that the decision favored the United States. Now that Juneau, the largest town in Alaska, was safely within the American border, it was made the seat of government for the region in 1906.

The interest in a seaway from the Caribbean to the Pacific, which dated back to the days of Columbus, became more acute after the acquisition of California and the discovery of gold. Several routes were projected, which may be shown from Map 72, and the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850 was intended to apply to any of them. But the surveys made between 1870 and 1875 showed that only those traversing Nicaragua and Panama, a part of Colombia, were of practical consideration, the preference being given at first to the former, though it would require locks to lower boats from the lake to the western ocean. An international conference, in 1879, decided that a sea-level canal be built from Colon to Panama (which locate), and construction was begun by a European company in 1888, though its slowness was discouraging. Americans as late as 1900 planned a canal by the Nicaragua route, some work was begun, and finally Congress authorized its support in 1902, if no

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

arrangement could be reached with Colombia as to the Panama route. From your reading you have learned of the diplomatic arrangements finally leading to the establishment of the Canal Zone and the building of the canal, officially opened in 1915.

After reading the assignment, locate, from Map 81, the possessions, leased areas, and protectorates of the United States in the Caribbean region, giv-

ing the date of acquisition of each. As a suggestion of the part played by the United States in world politics during this era, locate The Hague; Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where the Russo-Japanese treaty was signed; and Algeciras (near Gibraltar), where America took part in the international conference held to consider Germany's complaints of France. Locate Tampico (Map 79) and Vera Cruz, important in our relations with Mexico.

MAP STUDY No. 27

REFORMS AND ENTERPRISE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

TEXT: Bassett, pp. 829-852; Ogg, *National Progress*.

MAPS: United States (2).

ONE has but to turn to the first message of President Roosevelt to Congress to feel that public life in the new century was to mean something more constructive and adventuresome than it had meant in the old. Experiments in government, particularly in the Western states, were being tried, that would have astonished the statesmen of the 'eighties. Scientific men were bringing scientific methods in the solution of agricultural, business and social problems to the service of the government, in an era that looked hopefully toward progress and reform. It was urged, with earnestness, that the remedy for the evils of democracy was more democracy—that direct participation of the people in state government was the way to banish bossism—and in 1912 eleven states had already adopted statewide initiative and referendum, and may be indicated with the letters I. & R., as follows: Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Colorado, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas, and Maine.¹ The pioneer life making for equality before the face of nature was no doubt a democratic influence, and this insistence on a direct part in the government was not the only sentiment spreading from the West. As in Scandinavia, Finland, and the Antipodes, the

women of the West bore an obviously equal part in the struggle for existence and were granted equality in political life. The letter W., with date, may indicate the states which had granted women full suffrage by the end of 1912: Wyoming (1869), Colorado (1893), Utah and Idaho (1896), Washington (1910), California, Arizona, Kansas, and Oregon (1912). It will be noticed that the admission of Oklahoma (1907), and Arizona and New Mexico (1911), which may be shown with heavy boundary lines, had strengthened the influence of the West.

It was claimed that woman suffrage would hasten the prohibition of the liquor traffic, and so the event proved. But the statistics of statewide prohibition, as it was in 1912, show more connection with the negro problem: Maine, Kansas, West Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Georgia were already legally "dry." This connection became more apparent as the years went on, though these states marked with the letter P. will serve to show the sections of early development of this movement. The South was not cordial to the woman-suffrage propaganda, as it felt that the negro question would be still more complicated, and the manufacturers feared the influence of the women's vote upon the labor laws. A heavy line along the north-

¹ Nevada and New Mexico had the referendum only; the measures were pending in six other states.

ern boundary of Virginia, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Texas marks off the territory, as it stood in 1912, where more than half the boys of fourteen and fifteen years of age were engaged in gainful occupations, and South Carolina and Mississippi showed a like proportion of working girls. This was and is the region of child labor.

With the exception of the liquor question, these issues, though at that time supposed by many legally to belong to state politics, found a place in the platform of the Progressive party, whose leader, Colonel Roosevelt, played a dramatic part in the campaign of 1912. Using Map 77, show with shading what party carried each state in that election. In many states the combined minorities outnumbered the successful Democrats.

All three party platforms in 1912 agreed upon the need of conservation of natural resources, though this was more a concern of the Eastern consumer fearing high prices in the future, than of the Western exploiter intent on immediate gain. The public lands most available for farming and mining had largely been granted by the end of the nineteenth century; yet more than 300,000 acres (outside Alaska) remained, a considerable part of it eligible for lumbering and, if artificially watered, for agriculture. The following states had, at the time of that election, more than 15,000,000 acres each, and should be marked with Roman numerals, according to rank in acreage: Arizona (39,625,195 A), California (20,853,637), Colorado (19,353,231), Idaho (17,915,672), Montana (21,542,853), Nevada (55,138,593), New Mexico (31,298,621), Oregon (16,545,522), Wyoming (32,255,679). In his first message, more than a decade before, President Roosevelt had urged the withholding of forest and mineral lands from grant for a time, and the expenditure of national funds to forward irrigation. The latter proposal naturally appealed to Senator Newlands of Nevada, and the Newlands Act of 1902 appropriated \$20,000,000 for that purpose, the United States now engaging directly in construction rather than confining itself to co-operation with the states. With the help of Map 80a the student may now indicate the chief areas of irrigation provided by the Reclamation Service. The most famous enter-

prises are those of the Roosevelt Dam (280 feet high), and Salt River in south-central Arizona; the Shoshone Dam in northern Wyoming; the Rio Grande development in New Mexico; the Truckee project in the district of Lake Tahoe lying across the California-Nevada border; and the Sun River project in the northwestern part of Montana.

Whereas most of the leaders whose residences we have indicated in former map studies have lived in the East, with the spread of population it was expected that the West would furnish its share. The success of the Democrats in 1912 and 1916,¹ of course, brought opportunity for national leadership to the South. Show by initials the home states of the following: R. M. LaFollette, Elihu Root, Jonathan Bourne, Boies Penrose, E. M. House, N. W. Aldrich, W. R. Borah, A. S. Burleson, Hiram Johnson, J. A. Reed, J. B. Foraker, F. W. Lane, Woodrow Wilson, V. L. Berger, Claude Kitchin, Champ Clark, H. C. Lodge.

SUPPLEMENT

On separate sheets of plain paper prepare graphic charts showing the course of population growth, urban residence, immigration.

Population.—Lay out a rectangle 7½ in. by 5 in. Divide the short way into parallel sections ½ in. long, representing the decades from 1800 to 1910, and divide the long way into 29 sections, each ¼ in. broad and representing each 10 millions. Then plot a curve to show the growth in the United States according to the following statistics given in round numbers: 1800—5 m., 1810—7 m., 1820—9½ m., 1830—13 m., 1840—17 m., 1850—23 m., 1860—31 m., 1870—38½ m., 1880—50 m., 1890—63 m., 1900—75 m., 1910—92 m. Draw also graphs showing the population of Russia, in millions, throughout the century: 38, 42, 47, 53, 57, 62, 72, 78, 88, 98, 113, 138. Of Spain: 11, 11, 12, 13, 13, 14, 16, 17, 17, 18, 19, 20. Of France: 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 38, 38½, 39. Of United Kingdom: 16, 18, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35, 38, 42, 45.

Immigration.—Draw a 5-inch square and divide

¹ Map 79 should be examined along with Map 77, but need not be reproduced.

HARPER'S ATLAS OF AMERICAN HISTORY


it into $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch squares. Number decades along the top, beginning with 1820, and number millions along the left-hand side. Then plot the curve for the following statistics of total immigration by decades: 143,439; 599,125; 1,713,251; 2,598,214;

2,318,824; 2,812,191; 5,246,616; 3,844,420; 8,203,388; 6,347,380. The student is, of course, aware that it is not only the size of the immigration, but, since 1882, its new character, that constitutes the "problem."

THE END



**Department of
University Extension
University of Toronto
Toronto**



104608319023

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

G
1201
S1F6
1920

Fox, Dixon Ryan
Harper's atlas of
American history

