SKETCH OF THE LIFE

OF

Byt. Brig. Gen. Sylvester Churchill,

INSPECTOR GENERAL U. S. ARMY.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE

OF

BVT. BRIG. GEN. SYLVESTER CHURCHILL,

INSPECTOR GENERAL U. S. ARMY,

WITH

NOTES AND APPENDICES,

BY

FRANKLIN HUNTER CHURCHILL.

NEW YORK:
WILLIS MCDONALD & CO., PRINTERS, 25 PARK ROW
1888.

PREFACE.

In the year 1884, two gentlemen of my name, residing in or near Boston, requested me to give them such information as I possessed concerning a branch of the descendants of John Churchill, of Plymouth, Mass., their ancestor and mine. I was not able to render them much assistance. In fact, I am under obligations to them for valuable information. I never had any taste for genealogy. But, from my earliest recollection, my father had some memoranda concerning his ancestry, and to these he made additions at various times. In the latter part of his life, he prepared a compilation which I found among his papers. Using it as a basis, I added a few facts which had not been ascertained, and brought everything down to a later date. This I did for the benefit of some young relatives of mine. After the receipt of the request, which I have mentioned, and in order that I might comply with it, I endeavored to obtain full particulars concerning the descendants of my father's brothers and sisters, but have not accomplished all that I wished.

In the course of my correspondence with those gentlemen, one of them wrote to me : "You have much in your father's history towards making a readable book." It is the result of this suggestion that the following sketch has been prepared. It was my intention, when it was commenced, to make it quite brief, and, on its being printed, to distribute it, with all the information in my possession concerning the descendants of my father's brothers and sisters, as well as of his own, among his adult relatives, and to ask for corrections and additions. This is all I contemplated.

The work grew upon my hands, and, as I think, in accord with the intrinsic merits of the subject treated. Irrespective of what might otherwise have been the case, the fact that my father was an officer of the army for fifty years prevented his exercising any influence in matters of legislation, or in giving shape to the measures of Government, State or National. But, public events

determined the course of his life, and he participated, personally and actively, in many occurrences which form parts of the history of the country, and some of which had important and lasting results. It is clear that, from early life, he took much interest in public affairs. He had nearly attained his majority when the Louisiana purchase was made, a transaction preceded and followed by much excitement. It may be said that "The West" assumed importance after his active life commenced. Certainly, with the exception of the present State of Louisiana, and a few settlements in the present State of Missouri, all of the country west of the Mississippi was a wilderness. The railroad and the magnetic telegraph were introduced and carried to perfection after he had passed his middle age, making changes in the methods of travel and communication which the present generation cannot realize. The contrasts presented by those events are made apparent in the sketch. His activity continued till near the beginning of the civil war, and he lived to be made sad by that occurrence.

There are still in the army, as in private life, a few who knew my father personally, and there are more who were his contemporaries in the service, though separated far from him in years and rank. I think that the sketch of the life of one who was their contemporary will be interesting. I hope that it will be interesting to others. I have sometimes regretted that it did not occur to me to prepare this sketch twenty years and more ago, when a much larger number of my father's contemporaries were living. But, probably, the time was not opportune. The war had terminated so recently, and the conditions which resulted from it engrossed so much attention that there was no room for the consideration of remote events. The army was in a chaotic condition, and there had been a large infusion of a crude element, not yet assimilated, to which the history and traditions of the army went for but little. The present is the more opportune time, and I fancy that there are some officers who will be pleased to read a narrative which will enable them to connect the past and present of the army.

I am of the opinion that I add to the interest of the narrative by giving, in notes, the outlines of the military life of every one of my father's companions in arms who is mentioned in the sketch.

I think that the brief accounts of the military life of my

brothers and my only nephew, which I have given, will also add to the interest of the sketch. It is exceptional that three successive generations in a family should be represented in the army.

These considerations have induced me to give a wider distribution to the sketch than was originally contemplated. I intend to send copies to the survivors of the graduates of 1840, a few officers of the army, retired or still in the active service, and a few civilians who, as I think, take a special interest in the occurrences mentioned or subjects treated. But I do not know the addresses of all the persons indicated, relatives and others. In addition to this, there are some officers of the army, as I have intimated, as there may be civilians, who, seeing the book, or hearing of it, may wish to obtain copies. In order that these wants may be met, if there should be any, the persons who print the book will be authorized to sell copies on terms to be named by themselves; but there will be an agreement with them that it is not to be placed upon the market or advertised, and that press notices are not to be obtained. I am averse to any such proceedings. They would not be consistent with my purposes in writing the sketch, or its scope and tenor. I have written it as I would tell it to any one wishing to learn the events of my father's life. The same statement applies to the notes. Many of the details refer to matters of a domestic nature; and, though most of them are connected with public events, and nothing is told the knowledge of which need be limited, the book is not to be thrust before the public. It is probable that it will reach certain classes of persons, as specified, and this will suffice. The appendices have been written in a spirit somewhat different, it is true, but they are largely incidental.

The military reader will see that I have obtained most of my information concerning officers of the army from Gardner's United States Army Dictionary, Cullom's Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Academy, the Army Registers of various years, and a Register of the Graduates of the Academy, corrected to Sept. 1st, 1886, recently published. Some changes have taken place within a few months past; but, lest, if I should attempt to make the necessary alterations, all might not be included, I think it best to allow the statements to remain as they were written. I have placed some reliance upon newspaper slips, which seemed worthy of credence, and which I have been

collecting for several years. When I mention the Brevet Rank conferred upon an officer for his services in connection with any specific occurrence, and not for his general merit, I have, in most cases, given the date of the occurrence, and not the date when the brevet was actually conferred. I have been guided, in some matters, by various Cyclopædias, the U. S. census of different dates, and the American Loyalists by Lorenzo Sabine. It may be well to state that, where the marks [ ] appear in a quotation, they include explanations or comments of my own.

I add a few sentences concerning myself. I have mentioned a suggestion which was made to me. I had hardly examined and began to arrange the materials which were in my possession (my father's journals, a large number of letters received by him, and drafts of his reports and official letters), and was still endeavoring to obtain, by correspondence, some information which I desired, when I had an attack of sickness, which has, apparently, made me an invalid for life. I do not move with ease, as in former years. I write slowly and with difficulty, and often with pain, and I have been obliged to avail myself of the assistance of an acquaintance in order that a legible manuscript might be prepared for the compositors. Under these circumstances, to re-write, or, even, to re-arrange the matter which has been prepared, is almost out of the question. These facts will account, I trust, for any want of sequence, or connection, or for any confusion in what I have written. The only changes which I have found it possible to make, have been to entitle, as appendices, matters which I intended for notes ; and sometimes a portion of the matter, as originally prepared, has been placed under each head. After I decided upon this change the appendices were much enlarged. All were suggested by some portions of the sketch, but some have no connection with it. If it should be objected that I have aired my opinions unnecessarily in the appendices, the offense is not serious, even though the objection is well taken.

It is due to Messrs. Willis McDonald & Co., the printers, and especially to Mr. D. H. Jones, who has acted for them, that I should acknowledge my obligations to them and him.

Brooklyn, April 12th, 1888.

F. H. Churchill.

SKETCH.

The subject of this sketch was a descendant of JOHN CHURCHILL, of Plymouth, Massachusetts. It is supposed that the latter emigrated directly from England to Plymouth, but in what year, or from what part of England he came, or when or where he was born, is not known. It is supposed, by those who have investigated the matter, that he came from Dorsetshire. From him and Josias, who was an early settler of Weathersfield, Connecticut, William, who settled in New York previous to 1672, and William, who came from Oxfordshire and settled on the Rappahannock in Virginia, in 1666, are descended, it is believed, all persons of the name or blood of Churchill in the United States, except those, if there are any such, who have recently arrived in this country, and the descendants of such persons. It is supposed that John Churchill was the first who established himself in the Colonies.*

In the 4th volume of the New England Historical and Genealogical Register (Boston, S. G. Drake, p. 255,) is: "August, 1643. The names of all the males that are able to beare armes from XVI yeares to 60 yeares w^th^in the severall Towne Shipps." Among the 148 names mentioned is John Churchill. At Plymouth, December 18th, 1644, he married

* Note 1.

HANNAH PONTUS. In the 5th volume of the Register mentioned, p. 259, is an extract from the will of WILLIAM PONTUS, who was one of the grantees of Plymouth, dated Sept. 9th, 1655, mentioning "my son-in-law John Churchill and Hannah his wife." JOHN CHURCHILL died at Plymouth, between December 24th, 1661, and February 11th, 1662. This appears from his nuncupative will and the inventory of his personal property which are on record. He was apparently a person of substance. His will mentions uplands and "meadowes" in Plymouth, including fifty acres of land lying at Mannomett Ponds, other land at Punckatusett, "the old dwelling-house" and his "new house." That he was not only "able to beare armes" but had provided himself with arms and munitions of war is proved by the following extract from the inventory mentioned:

	LB.	S.	D.
2 guns.....	5	10	00
A sword and shott pouch, 2 pound of powder and 4 pound of shott.....	00	12	10

The inventory also includes household effects and farming tools, oxen, "cowes," steers, "heiffers," calves, and "2 sowes and three Piggs."

The children of JOHN and HANNAH CHURCHILL were: JOSEPH, *Hannah*, born November 12th, 1649; *Eleazer*, born April 20th, 1652; *Mary*, born August 8th, 1654; *William*, born 1656, and *John*, probably born in 1658. It is supposed that they are named here in the order of birth. All of these children, with the exception of Mary, are named in their father's will. The date of the birth of JOSEPH, and that of his death, are not known.

JOSEPH CHURCHILL married SARAH HICKS, June 3d, 1672. It is thought that SARAH was a daughter of SAMUEL, a son of ROBERT. The last named was a morocco dresser in London, and was one of the grantees of Plymouth. In 1639 he conveyed land to SAMUEL.

The children of JOSEPH and SARAH CHURCHILL were: *John*, born July 3d (or 22d), 1678; *Margaret*, born October , 1684; BARNABAS, born July 3d, 1686; and *Joseph*, born January , 1692.

BARNABAS CHURCHILL married LYDIA (or LIDIAH) HARLOW. The date of the marriage, her parentage, and the dates of her birth and death, and the date of the death of BARNABAS, are not known.

The children of BARNABAS and LYDIA CHURCHILL were: *Barnabas*, born October 15th, 1714; *William*, born December 5th, 1716; *Ichabod*, born January 12th, $17\frac{18}{19}$;* JOSEPH, born May 19th, 1721; *Lemuel*, born July 12th, 1723; *Isaac*, born May 30th, 1726; *Thomas*, born April 30th, 1730; *Ebenezer*, born November 9th, 1732; *Lydia*, born March 24th, $17\frac{34}{35}$;* and *John*, born May 9th, 1739.†

JOSEPH CHURCHILL, last above named, was married to MARIAH RYDER, September 23d, 1745, at Plymouth, by Rev. Nathanial Leonard. She was born December 2d, 1724, and was a daughter of SAMUEL RYDER and MARY (SYLVESTER or SILVESTER) RYDER. SAMUEL was born November 15th, 1698, and was a son of JOHN RYDER and HANNAH ( ) RYDER. SAMUEL and MARY were married at Plymouth by a Mr. Little, November 2d, 1722.

---

* Note 2. † Note 3.

The children of JOSEPH and MARIAH CHURCHILL were: *Ichabod*, born August 9th, 1746; JOSEPH, born July 14th, 1748; and *Lucy*, born August 22d, 1750. These children, it is understood, were born at Plymouth. JOSEPH died at Plymouth soon after his daughter Lucy was born. His widow married Archippus Fuller, and moved to Woodstock, Vermont, in or about the year 1777. There were five children by the second marriage of the widow: *Consider*, *Seth*, *Samuel*, *Polly*, and *Mariah*.

JOSEPH CHURCHILL, son of JOSEPH and MARIAH, lived from his boyhood until he was twenty-one years of age, with Doggett, at Middleborough, Plymouth County, Massachusetts. A grandson of Doggett lived, in 1852, on the same place one mile from the "New Works" Village, and, at that time, a part of the old house was still standing. On March 21st, 1771, at Middleborough, JOSEPH was married to SARAH COBB, of the same place, by Peter Oliver, Justice of the Peace. SARAH, who was born September 20th, 1747, was a daughter of GERSHOM COBB, Junr., and MERIAM * (THOMAS) COBB. GERSHOM and MERIAM were both residents of Middleborough, and were married March 3rd, 1739. MERIAM died soon after her daughter, SARAH, was born, and the latter then lived with a maternal aunt, *Mrs. Vaughan*, till she was married to JOSEPH CHURCHILL. In 1852, a widow, a daughter of Mrs. Vaughan, and who, therefore, was a cousin of SARAH COBB, aged ninety-one years, lived on the same place. The house was new, but the site was the same. She resided with a daugh-

* This, I understand, was the spelling, but, no doubt, it should have been Miriam.

ter, wife (or widow) of Col. Benjamin Wood. She must have been born in or about the year 1761, and, therefore, was ten years old when her cousin, SARAH, was married. SARAH had a brother, *Thomas*, born March 13th, 1742. Her father, GERSHOM, married again, and had children as follows: *William*, *John*, *Joanna*, and *Lydia*.

SYLVESTER, one of the sons of JOSEPH CHURCHILL, and the subject of this sketch, stated that it was generally understood that his father was in the American army in the war of Independence, and was in or near the City of New York at the time of the Battle of Long Island.

JOSEPH and SARAH resided at Middleborough till 1777, and then moved with their three children to Woodstock, Vermont, and established themselves on a wilderness farm on the north side of the Queechy River, two and a half miles west of "The Green," by which name the principal village in the town of Woodstock was known, between the farms of Captain Phinehas Williams and Rev. Samuel Damon. It may be stated that *Thomas Cobb*, above mentioned, the brother of SARAH, and their stepmother, the second wife of GERSHOM, and who survived him, and her four children, also above mentioned (the half brothers and half sisters of *Thomas* and SARAH), all moved to Woodstock in or about 1777.

The farm at Woodstock was quite extensive, and it appears that JOSEPH CHURCHILL was a man of substance. This is made evident by the fact that, among the things done by him for the benefit of the public, he gave a site for a school-house near his residence. The Baptists were a numerous denomination in the

vicinity, and a pond on JOSEPH CHURCHILL's land, or, possibly, a bend or eddy in the Queechy River near his residence, was a favorite place of resort for baptism, and some of his sons were fond of telling that whenever, during their boyhood, baptisms were to take place, it was their duty and, possibly, their pleasure, to remove from the water all the leaves, branches and rubbish which had accumulated since the spot had been last used for the purpose of baptism.

In those days, on every farm, almost every branch of mechanical operations, not requiring the attention of a skilled artisan, was conducted by the farmer and his sons and hired men. Not only were fences and walls built but tools were repaired and sometimes made, carpentry and cabinet-making, and the simpler forms of working in leather and iron were understood and carried on. Such was the state of affairs on the farm of JOSEPH CHURCHILL. All of his sons had some experience in such things, as well as in becoming practical farmers;* and one of them, SYLVESTER, acquired the skill of a master workman.

In 1819, JOSEPH, being about 71 years old, and SARAH moved to Stowe, Vermont, where all their daughters were then residing. JOSEPH died in Stowe in 1823, and SARAH in the same place in 1836. If their eight children, four sons and four daughters, who survived them, were their only children, as seems to have been the case, their longevity is remarkable. They lived to an average age of eighty years. Their son, SYLVESTER, states in a memorandum made by him, that *all* of their children survived them. It is possible that some children, of whom he never heard,

* Note 4.

died in early infancy; but it is not possible that any child died after that time of life without his having heard definitely of the fact.

Those eight children of JOSEPH and SARAH were: Levi, Miriam, Sarah, Lucy, Joseph, SYLVESTER, Isaac, and Susan. The sketch, as originally prepared, included all of the descendants, living and dead, of the eight children, so far as they could be ascertained, but, for the reason that it is to be distributed more widely than was intended, as stated in the Preface, it is limited to the descendants of SYLVESTER. The details, here presented, may be of interest to those who knew him, or one or more of the others who are named.

SYLVESTER CHURCHILL was born at Woodstock, Vermont, August 2d, 1783, and died at the City of Washington, D. C., December 7th, 1862, in the 80th year of his age. At Windsor, Vermont, August 30th, 1812, he married LUCY HUNTER, a daughter of WILLIAM HUNTER and MARY (NEWELL) HUNTER, who was born at Windsor, July 17th, 1786, and died at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, September 6th, 1862.

Children of SYLVESTER and LUCY CHURCHILL.

(A.) HELEN SUSAN was born on Governor's Island, in the Harbor of New York, May 29th, 1817, and died there September 27th, 1818.

(B.) WILLIAM HUNTER was born at Fort Wood, Bedloe's Island, in the Harbor of New York, July 8th, 1819, and died at Point Isabel, Texas, October 19th, 1847. At Savannah, Georgia, December 17th, 1844, he married Elizabeth Margaret Cuyler, a daughter of Richard Randolph Cuyler and Mississippi (Gordon)

Cuyler, who was born at Savannah, March 1st, 1823. She is living, and is temporarily in Europe.

Child of WILLIAM H. and Elizabeth M. CHURCHILL.

RICHARD CUYLER was born at Savannah, Georgia, December 12th, 1845, and died in the Town of Ossining, near the Village of Sing Sing, Westchester County, New York, June 24th, 1879. At the City of New York, November 22d, 1866, he married Josephine Young, a daughter of Henry Young and Anne (Mason) Young, who was born at Brooklyn, New York, on the day of October, 1847. She is living, and is temporarily in Europe.

Children of RICHARD C. and Josephine Y. CHURCHILL.

(*a*) WILLIAM HUNTER was born at Fort Delaware, Delaware, September 11th, 1867.

(*b*) ANNE MASON was born at Fort Delaware, Delaware, March 15th, 1869.

(*c*) MAUD was born at the Military Academy, West Point, New York, July 12th, 1871.

(*d*) ELIZABETH MARGARET was born at Ossining, near the Village of Sing Sing, May 22d, 1875, and died at , September 14th, 1875.

(*e*) RICHARD RANDOLPH CUYLER was born at Ossining near the Village of Sing Sing, November 2d, 1877.

The four living children are with their mother in Europe.

(C.) MARY HELEN was born at Windsor, Vermont, August 30th, 1821. At Carlisle, Pennsylvania, August 8th, 1846, she married Spencer Fullerton Baird, a son of Samuel Baird and Lydia (Biddle) Baird; who was born at Reading, Pennsylvania, Feb-

ruary 3d, 1823, and died at Wood's Holl, Massachusetts, August 19th, 1887.

Child of Spencer F. and MARY H. C. BAIRD.

LUCY HUNTER was born at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, February 8th, 1848.

Mrs. Baird and her daughter are living at the City of Washington, D. C.

(D.) FRANKLIN HUNTER was born at New Utrecht, Kings County, New York, April 22d, 1823.

He resides at Brooklyn, New York.

(E.) CHARLES COURSELLE was born at Alleghany Arsenal, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, July 18th, 1825. At Portland, Maine, April 22d, 1868, he married Alice Dow, a daughter of William H. Dow and Delia L. ( ) Dow.

Captain Churchill and Mrs. Churchill reside at Newport, Rhode Island.

SYLVESTER CHURCHILL remained on his father's farm until about the time of reaching his majority, and received the tuition which was to be obtained in the school or schools of the vicinity. He had a natural fondness for acquiring knowledge, and a great aptitude for figures. In those days, however, nothing was taught in the schools in the way of mathematics, beyond what was contained in the arithmetics which were then in use. It is understood that he added to the schooling which he obtained, or, rather, applied what he had learned, and fixed it in his mind, by being, himself, for a short period of time, a teacher in a school. Mention has been made of his skill in mechanical pursuits; and it naturally followed that, when he left his father's house and started in life for

himself, he betook himself to those pursuits. How long and where and under what circumstances any such occupation was followed, is not known; but it is remembered that he spoke to his family, in subsequent years, of having been engaged in the construction of a bridge at Glen's Falls, in New York, and of the Old State House at Montpelier, in Vermont, which stood near to and east of the site of the present State House.* In what position he was thus employed is not known, and probably was never stated. There can be no doubt that, had circumstances been favorable, he would have reached distinction both as a civil engineer and an architect. The practical knowledge thus acquired was of great service to him in after life at the various posts at which he was stationed, and in operations in the field. Not only did he work, for his amusement, with his own hands, in making small articles for domestic use, but he was able to instruct and supervise others in all constructions in which wood, iron, brick, stone, mortar and cement were used. There was no laborer, mechanic, or "artificer" whom he could not equal, if necessary, with his own hands. In his early manhood he took an active interest in politics as a member of the Democratic-Republican Party; and in the year 1808, became the part owner and publisher, at Windsor, Vermont, of a weekly newspaper called the Vermont Republican, an organ of that party. He continued in that position until 1812, and the newspaper exerted an active influence in continuing the political control of the Democratic Party in the State of Vermont. The electoral vote of that State was cast for John

* Note 5.

Adams in 1796 and 1800; for Thomas Jefferson in 1804; and thereafter for James Madison and James Monroe. At the time that Mr. Churchill was thus occupied, every country newspaper was but a part of a general printing and publishing concern,* and with it the business of book-binding was often conducted. Hand-presses alone were used. The publisher and editor was a practical printer, and was personally familiar with all the details of printing, from the setting of the type till the newspaper was ready to be issued or the book to be published.† Such was the case with the Vermont Republican, with which a bookstore, also, was connected, and in his connection with it, Mr. Churchill cultivated and practically applied his natural tendencies towards accuracy in details and completeness in the execution of any matter of which he had charge. In after life nothing was ever done by him in a slovenly manner, and nothing entrusted to his care, and which he had time to complete, ever left his hands in an incomplete condition. He was careful to observe, in all his writing, the rules of punctuation. Naturally, and by training, punctuality, also, was considered by him a matter of the first importance, and was always observed. To his children he taught the importance of punctuation and punctuality, and punctuality was required by him of them and of all those who were under his command. To these qualities, in matters of detail, were added those of an inclination and ability to discharge with industry, thoroughness, and perseverance, any duty entrusted to him; of self-reliance and confidence, without presumption; much inventive capacity of his

* Note 5. † Note 7.

own, and a readiness to investigate, and, when approved by himself, apply, the ideas and methods of others, some fondness for innovations and departures from usual methods, and the ability to make use of all the appliances which were at hand fitted to accomplish the end or object in view. These qualities were called into play in after life, and contributed largely to his future success. He fortunately possessed, in addition, a hopeful disposition, a well-balanced mind, judicial impartiality, a robust frame, and, at most times, perfect health. He was about five feet eleven inches tall, had brown hair and gray eyes, and his complexion was fair, clear, healthful and ruddy. In appearance he approached the English type. It was near the end of his life that he lost any of his teeth, or that they gave him a moment's trouble. His sense of hearing became very defective, but that of seeing was exceptionally good. Though he used spectacles, he could dispense with them on an emergency under ordinary circumstances. In connection with the subject of personal characteristics it may be added that he was dignified in deportment and language, and was rather taciturn. By most persons he was considered unapproachable and cold, but such coldness was that of appearance only. He was a man of warm sympathies and kind feelings, and was always ready to aid by word or deed any one who required aid. But, it is true, that people were generally a little afraid of him, and that no one, who knew better than to do so, ever presumed to treat him with familiarity.* He ate with moderation, never drank spirits except medicinally, and drank wine merely in compliance

* Note 8.

with social usages, and then sparingly. Tobacco in every form he detested. Without being censorious as to profanity, he rarely uttered a profane word.* He was, naturally, rather pugnacious, but was not quarrelsome, and never manifested any vindictiveness, malice or spirit of revenge. He was tenacious of his own rights, and sensitively thoughtful concerning the rights and feelings of others. This was the result of his innate characteristics, and his military life.

On the 12th day of March, 1812, having declined a Captaincy in the Infantry, he received the commission of a First Lieutenant in the Third Artillery, U. S. Army. He remained in the army until the time of his death in December, 1862, a period of over fifty years. Through what influences, or for what reasons, this position was obtained is not now known, and the writer of this sketch never heard the subject mentioned. It is not to be doubted, however, that the commission was conferred upon him, in part, at least, in recognition of his services to the Democratic Party of which Thomas Jefferson was the exponent and acknowledged head. It is to be supposed that Lieut. Churchill had read but little concerning military affairs, and all that he had ever seen of military manœuvres was what he had seen on "training days," in a remote country village. But his qualifications did not differ from those of a vast majority of the citizens who received commissions in the regular army. As to the regular army itself, by the Act of March 16th, 1802,† it was to consist, in addition to one Brigadier General, the General Staff, Surgeons

* Note 9. † U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 2, p. 132, Ch. IX.

and Surgeons' mates, and a small Corps of Engineers, of a Regiment of Artillery composed of twenty companies divided into five battalions, and two regiments of Infantry, of ten companies each, and to this force was added, by the Act of April 12th, 1808,* two Brigadier Generals, Brigade Staff Officers, Hospital Surgeons, and Hospital Surgeons' mates, a regiment of Light Artillery, to consist of ten companies, a regiment of Light Dragoons, to consist of eight troops, and five regiments of Infantry and one of Riflemen, of ten companies each. The companies were, on an average, about twice as large as they are at the present time. This force, in proportion to the population and geographical extent of the country, was as large as it has been at any time since in time of peace. There was no increase of the army thereafter until war with England was threatened and preparations were made for it. The Military Academy at West Point was established by the Act of March 16th, 1802; but, prior to the year 1812, only 71 cadets had graduated, and the course of study and the discipline and efficiency of the Corps of Cadets, do not admit of comparison with what they became in subsequent years, and, especially, during the long and able superintendency of Colonel Sylvanus Thayer,† which extended from 1817 to 1833. Outside of the regular army there were but few who had personal experience in military affairs. In 1812 over thirty years had elapsed since the termination of the active hostilities of the War of Independence, a period of time twice as long as that between the fall of Quebec and the

* U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 2, p. 481, Ch. XLIII. † Note 10.

Battle of Lexington. In the war of 1812–14 there were several officers who had served in the war of Independence, but no one of the number ever became conspicuous.* On the other hand, the "Old French War" furnished to the Colonies, in their struggle with England, many persons, both officers and soldiers in the ranks, still in the full vigor of life, some of whom became prominent and distinguished. A number might be named, but it is sufficient to name GEORGE WASHINGTON. The writer of this sketch remembers that, in his early boyhood, he occasionally read notices of the deaths of very aged men in which it was stated that they served in the "Old French War" as well as in the war of American Independence.†

The Company of Artillery to which Lieutenant Churchill was attached, was raised by himself. It was under his sole command during the greater part of the period of his connection with it, and gained a high reputation for discipline and efficiency in the exercises and manœuvres of what is now termed Light Artillery. As has been already stated, a Regiment of Light Artillery was organized in 1808, and in that Regiment every man was separately mounted, as was the case in Ringgold's battery some thirty years afterwards. But, in addition to this, in many of the companies of the three other regiments of Artillery, the men rode upon the caisson chests, as is the case at the present time with the two light batteries in each of the five regiments of Artillery. At the beginning of the war of 1812–14, and during its entire continuance, there was no system of exercise and manœuvres for artillery prepared by any American author and estab-

* Note 11. † Note 12, and Appendix A.

lished by the Government. Consequently, officers who desired to become familiar with such matters, were obliged to avail themselves of anything which fell in their way. In November, 1849, Gen. Churchill wrote upon this subject as follows: "I obtained the first book that fell in my way, by chance, in July, 1813, 'Stoddart's Exercise and Manœuvres for Field Artillery,' and in August I could perform them with very considerable accuracy and celerity."* Lieut. Churchill served with his company under General Henry Dearborn,† and subsequently, in the summer of 1813, constructed a parapet on the heights north of and near Burlington, Vermont, placed in it a battery of thirteen heavy guns, and, with this battery, gave protection to Commodore McDonough's fleet, when, crippled by a storm and otherwise weakened, it anchored under this shelter for repairs, and, while in this condition was attacked by the British fleet. In August, 1813, he became a Captain in the ordinary course of promotion. He served under General Wade Hampton,‡ and performed the duties of Ordnance Officer in the Chateaugay Campaign. On the 29th of August, 1813, he was appointed Assistant Inspector General, with the rank of Major, and served in this capacity until the end of the war, but retained, at the same time, his Captaincy in the Artillery. He was with General James Wilkinson§ in the attack on La Colle Mill, was, subsequently, on the staff of General George Izard,‖ and was with him on the march of a large force under his command, in 1814, from Lake Champlain to the Niagara River,¶

* Note 13. † Note 14. ‡ Note 15.
§ Note 16. ‖ Note 17. ¶ Note 18.

and, finally, was on the staff of General Alexander Macomb * at Plattsburg. The writer of this sketch has before him a printed order with the heading:

"H. Q. CHAMPLAIN DEPARTMENT,
Adjutant General's Office,
May 30th, 1815."

and terminating:

"By command,
S. CHURCHILL,
Act'g Adj't Genl."

This order incorporates a general order issued from the Adjutant and Inspector General's office at Washington, and dated May 17th, 1815, and signed:

"By order of the Secretary of War,
D. PARKER †
Adjt. and Insp. Genl."

and which order gave the details of "the military peace establishment," the methods of the selection for this establishment from the non-commissioned officers, musicians, and privates, whose terms of service had not expired, and the names of all the officers retained in the service on the reduction of the army. Captain Churchill was retained as Captain in the Corps of Artillery which had been formed from the 1st, 2d and 3d Regiments of Artillery by the Act of March 30th, 1814.‡ The reduction of the Army was made pursuant to an act dated March 3d, 1815,§ which provided that, in addition to the General Officers, the General Staff, the Corps of Engineers, the Ordnance and other Departments, the Military Peace Establishment

* Note 19. † Note 20.
‡ U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 3, p. 113, Ch. XXXVII.
§ U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 3, p. 224, Ch. LXXIX.

should consist of Artillery, Infantry and Riflemen, in such proportions as the President should judge proper, not exceeding ten thousand men, and thereupon the President decided that there should be a Corps of Artillery of 32 companies or eight battalions, one regiment of Light Artillery, of ten companies, the Infantry, eight regiments of ten companies each, and a regiment of Riflemen of ten companies.*

Captain Churchill was stationed at Plattsburgh till 1816, and subsequently at Governor's Island, Bedloe's Island, and "The Narrows" in the Harbor of New York.† The defensive works on Governor's Island were: Fort Columbus, built on the site of Fort Jay, the latter having been demolished in 1806, Castle Williams, named after Colonel Jonathan Williams, ‡ of the Engineers, and, possibly, the South Battery. On Bedloe's Island was Fort Wood, named after Lieut. Colonel Eleazer D. Wood,§ of the Engineers, who was killed on the 17th of September, 1814, in a sortie from Fort Erie, and at "The Narrows" was Fort Diamond, afterwards Fort Lafayette. During the time that Captain Churchill was stationed at "The Narrows" the latter name was substituted for the former in honor of General Lafayette, who made his last visit to the United States in the years 1824 and 1825. Fort Hamilton, named after Alexander Hamilton, had not, as yet, been constructed. Captain Churchill, who was in command, resided on the mainland. In honor of the raising of the flag, for the first time, over the fort with its new name, he entertained, at dinner, a number of guests, among whom were the

* Note 21. † Note 22. ‡ Note 23. § Note 24.

members of the Common Council of New York. They, as a body, were very unlike most of the Aldermen of the present day. General Winfield Scott,* hearing that an entertainment was to take place, sent him, as a present, a basket of champagne to be used on the occasion. It was a gift very acceptable to a Captain of Artillery.

By the Act of March 2d, 1821,† reducing and reorganizing the army, the regiment of Light Artillery and the Corps of Artillery were abolished, and four regiments of Artillery were created of nine companies each, one to be designated and equipped as Light Artillery. Captain Churchill was assigned to the first regiment. On the 15th of August, 1823, he received the brevet rank of Major for "ten years' faithful service" as Captain, pursuant to an Act of July 6th, 1812.‡

By the Act of March 2d, 1821, already mentioned, the Ordnance Department was merged in the Artillery, and it was further provided that all ordnance duty should be discharged by officers to be selected by the President from the Artillery regiments. This system continued until 1832, when the Ordnance Department was again established as an integral part of the army.§ In the spring of 1824, Bvt. Major Churchill was selected for ordnance duty, and from that time till the spring of 1828, he was stationed at, and in command of Alleghany Arsenal, which was

---

* Note 25.

† U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 3, p. 615, Ch. XIII.

‡ U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 2, p. 784, Ch. CXXXVII.

§ U. S. Stat. at Large, Vol. 4, p. 504, Ch. LXVII.

then in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and now, on account of the growth of that city, is within its limits. The duties of the position gave him an opportunity to exercise the skill and indulge the tastes which have been mentioned, and, consequently, were very agreeable to him.* While he was in command of the Arsenal it was visited by General Lafayette and the Duke of Saxeweimar Eisenach, a son of the Grand Duke then reigning, who travelled in all parts of the United States from July 26th, 1825, till June 16th, 1826. He was a highly educated gentleman, and one of a liberal mind and free from prejudice Of this any one will be assured who will read an account of his travels published in Philadelphia in 1828, by Carey, Lea & Carey.†

In the spring of 1828, Bvt. Major Churchill, having served four years on ordnance duty, was ordered to join his company, "D," 1st Artillery. Having obtained leave of absence he went with his family to Vermont, spent the summer in that State, making, in the meantime, a brief visit in Essex County, New York, on the west side of Lake Champlain, and, in the fall of 1828, sailed from New York for Wilmington, North Carolina, on the brig New Hanover, Hallett, Master.‡ This was the first voyage of the brig. Then, on a sloop or schooner he went to Smithville, North Carolina, near the mouth of the Cape Fear River, 25 to 30 miles below Wilmington, joined his company at Fort Johnson§ at that place, and there remained till the spring of 1835. Prior to this time he had never been south of Wash-

* Note 26. † Note 27. ‡ Note 28. § Note 29.

ington or west of Pittsburgh. Fort Johnson was a fort but in name. The only defensive work was a building in the form of a block house, the lower story, the walls of which were about three feet thick, being formed of a hardened mixture of broken oyster shells and mortar or cement, and the upper, which projected beyond the lower in the usual manner, being constructed of timber. Fort Caswell,* on the eastern end of Oak Island, at the mouth of the river and on the right bank, and two miles below Smithville, was in process of construction during the entire seven years, and was substantially completed at the end of that time. The officer of the Corps of Engineers, who was in charge of the construction of Fort Caswell, was Captain, and after the month of June, 1834, Bvt. Major Blaney.† While stationed at Fort Johnson, Bvt. Major Churchill, in addition to visiting the neighboring posts, in North Carolina and South Carolina, and possibly Georgia, as a member of the various Courts Martial, went to the country of the Cherokees, an Indian Nation, on some duty assigned to him. In August, 1830, occurred one of the few disturbances among the negro slaves which took place in the United States during the existence of slavery. To use the language of the "Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and United States History," Article Slavery, Vol. 3, p. 731, "No slave race has organized so few slave insurrections as the negro race in the United States. * * * It is certain that revolt, during their history as slaves, was regularly individual, and that most of it was only revolt by legal construction." Whether the slaves were posi-

* Note 30. † Note 31.

tively contented with their lot, or whether they were contented by reason of their having no sense of deprivation of right, and no conception of any other condition of affairs as suited to persons of their race, or as ever to be attained by them, it is certain that they, as a mass, were perfectly contented, and it is equally certain that the relations between them and their owners were generally relations of good feeling on both sides, kindness on the part of the owners, and confidence on the part of the slaves. Those, who asserted the contrary, either asserted it through ignorance, being governed by what they thought would be their own feelings if slaves, or indulged in the recognized, though, in this case, vicious, license of romance, or knowingly and maliciously falsified the facts of the case.* The writer has not been able to learn to his satisfaction what was the cause of the disturbance which took place in August, 1830, or to what extent, geographically, it prevailed. He was a mere lad at the time, and he has had no opportunity to consult books or contemporaneous publications, or to confer with any of the survivors of those who lived in the vicinity at the time. He remembers that there was an intense excitement in Smithville and Wilmington, near which latter place there were many rice plantations cultivated exclusively by slaves; that the white women and children, residing at Smithville, flocked for safety into the inclosure which constituted, with the barracks and other buildings within it, what was known as Fort Johnson, and that it was reported that large bodies of armed negroes were on their way toward Wilmington, devastating the country as they moved. It appears,

* Appendix B.

from the papers on file in the Adjutant General's office in Washington, that Bvt. Major Churchill reported, on the 22d of August, 1830, "that there was great excitement among the citizens on account of an apprehended insurrection among the negroes, and that the Commissioners at Smithville, N. C., have applied to him to aid them in suppressing it, should an attack be made, and also to afford protection, in the garrison, to the women and children of the town; and, further, that the alarm had so much increased that his quarters on that evening were filled with women and children." In point of fact, in the vicinity of Smithville, at least, there was no insurrection or, so far as appeared, a thought of one. The excitement subsided almost as rapidly as it arose, but, still, the circumstances left a feeling of insecurity and anxiety in the minds of the people. On the 9th of December, 1830, General Macomb, the Commanding General, instructed Major Churchill, "that, in consequence of information received at the War Department from the authorities of Wilmington, N. C., that there was strong evidence of a disposition among the blacks to insurrection, it had been thought proper to assemble a respectable military force in or near the town, with a view to averting, by its presence, any evil consequences that might arise from that disposition, and to suppress, by force, any insurrectionary attempt, that two companies of the garrison at Fort Monroe would be ordered to Smithville by sea, and that, on their arrival at that place, Major Churchill should assume command of the detachment, and, if thought proper or advisable, he was authorized to add to it a portion of the garrison at Fort Johnson, * * * and proceed, without delay,

to Wilmington on the transport which should convey the troops from Fort Monroe, and on his arrival at Wilmington, Major Churchill was directed to concert such measures and arrangements with the authorities of that place as may be best calculated to produce the desired effect." On the same day, Colonel J. B. Walbach,* commanding at Fort Monroe, was instructed to detail two companies of his garrison for service at Wilmington. The order proceeded as follows: "The object in view, to be prepared to meet any insurrectionary movements which may take place at Wilmington or vicinity about the period of the Christmas Holidays. The object of this movement not to be made known except to the commander of the detachment," etc., etc. In compliance with the foregoing, Companies "A" and "G," 1st Artillery, armed as infantry, left Fort Monroe on the 19th of December, and arrived at Wilmington on the 24th of December. Major Churchill designated the location of the detachment under his command as "Station McRee," in honor of a distinguished officer, a native of Wilmington, late in the Corps of Engineers,† and reported that he did not deem it necessary to augment the detachment by any portion of the garrison at Fort Johnson. While at Wilmington Major Churchill endeavored to ascertain the condition of affairs and the feelings of the people in the neighboring portions of the State, and, in reference to those subjects, wrote to the Commanding General on the 17th of January, 1831, as follows: "I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter (from Lieut. Cooper, Aid-de-camp) of the 10th, by the mail of yesterday. On

* Note 32. † Note 33.

the 3d, at noon, I set out for Newbern for the purposes mentioned in my letter to you of the previous day. On my way there I inquired of several of the most respectable gentlemen along the road respecting the excitement, and was informed by all of them that they have no fears of a rising of the negroes in the country at present; but that, in the event of an insurrection in the *towns*, they are apprehensive many of their negroes may be induced to join in it. Some gentlemen, who own large plantations, have spoken to their negroes, whilst others have thought it more prudent to say nothing on the subject. Very severe regulations have been enforced by the patrols during the holidays. At Newbern the fears of the people have so much subsided that the Intendant did not think a company of troops necessary for the safety of the place. * * *." The detachment left Wilmington on the 2d of May, 1831, and marched by way of Newbern and Washington to Plymouth. There it took water transportation, passed through the Dismal Swamp Canal to Norfolk, and thence went to Fort Monroe, where it arrived on the 14th of May. In those days this movement by two companies of regular troops was considered a great display of force. Of the commissioned officers of the detachment one was from Massachusetts, two (one being Bvt. Major Churchill) from Vermont, one from New York, one from Maryland, and two from Virginia.* At the expiration of this temporary duty Bvt. Major Churchill resumed his command at Fort Johnson.†

---

* Note 34. † Note 35.

On the 6th day of April, 1835, Bvt. Major Churchill became Major of the 3d Artillery, in the ordinary course of promotion, and was ordered to Fort Sullivan (named after Governor Sullivan, of Massachusetts), Eastport, Maine. Accordingly, he proceeded north,* and, after having passed a portion of the summer in Northern New York † and Vermont, joined his post in the early part of the fall of 1835.‡ He was then 52 years old, had been in the army for 23 years, and a Captain for 22 years.

In the fall of 1835 hostilities commenced with the Seminole Indians in Florida, and continued with brief intervals until the summer of 1842. (They were renewed subsequently, at long intervals, and in a limited degree.) At the same time there were apprehensions of hostilities with the Creek Indians, and afterwards with the Cherokees. By a treaty dated March 24th, 1832, the Creeks had ceded all their lands east of the Mississippi for an equivalent area west of that river, but many of them refused to remove, and resisted removal, on the alleged ground that the chiefs and other persons, who had made the cession, had no authority to act for the nation, and, therefore, had not bound it. On the other hand, a large portion of the whites were not disposed to admit that Indians had, or could have, any rights (and in this they were in accord with the feelings which have too often controlled the white people in every part of the United States in their relations with the Indians), and were determined to "dispossess the inhabitants of the land and dwell therein." (Numbers,

* Note 36. † Note 37. ‡ Note 38.

ch. xxxiii, v. 53.) It is not necessary, for the purposes of this sketch, to consider the merits or demerits of either side, or to give details of the proceedings by which the removal of the Indians was finally effected. It is sufficient to say that, after threats on both sides and preparations for attack on the part of the whites, and for resistance on the part of the Indians, the removal of the latter was finally effected through the interposition of the United States without much, if any, bloodshed.*

The Creeks were a powerful nation or tribe, and in 1813 and 1814 had fought vigorously and with large forces against troops under the command of General Jackson,† General Floyd,‡ and others.

On the 30th of May, 1836, Major Churchill received an order, of which the following is a copy:

"IV. Major Churchill, of the 3d Reg. Artillery, will repair to Fort Mitchell, and report for duty to the Commanding General." (Fort Mitchell, named after an Indian agent, David B. Mitchell, was on the right bank of the Chattahoochee River, which, at that point, and in a large part of its course, is the dividing line between Georgia and Alabama, and was near the old Southern Road to New Orleans. It has been long discontinued.)

At this time the subject of this sketch commenced the most important part of the work of his life, and this work continued for more than twenty-three years. His travels, in every form, amounted to many tens of thousands of miles. He was never in the Pacific States, nor, except during the war with Mexico, was he west of the Posts which were in the pres-

* Note 39. † Note 40. ‡ Note 41.

ent State of Kansas and the Indian Territory; but, within those limits, he travelled in every State time and again, extending his travels to the most inaccessible portions of many of them, and resorting to every known means of conveyance. It may be mentioned here that, according to the H. V. Poor's Manual, there were but 1,273 miles of railroad in the United States in 1836, and that, in 1841, excluding Maryland, Delaware and Virginia, there were but 974 miles in all the States south of Penn. and the Ohio River. At one time, in the latter part of the summer of 1842 (Mrs. Churchill and a colored man-servant being with him), he started in two-wheel Canadian carts, without springs, each seating two persons, of whom the hired driver was one, from the right bank of the St. Lawrence River, at the mouth of the Riviere du Loup, crossed the "divide" between the head waters of the branches of the St. Lawrence River and those of the branches of the St. John's River, and then proceeded in birch bark canoes, each carrying three persons, of whom the hired paddler was one, through Lake Timiscouta, the Madawaska River, and the St. John's River to Fort Kent,* at the junction of Fish River with the St. John's. Thence they returned by canoes and by barge to the mouth of the Aroostook River, and then by wagon to and from Fort Fairfield,* on the right bank of the Aroostook River. The fall of 1843 and the following winter were passed in the northern parts of Georgia and Alabama in the examination of claims for horses lost in Florida, made by persons who had been volunteers. Mrs. Churchill was with him.† He had, as assistants in this duty,

* Note 42.

† Note 43.

Lieutenants William T. Sherman * and Richard P. Hammond † of the 3d Artillery, and two or three civilians, one of whom was his youngest son, Charles C. Churchill. A part of the country through which they travelled, most of them on horseback, was the theatre of a portion of General Sherman's celebrated campaign more than twenty years afterwards.

A glance at the map of the United States in 1835, and a brief consideration of the means of travel existing at that time, will enable the reader to appreciate the vast change which has taken place in the condition of affairs in the United States within the last fifty years. The writer has before him a school atlas published in 1835, and which he used when in school at Eastport, Maine, in 1835 and 1836. It shows that there were 26 States. A large part of the State of Michigan, then limited to the lower peninsula, is marked "Ottoway Indians." The upper peninsula of Michigan, the present State of Wisconsin, and so much of the present State of Minnesota as lies east of the Mississippi River, are marked as the "Northwest Territory." Green Bay Settlement and Prairie du Chien are credited, by name, to the whites, and the words "Chippeways," "Menomonees," and "Winnebagoes," occupy the rest of the space allotted to the Territory. In the State of Illinois a line marked as the Indian Boundary commences on the Mississippi at the mouth of the Rock River, crosses the Fox River, and reaches Lake Michigan a short distance north from Chicago, which appears upon the map, but which, only a few years previous, consisted of a few houses clustered near Fort Dearborn. This

* Note 44. † Note 45.

"Fort," which stood on the right bank of the Chicago River, near Lake Michigan, and was named after Secretary of War and, afterwards, General, Dearborn, already mentioned, afforded protection to the inhabitants of the vicinity during the "Black Hawk War" of 1832. A large portion of the northwestern part of Georgia is marked "Cherokee Indians," whose boundaries are in part well defined. Their possessions apparently extended into North Carolina and Tennessee, and certainly into Alabama, a large part of which State was occupied by the Creeks. Nearly one half of the State of Mississippi is marked as in the recognized possession of the Choctaws and Chickasaws. In Florida the possessions of the Seminole Indians are indicated by a boundary line, but, in point of fact, they ranged, during the war, from the Okefinoke Swamp, on the Georgia line, to Cape Sable; and there were times when no white person's scalp was safe between those limits except in the immediate vicinity of the villages. The area of this part of the State of Florida was equal to that of the entire State of New York, and, yet, people wondered why the troops did not find the Indians, and thought that they were inactive. The fact is that the Indians never fought unless they were in ambush, or in superior numbers, or, unless, when attacked by superior numbers, defense was necessary, in order that, during the delay caused by the conflict, an escape might be made. West of the Mississippi there were the State of Missouri and the larger portion of the State of Louisiana, and in the former the "Kickapoos," "Delawares," and "Shawnees" appear. Arkansas Territory occupies the space now known as

Arkansas and the Indian Territory. All of the residue, east of the Rocky Mountains, was known as "Missouri Territory," and is so named in the Atlas; and in the western and southwestern parts appears, in large letters, "GREAT AMERICAN DESERT. This desert is traversed by numerous herds of Buffaloes and Wild Horses, and inhabited by roving tribes of Indians." These words run over the boundary into Mexico. Texas appears in the Atlas as a Mexican State, but without defined boundaries. California is not named, but the words "Unexplored Region" may be seen, and, also, a large lake named "Lake Timpanogos," with a large river flowing from it, and having its outlet in the "Bay of Sir F. Drake."

It is probable that the travels of Major (afterwards Colonel and Bvt. Brig. General) Churchill within the United States were never exceeded, modes of conveyance, as well as distance, being taken into consideration, by those of any other person. From June, 1836, till the summer of 1841 (with brief intervals, which will be noted in their order), he was engaged in the military operations against the Indians. At various times he served with the troops in the field, being, for a brief period, in command of his regiment serving as Infantry, but, having been assigned to the position of Acting Inspector General by General Jesup,* and afterwards by General Taylor,† he was mainly occupied in inspecting troops and posts, and in mustering into the service of the United States Militia and Volunteers from Florida, Georgia, and Alabama, and in discharging them at their respective homes on the expiration of their terms of

* Note 46. † Note 47.

service. His travels in those States were mainly on horseback, and no doubt more hours were passed in this form of travel than in all other forms combined. Concerning the nature of those services, and their value, it is sufficient to insert a copy of a letter addressed to him by the Adjutant General of the Army, as follows:

"ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, May 24th, 1838.

SIR:

In acknowledging the receipt of your letters of the 12th and 13th instant, transmitting Muster Rolls and a return of the Georgia mounted brigade, it gives me pleasure to state that they are well executed and satisfactory in every respect. I wish the same promptness oftener characterized other mustering officers, so that the calls of Congress, &c., might be answered with more accuracy and dispatch than they have been.

I am, sir,
Very respectfully,
Your obt. servant,
R. JONES,
Adj't Gen'l.

Bvt. Major
S. CHURCHILL,
3d Artillery,
Calhoun, Tennessee."

(The address of "Bvt. Major" was incorrect. F. H. C.)

To return to the narrative: For want of an earlier conveyance Major Churchill left Eastport on the

afternoon of June 5th,* on the Revenue Cutter (Captain Coolidge in command), and arrived at Owl's Head the next day. Thence he proceeded by the accustomed route and means of conveyance, waiting at Columbus, Georgia, for some detachments, in the rear, to arrive, and reported to General Jesup at Fort Mitchell on the 26th of June. In his journal he states: "On my way stopped at Smithville, to my great delight, at one o'clock on the 18th, where the news of my arrival was carried quickly through the village, and there was a rush of all classes and all colors to see me. Dined with my friend Ruggles,† and passed four hours in the place. Had no sea sickness south of Portland. In Charleston saw Captain Hallett from Mobile." At Fort Mitchell he was assigned to the command of four companies of regular troops, and marched to Montgomery, Alabama, most of the distance through what was then a wilderness country, as a guard for a large number of emigrating Indians, warriors (in chains), squaws, and children. The duty of the troops was to prevent escapes, and to resist the attack of hostile Indians, in whose country the march was partly made. Major Churchill had also been apprised by General Jesup, that it was in contemplation by some of the whites in Georgia to force the guard and to rescue the prisoners.‡ He afterwards learned that the contemplated attempt was abandoned in consequence of its having been ascertained that regular troops had been employed to guard the prisoners. The journal states that the first house occupied by a *white family* was 49 miles from Fort Mitchell. At 78 miles from Fort Mitchell the line dividing Alabama and the In-

* Note 48. † Note 49 ‡ Note 50.

dian nation was crossed. This duty closed at Montgomery.

A few condensed extracts from the journal may be interesting: "July 3d, Sunday. This morning I took charge of the emigrating Indians guarded by my own proper command of four companies, and resumed the march at half an hour after sunrise. One company formed the front guard, then followed the warriors in chains, with another company on their left and right, and extended from front to rear, as a flank guard. One company guarded the right and left of the squaws and children, who followed the warriors, in the same manner. Next after the squaws were seventeen wagons, belonging to the contractors, containing provisions for the Indians, children, &c., &c., and six wagons of my detachment, and after these was the fourth company, as a rear guard—all the troops with loaded muskets—and the march was by the Federal, or old road by Fort Hull, and other posts (now in ruins) established by Gen. Floyd in 1814. * * * The column, in close order, occupied half a mile, but extended, when marching, usually a mile, often more. * * * I had [at night] the Indians, women and children included, within an inclosure of logs, or log fence, under a guard of about thirty men, commanded by a Lieutenant, and another guard, in addition to the mounted men [about ninety in number who reached the camp the first night and were, thereafter, while with the detachment, under the command of Maj. C.] of the same strength, beyond all, to protect the camp. * * * 5th, Tuesday. Having passed through the country occupied by hostile Indians, the squaws this night, and afterwards, were not

kept within the chain of sentinels. After halting each night, and after the prisoners (chained Indians) were placed on their ground, the squaws were employed in cooking and supplying them with food, water, bushes for shade and covering, but were not allowed, after the first two nights, to be with them between dusk and reveille. During the day, on the march, they assisted the prisoners to water and food. * * * 6th, Wednesday. This night three Indians withdrew their hands from the shackles and then *withdrew themselves* from our camp, with a musket shot after them, without effect, by one of the sentinels. Two squaws were found *asleep* near the place in the chain vacated, and were yoked or harnessed in the place of the men as a warning, but taken out the second day after. * * * 12th [at Montgomery]. In the removal of about fifteen Indians from the chains, identified as having committed offenses against the State of Georgia, and ordered to be brought back for trial, one of the Indians seized a hatchet and struck the person who was engaged in riveting the new irons on his hands and ran to escape. He was, however, intercepted in his flight, and shot within a hundred yards. * * * Another Indian, the father of the other, I believe, and who, it was supposed, was encouraging him to do the deed, was bayonetted through the body, but was alive two days after. The Indians were submissive and obedient to all orders and directions during our march, and soon learned to range themselves in rows on any indicated line, for sleeping at night."

On the termination of this duty Major Churchill was appointed Inspector General of the Army of the

South. In the discharge of the duties of this position he went to Montgomery, Huntsville, and Claysville, at which last named place he mustered a battalion of twelve months' volunteers into the service of the United States. On reaching Fort Mitchell again he was relieved from staff duty, and assigned to the command of a battalion composed of several companies of regulars and one of volunteers, and with this force he proceeded to Tampa Bay,* at which place he arrived on the 15th of Oct., 1836.† Early in the year 1837, having been again assigned to staff duty, he accompanied the troops under the command of General Jesup to the interior of Florida. On the 14th of January he met with an accident, the circumstances of which are described in the journal, as follows: "While giving directions, when we halted this evening, for making a pen to secure the cattle which had been taken on this day and yesterday,‡ a tall pine tree, about five inches thick at the base, cut by one of the pioneers, who was not careful to apprise me of its fall, struck me on the back and tip of my left shoulder, knocked me forward off my horse (a very high one), by which I am lamed severely in my shoulder, and left side and hip, was near fainting, but walked without help to my tent, 50 yards distant. * * My horse was considerably lamed in the back by the tree which rested across the saddle (about 30 feet from the stump), after gliding from my shoulder." This injury caused much suffering for several weeks, and from its effects he never entirely recovered. He was able to ride on horseback, and to travel by any

* Note 51. † Note 52. ‡ Note 53.

means of conveyance, whatever might be the distance or length of time, without more than the usual fatigue, but to stand or to walk generally wearied him, and there was often lameness or numbness in the left side, arm and leg.*

On the 18th of April, 1837, at Tampa Bay, he wrote in the journal: "Mrs. Perkins and Mrs. Eastman (wives of two captains of brigs engaged to transport the Seminoles) and their husbands, came ashore to-day, and I accompanied them to the Creek Indian Camp, they in a wagon, I on horseback. Returned at one o'clock to my tent, where they (declining to dine with me) opened the baskets which they had brought well filled with cakes and *doughnuts* of their own make on shipboard, and I filled *my flexible* basket * * * with a hearty good appetite. The ladies (all the way from "down east"), quite accomplished, had the *kindness* and consideration to offer in the most modest and friendly manner, to repair my collars, meaning, of course, my shirts and other small articles, which, from the long time I have been from home, they conclude are out of fix. Besides thanking for *myself*, I thanked them for my dear L. HER GOOD STITCHES REMAIN FIRM, and the wearing out of my clothes has not been so rapid as to leave me *shiftless*. I have never felt more gratitude, however, for proffered assistance."

At Tampa Bay, on the night of the 1st of June, 1837, while he was loading his pistols in order to be prepared for any emergency,† one of the pistols went off, and the nail and end of the thumb of the right hand were carried away, and the forefinger was lacer-

* Note 54. † Note 55.

ated. He thought that it was a wonderful escape, considering that the charge, ramrod and screw-driver passed, of necessity, between his thumb and fingers. He wrote in his journal: "And though I am in a camp of supposed wickedness, without having seen a *preacher* for months, I am deeply thankful to *God* for the continuance of life, such as it *is*, for *health* and numerous blessings!! and my *happiness* is that I feel this gratitude!!!"

June 24th, 1837, Major Churchill was ordered to Fort Mitchell to muster and discharge Alabama and Georgia volunteers. On the 4th of July, at St. Mark's, he was invited by Judge Crane, the U. S. Collector, to stay at his house,* and wrote in his journal: "At tea I came and sat down at a lady's table, the first time since I left home, now 13 months since, and my thoughts, my deep love, are carried in haste to my dear wife and children, back, time past, forward, I trust, to time *soon* to come." He was engaged in mustering into service and discharging volunteers in Georgia,† Alabama,‡ and Florida,§ and then in Georgia again, till the latter part of May, 1838, when, being in the northern part of Georgia, General Scott, who had arrived in that part of the country, and was in command of the troops, regulars and militia, who had been assembled on account of anticipated trouble with the Cherokees, gave him orders to go to Washington on the completion of the duties in which he was then engaged, and report to the Adjutant General for light duty. It should be stated, here, that Major Churchill had suffered much for some months,

* Note 56. † Note 57. ‡ Note 58. § Note 59.

and at times severely, from fever and ague contracted in Florida, and that a change of climate was important for him. At Washington he received orders for duty on the Vermont frontier, where, as well as on other parts of the frontier, troops were assembled during the first "Canadian Rebellion," in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States. On his way further north he remained 24 hours at West Point, "with [as he wrote] my dear son William, who has become a Cadet, and passed two years of his time at the Military Academy since I parted with him at Eastport in 1836. Is well and doing well." On the 14th of June he joined the rest of his family at Woodstock, Vermont, after an absence of two years and eleven days. He wrote: "Has a person, ever, *feelings* which he cannot describe? Then here and at meeting with William I must be *more than dumb.* The long separation from the best of families, the preservation from danger myself, the changes of my children by growth and appearance, the sickness of my dear L., our again coming together in life, serve to fill me with indescribable excitement, joy and gratitude. June 17th. In the afternoon go with my L. to Windsor, where we find mother Hunter in good health."

Major Churchill spent the summer in the State of Vermont, making St. Albans his residence, and occupied much of his time in visiting the villages on the frontier, ascertaining the feelings and tendencies of the inhabitants, and endeavoring to develop among them a spirit of loyalty to the laws of the United

States relative to neutrality.* The only troops in the State were a detachment of recruits commanded by Lieut. Freeman,†, stationed at Swanton, which afterwards became a company, or the *nucleus* of one, in the 8th Regiment of Infantry, organized in 1838, whose first Colonel was William J. Worth,‡ a brilliant and able officer, greatly distinguished in the war of '12–'14, and in the war with Mexico. This company was relieved by a company of the 1st Artillery, the Head Quarters of which regiment and several of its companies were at Plattsburgh, New York, under the command of its Colonel, Bvt. Brig. Gen'l Abraham Eustis.§

In September, 1838, Major Churchill received orders to join his regiment then in the Cherokee country. He was detained in Washington on his way South, and the nature of his duties there is shown by the following extract from his journal: "Have been engaged, most of the time since the 9th [October], by order of the Adj't General, in examining, with the 3d Auditor, the accounts of [name omitted in copying], late Quartermaster in Col. Snodgrass's Regiment of Alabama Volunteers, which I mustered into service last October and discharged in April. Fraud and forgery detected therein." In November he joined his regiment at Augusta, Georgia. Eight companies were there on their way to Florida, one company was already in Florida, and one at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The Colonel, Walker K. Armistead,‖ was not on regimental duty. The Lieut.

* Note 60. † Note 61. ‡ Note 62.
§ Note 63. ‖ Note 64.

Colonel, William Gates,* left on leave of absence, and, consequently, Major Churchill succeeded to the command of the regiment, and proceeded with the eight companies to Florida. During the early part of the winter he was occupied, with a portion of the regiment and a company of Dragoons, in cutting roads and making bridges and scouring the country, in search for Indians north of the Ocklawaha River and between that river and the St. John's River. Later in the winter he went down the eastern coast as far as Key Biscayne, and remained until May, 1839. He was occupied with troops under his command in scouring the country north and south of the Miami River as far as the Everglades. In order that the methods of the Indians may be understood, an extract from the Journal of April 10th, 1839, is inserted: "At 10 A. M., received a report from Capt. Vinton † that a party of about 15 Indians were discovered by a wood party of 18 men within three-fourths of a mile of Fort Dallas [on the north side of the Miami River, at its mouth, and about four miles from the glades] on the morning of the first. One of the soldiers happened to *whoop* like an Indian, and this caused the savages to rise from their ambush and expose themselves before they fired, about 200 yards distant. The soldiers, without firing, under the command of a sergeant, and on the advice of Ass't Surgeon Baldwin,‡ who was near, charged upon the Indians and put them to flight. On the hearing of the *yell*, Lieut. Rodney § was sent from the Fort, with a few additional men, and, soon coming up with the others, pursued the Indians about eight miles, but

* Note 65. † Note 66. ‡ Note 67. § Note 68.

could not get near enough to bring them to action or do any execution, and lost sight of them in the glades. The Indians, first seen, were joined by others, and the whole were thought to be near 40 to 60 strong, all warriors, as they were in fair view much of the eight miles. With horsemen they might have been overtaken on *such ground*, as they went in a N. W. direction."

In May General Macomb directed Maj. Churchill to repair to Washington * and report to the Adjutant General, from whom, on his reporting, he received a leave of absence for six months from the time he left Black Creek, at the expiration of which time he was to report to the Adjutant General in Washington. On the 17th arrived at West Point, and, as he wrote: "found my good son William in good health and sustaining a high standing as a Cadet." On the 20th rejoined his family at Westport, Essex County, New York. An incident occurring during the summer may be mentioned. As has been stated, Maj. Churchill, in early life, was an ardent Jeffersonian Democrat. Politics ran high in those days, and the Federalists, who considered themselves "the better class," and, no doubt, were the moneyed class, resorted to a system of social ostracism in regard to their opponents, which spirit was, to some extent, manifested by portions of their political successors, the Whigs, Native Americans and Republicans,† and were particularly hostile to officers of the army. Of this fact Major Churchill had personal knowledge at Burlington in the war of 1812–14. In

* Note 69. † Appendix C.

subsequent years he ceased to take any part in politics, but various circumstances led him into sympathy with Adams, Clay and Webster, and other leaders of the Whig Party. He had not, however, had occasion to note, with his own eyes, the extent to which in most places, the Whig Party was the legitimate descendant of the Federal Party, and that most of the "Old Federalists," who were still living, were active Whigs. In the summer of 1839, Henry Clay, himself a Democrat in former years, and, as such, disliked by the Federalists, as was Jefferson, the great leader of his party, visited Burlington at a time when Major Churchill was in the same place, and, of course, was received with marked attention. Naturally, those, who took charge of the affair, belonged to the Whig Party. Most of those who were on the shady side of 50 to 55 years of age, were old residents of Burlington, had been Federalists in early life, and had been personally known as such by Major Churchill. It is well remembered by the writer that, on the occasion of a reception held in honor of Mr. Clay, Major Churchill called him aside and said: "Frank, it galls me to see that those who surround Mr. Clay, and stand in most favor with him, are old Federalists." *

On the 11th of November, 1839, Major Churchill reported himself to the Adjutant General, and received orders to join the army in Florida without delay. Arrived at St. Augustine on the 28th of the same month, and soon afterwards was placed in command of the sub-district composed of St. Augustine and the posts in its vicinity. On the 11th of January,

* Note 70, and Appendix D.

1840, he received an order from "Head Quarters, Army of the South" (General Taylor), directing him to "inspect, from time to time, the militia in the service of the United States, east of the Suwanee River, and to muster militia into and out of service, when necessary." He entered upon this duty at once. In his journal is found: "Feb. 14th [1840]. Again to Picolati (30 miles), and to St. A. 18, making since Jan. 16, 575 miles on horseback and 90 miles in public steamboat;" and, also, "Feb. 15th. To-day, two mail carriers, each driving a two-horse stage, were killed by Indians north of St. Augustine, one going on the Jacksonville road seven miles out, the other coming on the Pablo road, ten miles out, and the horses taken from both stages. The men were not scalped or mutilated. * * * The trail was followed on the 17th down to Tomoka, where it turned to the S. W. in the direction of Lake Monroe, and the pursuit by Capt. Wicker, Flor. Vols., *was discontinued!*" Major Churchill continued in the discharge of duties of this nature until near the end of April, 1841, travelling extensively on horseback in the northern part of Florida. In order to give another illustration of the methods of the Indians in their warfare, the following extract from his journal is made: "May 23d [1840]. At sunrise, with an escort of four men, to Fort Baker, six-mile post, and then with three men to Fort Searle, where Lieut. Ord* joined me in the further ride to Picolati, where we arrived at 10 o'clock. Met Paymaster Van Ness,† about midway, going to St. A., himself, clerk, and two armed men on horseback, his baggage wagon with two armed men in it,

* Note 71. † Note 72.

and a carry-all with two citizens in it; those personages and teams as close together as they could travel. I and my party (my invariable custom when my escort is small) were riding singly at intervals of 100 yards, two men in my front and one in my rear. I halted and transacted business with Major Van Ness for about ten minutes, and then both parties proceeded on their way. Within three hours after my arrival at P. an express came from Fort Searle (7 miles), with a report that two wagons with unarmed citizens, theatrical performers, going to St. A., whom I met three miles out from P., had been attacked by a party of 15 Indians, between the 8 and 9 mile posts, and two of the men killed. The spot was within half a mile of where I met Major Van Ness, who was, no doubt, permitted to pass unmolested in consequence of myself and party being so near. My safety was in the *distance* occupied on the road. Major Van Ness was not in sight when I passed the place where the Indians were in ambush; he emerged from a strip of thick trees or swamp when I met him. These suppositions were confirmed by the Indians themselves in the following autumn, when they surrounded, for a night, the house of Capt. Schenck on North River, 25 miles from St. A. Coachoochee (Wild Cat) then and there said to Capt. Schenck's negroes that he made the attack on the theatrical party with "many Indian," and in 1844 Coachoochee confirmed this to me personally in Washington. [Last clause interlined by S. C. in journal.] Lieut. Ord, being still here, set off, with four mounted men, to examine the place. In the evening I heard, by the Quartermaster's clerk, who came from St. A. (he went with Major Van

Ness in the morning), that a wagon containing citizens, unarmed, coming from St. A., had been attacked between 11 and 12, about half a mile from the first attack, and within a mile this side, west, of Fort Baker, by almost the same number of Indians, and two men killed. At Fort Baker there were about a dozen men of the Third Artillery, under a sergeant, who, hearing the firing, and being in sight, went with nearly all his men to the rescue, and saved the remaining persons. A negro, the driver, escaped, wounded, to St. A., and gave the alarm, and nearly 100 men took horse and came out to the spot by two o'clock. Expresses were sent off, also, to the posts south and southwest, and as the ground is soft from recent rains (the last on the 20th) it is hoped that the Indians may be pursued by their trail and intercepted. I have been informed to-day, likewise, that Lieut. Martin,* 7th Infantry, was going from Micanopy to Waccahoota, on the 19th, with an escort of three men, was fired upon by a large party of Indians, the Lieutenant and one man wounded, and, returning to Micanopy, gave the alarm, upon which Lieut. Sanderson,† 7th Infantry, with 13 men, went in pursuit, fell in with 60 or more Indians, who, firing, killed the Lieutenant and five men, and that the others escaped to Micanopy."

During the summer of 1840 Major Churchill had an attack of bilious fever, and suffered also from fever and ague until December. During all this time, however, with but few intervals, he continued in the performance of his duties in mustering and discharging militia, and, for this purpose, in travelling, mainly

* Note 73. † Note 74.

on horseback, between St. Augustine and Tallahassee, and in both directions.

Entered in his journal is the following: "On the 16th [December, '40] I was joined at Picolati by my son, Lieut. William H. C., who graduated at the Mil. Academy in June last, had been detailed as my assistant in mustering militia, and just arrived in Florida." Lieut. C. was with Major C. for a few days only, but joined him again on the 24th of March, 1841, and remained with him till April 28th. On their parting Major Churchill entered in his journal: "In this short term of duty with me [he has] given me the highest degree of satisfaction and pleasure as a son and an officer." *

On the 26th of April, 1841, Major Churchill, having completed the discharge of the Florida militia,† reported, as a member thereof, to a Board for examining claims in connection with the militia service, then in session in Tallahassee. The following is a copy of an entry in the journal: "Monday, June 14. The Board, having resolved some weeks since to proceed to St. Augustine, holding sessions on its way at several places, left Tallahassee this morning, the party consisting of myself (Prest.), Major Mapes‡ and Capt. Heintzelman § (members), and Mr. Towle, recorder, with Kemp,‖ my orderly, Charles (negro), messenger to the Board, a two-horse wagon, in which two persons ride, a five-mule wagon for baggage, to be met ten miles from town by an escort of seven mounted infantry, Mr. T., myself, and orderly being armed with double-barreled guns, I and the other

* Note 75. † Note 76. ‡ Note 77.
§ Note 78. ‖ Note 79.

gentlemen with pistols, also; Capt. H. and I and orderlies on horseback." The Board held sessions at various places until August 25th, when, being at St. Augustine, it received an order from the Adjutant General's office, issued on its suggestion, to adjourn to Washington and there resume its duties. Major Churchill arrived at Washington on the afternoon of September 6th, 1841.

Appointed Inspector General.

Extract from journal: "The next day I was informed by General Jesup, Quartermaster General, that he had sent my name to the President on the first for the appointment of Inspector General of the Army, in the place of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Wool,* appointed Brigadier General, vice Scott promoted to Major General to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Maj. Genl. Macomb on the 25th of June last. Paymaster General Towson† was consulted the day after by the President (Gen. Scott and the Adjt. Genl. Jones‡ not being in Washington), and so favorable were the recommendations, principally on account of my having been employed on similar duty in Florida for much of the last five years, that the President nominated me to the Senate for the office on the 10th, the nomination was confirmed on the 13th, and on the 15th the *order* of the appointment was issued; and thus, without any *application* by me, two grades of rank are conferred upon me, and I have assurances from all the officers I meet of the unanimous satisfaction the appointment gives. 15th. Relieved from duty on the Board, and ordered to relieve

* Note 80. † Note 81. ‡ Note 82.

Gen. Wool in Troy as Inspector Genl., and left Washington accordingly same day." *

With this appointment came more important duties, greater responsibilities, and much more extensive travel. Though there were two Inspectors General, the duties of the position were discharged almost exclusively by Colonel Churchill. He traveled in every part of the country, inspecting troops and posts, arsenals, depots, and hospitals (West Point, and unfinished works still in the hands of officers of the Corps of Engineers, alone excepted), and ascertaining by personal observation and inquiry, the manner in which the duties of every branch of the service were discharged. Much of his time was occupied, also, in the examination of the claims of volunteers and militia who had been in the service of the United States. His reports to the Adjutant General were frequent and in detail, and upon them the action of the Head Quarters of the Army was often based.† By way of illustration of the extent of Colonel Churchill's travels, it is sufficient to state that the memoranda kept by him show that from September 15th, 1841, till June 15th, 1843, his journeyings amounted to 19,363 miles. The distance would not be considered great at the present day when people make a pleasure trip in a parlor car to Mexico, Utah, California, etc.; but it should be remembered that the time mentioned was 45 years ago.

Services during the war with Mexico.

In January, 1846, Colonel Churchill, being, at the time, in the City of Washington, received an order to

* Note 83, and Appendix E.

† Note 84.

inspect the troops in Texas, and, returning, by way of Florida, to inspect the posts and troops in the Gulf and southern Atlantic States. On or about the 22d February, 1845, he inspected "The Army of Occupation," commanded by General Taylor, and encamped at Corpus Christi, Texas. With the exception, possibly, of a few Texan mounted troops, it was composed of regulars. After this he proceeded 220 miles on horseback, by way of San Antonio to Austin, and then 172 miles by wagon to Houston. His return was by way of Galveston, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, &c., &c. His journal reads: "Washington, Sunday, May 17th. I arrived at 4 P. M. direct from St. Augustine, Florida, where, on the night of the 11th, I heard of the capture of Capt. Hardee* and others, 2d Dragoons, on the Rio Grande, above Matamoros, and without making further inspection under the instructions of 22d January, I hurried direct to Washington. I could not have inspected the troops on the way, for I found that the garrisons at Savannah, Augusta, Charleston and Fort Monroe had been ordered to embark for Texas, or hold themselves in readiness to do so. General Scott, to whom I reported in his office, at 6 o'clock the evening of my arrival in Washington, approved my return, and directed me to employ my time, for a few days, in preparing instructions for officers in mustering volunteers into service, and I accordingly devoted my attention to that duty and preparing forms of muster rolls for volunteers and militia." On the 22d of May he received an order assigning him to the special duty of mustering into service the volunteers to be raised in Indiana, Tennessee, and

* Note 85.

Mississippi, and directing him to "repair to those States without delay, see or correspond with the Governors, and take such prompt measures as may be necessary for the execution of the duty assigned." Soon afterwards the States of Ohio, Kentucky, and Missouri were added. But the duty was not entrusted to Colonel Churchill alone. Colonel Croghan,* the other, and the Senior, Inspector General, was also assigned to it, and the whole matter was to be under the superintendence of General Wool. Finally, the duties in Indiana and Illinois were specially assigned to Colonel Churchill. He received the final order at Carlisle on the 30th of May at 12 M., and started for Indiana at 1 P. M, on the same day. Within a fortnight previous to this date news of the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, and of the bombardment of Fort Brown,† opposite Matamoros, had been received, and the survivors of those, who were living at that time, well remember the intense excitement which ensued. Col. Churchill mustered into service three regiments of Indiana Volunteers, Colonels James P. Drake, Joseph Lane, appointed Brig. Gen'l U. S. Vols., July 1st, 1846, and succeeded as Colonel by William A. Bowles, and James H. Lane, and four of Illinois Volunteers, Colonels John J. Hardin, William H. Bissell, Ferris Forman, and Edward D. Baker. Colonel Baker, who was born in London, England, was a member of the U. S. House of Representatives at the commencement of the war with Mexico, but resigned his seat and raised the fourth regiment. He commanded a Brigade, after General James Shields was dangerously wounded in

* Note 86. † Note 87.

the battle of Cerro Gordo, and was distinguished in that battle. He subsequently removed to California, and then to Oregon, and was elected U. S. Senator from the latter State in 1860, but went into the Union Army and was killed at the battle of Ball's Bluff, Virginia. Colonel Churchill was brought into close relations with the 1st and 2d Illinois Volunteers, which subsequently formed a part of General Wool's command. Colonel Hardin was killed in the battle of Buena Vista. His widow became the wife of Ex-Chancellor Reuben H. Walworth, of New York, and a lasting friendship was maintained between her and Col. Churchill. Colonel Bissell was greatly distinguished in the battle of Buena Vista, and, with his regiment, aided in holding an important position, and in checking the progress of the Mexican troops after a portion of the American troops had given way. It was in this battle that General Taylor is said to have used the expression, in the form of a command: "Give them a little more grape, Captain Bragg."* The story, though not true, well illustrates the cool, sturdy and unflinching character of General Taylor. There were other stories told of "Old Zach," or, according to the nickname given him by the soldiers, "Old Rough and Ready," also often untrue, but, still, perfectly applicable, and, in their essence, complimentary to him. Colonel Bissell was subsequently a member of the U. S. House of Representatives for several years. He was elected as a Democrat, and acted with his party, except that he opposed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. In 1856 he was elected Governor of the State of Illinois by the Republican party, and

* Note 88.

died during his term of office. While he was in the House of Representatives another member made some comments upon the floor concerning the comparative courage of the Northern and Southern troops in the battle of Buena Vista, and spoke disparagingly of the former. Colonel Bissell promptly contradicted the statement. The other member sent him a challenge which was accepted, and muskets were named by him as the weapon. The question was one of fact, and, fortunately, was one of easy solution. Colonel Bissell was so clearly in the right that it can be said that there was but one side to the question. The friends of the parties intervened, and obtained statements from those who were familiar with the facts. The writer remembers that Colonel (then Bvt. Brig. General) Churchill made a statement in writing, and he thinks that General Taylor, father-in-law of Jefferson Davis, who had been elected President of the United States, was still living, and also made a statement. The challenger saw that his position was untenable, and, after the negotiations conducted through friends which are usual in such cases, the matter was compromised and the challenge was withdrawn. The writer visited Colonel Bissell at his residence in Belleville, Illinois, in the winter of 1847–8, and saw him afterwards in New York. He well remembers him as a gentleman of delicate appearance, quiet and unassuming, and, showing, at the same time, the characteristics of coolness, self-possession, and self-assertion. Such men are not to be intimidated. Colonel Bissell was not a person who would seek, or desire to raise, a sectional issue, or would grade the value of any man by reference to the part of

the country in which he resided. In the war with Mexico, the behavior of a regiment in battle depended largely upon what was its behavior on the march and in the daily routine of duty in the camp, and the standard of its behavior in the latter respects was established by the measure of its discipline as imparted to it by its officers.

On the 29th of August, 1846, Colonel Churchill joined General Wool at San Antonio, Texas. From that time till Sept. 28 (as he wrote in his journal) "I was most busily employed in camp and at Hd. Qrs. inspecting men and horses for discharge, getting the muster rolls in and examining them, regulating camp duties and many important matters confided to me by Gen'l Wool." On the 14th of October he left that place in command of the rear column, crossed the Rio Grande on the 25th and 26th, and arrived at Head Quarters at Monclova on the 6th of November. The Division, under the command of General Wool, arrived at Parras on the 5th of December. On the 17th of that month, at one o'clock P. M., a communication dated on the 16th at Saltillo, was received from Gen'l Worth, containing the information that the enemy was reported to be moving in large force on that place from San Luis Potosi, whereupon Gen'l Wool moved at 4 P. M. on the same day with all his force (and having nearly 300 wagons), except two companies left temporarily, and arrived at Agua Nueva, opposite a pass in the mountains 20 miles from Saltillo, at 1 P. M. on the 21st, a distance of 115 or more miles, about 29 miles per day. During a part of this march the Division moved in two columns, and Col. Church-

ill was placed in command of the rear column, consisting of all the foot troops with about 225 wagons. On the 20th it moved at 2 o'clock A. M., and reached Gen'l Wool's camp at daylight. On the 21st it moved at 4 A. M., and reached his camp again at daylight; and then the entire force moved in one body 18 miles to Agua Nueva. From this time until the battle of Buena Vista was fought there were constant reports, more or less authentic, of the advance of the enemy. The army was on the alert at all times,* and the scouts confirmed the later reports. On the 28th of December Colonel Churchill received an order detaching him from Gen'l Wool's Division, and directing him, after making the muster of that command on the 31st of the month, to join Maj. Gen'l Butler,† and, accordingly, on the 4th of January, 1847, he reported to that officer in Saltillo.‡ On the 8th of January orders were received from Gen'l Scott, dated at Comargo, on the 3d, calling for a large part of the force, including all of Gen'l Worth's Brigade, to report to him on the Rio Grande. On the 20th and 21st of February, 1847, such of the troops as were at Agua Nueva fell back, and by reveille of the 22d were in position at Buena Vista ranch 4½ miles from Saltillo, and at and near a narrow pass a mile and a half further south. On the 22d and 23d of February, took place the battle of Buena Vista, the Mexicans being commanded by Gen. Santa Anna, and the Americans by Gen. Wool at the outset, and subsequently by Gen. Taylor.§ Colonel Churchill, whose horse was wounded four or five times by musket balls, received the brevet rank of Brigadier General for gallant and

* Note 89. † Note 90. ‡ Note 91. § Note 92.

meritorious conduct in the battle. It was conferred in May, 1848.

In May, 1847, Colonel Churchill was ordered to New Orleans to muster for discharge the twelve months' volunteers. Accordingly, in June, in that city, he mustered and discharged, signing a discharge for each officer and man, ten regiments, one battalion, and one detachment, from Mississippi, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana and Missouri.* In the fall of 1847 he received orders to muster into the service of the United States, to serve during the war with Mexico, five regiments of volunteers from Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee. He had discharged that duty but in part when he received an order detailing him as a member of a Court Martial to assemble at Fort Monroe, but which finally assembled in Washington, and held its sessions in that city till the latter part of the winter of 1847 and 1848. The next duty of importance was the supervision of the muster for discharge of the troops who had volunteered for the war with Mexico, and he was personally occupied in the performance of this duty in New Orleans from June 27th till August 2d, 1848, and, in addition to this, had general supervision of the discharges made at Mobile, East Pascagoula, Vicksburg, Memphis, Alton, and elsewhere.

Gen'l Churchill then resumed the discharge of the duties appertaining, in time of peace, to his position and rank in the army. They consisted in the inspections already mentioned and of vessels engaged as

* Note 93.

transports, in investigations of Indian affairs, and occasional attendance, as a member, on Courts of Inquiry, Courts Martial, and Boards of Inspection.* Details are not necessary. The statements already made will give an idea of the nature of his duties and the extent of his travels. The last inspection noted in his journal was that of Fort Sullivan, Eastport, Maine, July 4th, 1859. It was from this point, as has been stated, that he started for the Creek Nation twenty-three years before. The following entry in his journal, made July 28th, 1860, on the occasion of a visit to Vermont, is significant: "Went up to Mount Mansfield, 8 miles and returned. 1½ miles very steep, on horseback, near the summit. Dined at the tip-top house. Horse fell in coming down, but I was not hurt. L. [Mrs. Churchill] rode up and down without accident, though she had not been on horseback since 1844." Then follows a full account of the hotel, the method of supplying it, and the sources of its supplies, and the details of the dinner; all characteristic of his habit of close and accurate observation. At this time Gen'l Churchill was nearly 77 years old. The previous riding on horseback by Mrs. Churchill, which is mentioned, was in Georgia and Alabama, as already stated. The last official paper, of a personal nature, addressed to Genl. Churchill, and found among his files, except the order for his retirement from the active list, which took place on the 27th of September, 1861, was as follows: "The Adjutant General

* Note 94.

desires to see General Churchill at his office as early this morning as he can call. Very respectfully,

A. G. O., JAMES B. FRY,*
Monday, April 15, 1861. A. A. G."

At Carlisle, Pennsylvania, the following entry was made in his journal: "1861, April 20.—Myself, wife, Lucy [their grand-daughter], with David [a colored man servant], left Washington at 3 P. M., via Relay House, to Frederick. Next day in carriage to Hagerstown. 24th, P. M. By rail to Chambersburgh, and morning of 25th to Carlisle. I, being too lame and infirm, I am unfit for any active service, and being directed by Gen'l Scott to take care of myself, as he had repeatedly said in the last three years. The train we came in was the *last* unbroken one from W." The party left Washington at the urgent solicitation of Prof. Baird, who, having ascertained on that day that the last train was to leave, returned to his residence in order to make the fact known, and to cause the party to start. It may well be understood that General Churchill left with reluctance. He was fully aware of his infirmities, but it galled him to be obliged to recognize himself as a non-combatant, and to retire from the post of danger. He carried his sword in the car between his knees, and it was observed that he and it were the subjects of scrutiny by some of the passengers. General Churchill omits to mention that one of the party was a Mr. Clark, who had been for some time a member of Prof. Baird's household, and who, for the reason that he was a native of that part of the coun-

* Note 95.

try, and had acquaintances, went with the party, in order, if necessary, to obtain conveyances and render assistance. He went as far as Frederick. His return and his announcement that the party was safely on its way gave great satisfaction to those who had remained in Washington. The last entry of any military service in the journal bears date on the 27th of April, 1861: "Went to Harrisburgh to see Adj. Gen'l Biddle." [He was the Adj. Gen'l of the State of Pennsylvania, and an uncle of Prof. Baird.]

General Churchill, after his retirement, resided in Washington, but passed a part of the time at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and Bellows Falls, Vermont. The last entry in his journal is dated Oct. 11th, 1862, and consists merely of a memorandum of payments made.

At Windsor, Vermont, on the 30th day of August, 1812, SYLVESTER CHURCHILL was married to LUCY HUNTER,* daughter of William Hunter and Mary (Newell) Hunter. She was born at Windsor, July 17th, 1786, and died at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, September 6th, 1862. She was the oldest of five children of their parents who reached maturity, five others having died in infancy or childhood. The former were: Lucy, Mary, Franklin, Sarah, and William Guy. William Hunter was born at Sharon, Connecticut, January 3d, 1754, and died at Windsor, Vermont, November 30th, 1827. At Windsor, January 30th, 1777, he married Mary Newell, above mentioned, who was born at Farmington, Connecticut, November 5th, 1757, and died at Westport, Essex County, New York, April 26th, 1844. William Hunter's parents were David Hunter and Rebeckah (Marvin) Hunter, the latter born at Norwalk, Connecticut, who were married June 26th, 1750. David's parents were Jonathan Hunter and Hopestill (Hamblin) Hunter, who were married at Rochester, Massachusetts, November 27th, 1729. Mary Newell was a daughter of Elihu Newell and Esther (Langdon) Newell, who were married at Farmington, Connecticut, in 1754. Elihu, who was born July 14th, 1730, at Farmington, and died at Windsor, Vermont, in 1813, was a son of Thomas Newell and Mary (Lee) Newell, born March 18th, 1690, who were married at Farmington, July 9th, 1713. Thomas, who was born March 1st, 1690, probably at Farmington, was a son of Samuel Newell and Mary (Hart) Newell, who were married at Farmington, December 20th, 1683.

* Note 96.

Samuel, who was born December 5th, 1660, probably at Farmington, and died February 15th, 1753, was a son of Thomas Newell and Rebecca (Olmstead) Newell. Thomas came from Hertfordshire, England, settled at Farmington about 1640, and died there February 25th, 1698.

The life of Mrs. Churchill is narrated, in substance, in the sketch of the life of her husband. From the time that he left Eastport, Maine, in 1836, till their children were all established in life, she was virtually the household head of the family, and had charge of most of the details of its daily affairs. So long as she lived, the place where she was, even temporarily, was *home* to them. From the time of the appointment of her husband as Inspector General, in 1841, for over fifteen years she accompanied him in the greater part of his travels in the United States, shared the fatigues and exposures as well as the pleasures and novelties of the journeyings, saw every part of the country, and became acquainted with large numbers of persons of every grade and condition in life. Her social qualities, her conversational powers, and her capacity to adapt herself to all positions, and make warm friends of all whom she met, her sympathetic and kindly disposition, her quick apprehension and keen sense of humor, were remarkable. She and General Churchill differed much in temperament and tastes, but their differing qualities merely served to supplement those of each other, and to develop them to the best advantage. Perfect harmony was the result.

It was a consequence of their natural characteristics and of their mode of life that they were entirely independent in the management of their affairs, and

in forming and maintaining personal relations with others according to their merits and character. They had due regard to the conventional requirements of society, but recognized the fact that such requirements are carried, at times, by sticklers, beyond the limits of reason and charity. With them the opinion of any local Mrs. Grundy went, merely, for what it was worth.

For many summers they visited, whenever able to do so, two small villages on the west side of Lake Champlain, one on the Lake and the other a few miles distant from it, and in and near which relatives of each resided.* Their last visit was made in July and August, 1861. The writer well remembers that, on the 2d day of August of that year, General Churchill's birthday, he heard him say, while reclining in a capacious arm-chair (fond of work and with much capacity for work he did not fail to take his ease when the opportunity permitted): "I am seventy-eight years old to-day, and as happy as happy can be." He might well speak thus. He had the consciousness of a life well spent, he had had unusual health and strength, had, by his merits, gained position and reputation, was happy in his domestic relations, and had means amply sufficient for every want. There were assembled, on one occasion during this visit, in the parlor of the country inn, General and Mrs. Churchill, her sister, Mrs. Sarah Aikens, and her husband, her brother, William Guy Hunter, and his wife. It was the last time they met. General and Mrs. Churchill died in 1862. One of the six, Mrs. Hunter, still remains among the living. The writer thinks that his sister and he were the only other persons present.

* Note 97.

The oldest child of SYLVESTER and LUCY died in infancy. The others resided with their parents at the various posts where their father was stationed till 1836, when he went to the Creek Nation as already stated, and the oldest son went to West Point. After that time, and during the lives of their parents, the family residence, so far as there was one, was at various places in Vermont, in New York and Pennsylvania, and in the City of Washington. Those frequent changes of residence did not fail to make a permanent impression upon the minds of the four children, and, to a corresponding extent, to form their character. From early life they never considered themselves permanent residents of any place. They were aware that their father was liable to be ordered elsewhere, and, as they advanced in years, each remembered a former residence equally uncertain. They never attached the idea or sentiment of *home* to any spot or place. As has been stated, home was wherever their mother was, and this was irrespective of the length of her sojourning or of the roof which covered her head. If there was any *place* with which the associations of home were connected, it was Smithville, in North Carolina. There they passed seven years of their childhood, a time of life when impressions are most readily received. Such impressions are, also, the most lasting. Smithville was, as it is still, an insignificant place in itself, and in its surroundings and its relations to other parts of the country. It merely had the merit of being a seaport, situated on a broad river, but two miles from the ocean, and of being a harbor for sailing vessels and steamers engaged in domestic and foreign commerce.

But, here, friendships were formed which continued through life, and the survivors of the family often speak of that sandy and uninteresting place and its former inhabitants with warm affection. The writer has seen the place but once, and then merely from the deck of a steamer in passing in front of it, on his way from Charleston to Wilmington, in the spring of 1853. Every other member of the family actually visited Smithville, and two of them frequently.* Next in importance, in the minds of those four children, was Windsor, Vermont; but, though three of them resided there for a year, their interest in the place was not so much on account of any actual knowledge and experience as because it was the birthplace of their mother and a frequent subject of narratives by her during their childhood when they were in what was then a distant part of the country. They learned the names and characteristics of persons whom they never saw, became familiar with the facts of her own early life, and of her home with her parents; and the sayings and acts of the worthies, and, even, the unworthies, of Windsor, became, for them, proverbs and examples to be followed or shunned. It is worthy of remark that their father's birthplace had no such importance in their minds, though, in their esteem, their father's relatives stood quite as high as did those of their mother. This circumstance was not an exception. The writer has often noticed that the younger members of a family generally know more of their mother's relatives than they do of those of their father. This seems to be but a fulfilment of the words

* Appendix F.

of Scripture: "Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife."

Another circumstance should be mentioned. At each military post were officers of the army, natives of various parts of the country, associating among themselves, and among each other's families, with much intimacy, and, generally, having acquired a knowledge of the world by travel and social experience which was possessed by but few of the citizens among whom they were stationed.

It naturally followed that the children of General and Mrs. Churchill were exceptionally free from sectional feeling, and were better able than most persons to judge of sectional differences with impartiality and upon their merits. Devotion to the Union was the result of their training as well as a matter of sentiment, though they did not deem it incumbent upon themselves, when the Civil War came, to make blatant proclamations of their loyalty. They had no sympathy with the extremists of either North or South, and they knew that the citizens of no part of the country had a monopoly of virtue, morality, intelligence, sincerity, or patriotism, or more than their natural share of those qualities. They had charity for the honest opinions of others even on such vital questions as the constitutional right of secession, and even though their own opinions were different. In the admirable language of President Cleveland, they could exercise "toleration when approval of * * opinions is withheld." When opinions led to acts there was no room for toleration for those acts. When acts ceased, as a finality, either by compulsion or willingly, there was again, in their opinion, room for toleration. There

was always room for charity. It happened to them to know that some of their northern acquaintances looked upon them with suspicion. So, they knew that some of their old southern acquaintances wondered why those who had resided so much at the South, and had so many southern friendships, should oppose the South. This would have been amusing to them had not the state of affairs made them sad.

William Hunter Churchill entered the Military Academy, as a Cadet, September 1st, 1836. In his first year he stood the fourth in a class numbering 76 at the end of the year; in his second the tenth in a class of 58, and was a corporal; in his third the ninth in a class of 46, and was the Sergeant Major, and in his fourth, or as a First Classman, was the eighth in a class of 42, and was the Adjutant of the Corps. There were 42 graduates, 28 of whom were born in the Free States, so called, and 14 in the Slave States, including the District of Columbia. The proportion of those born in the Free States was much above the average. One, Charles P. Kingsbury, who was born in New York, was appointed from North Carolina, and one, Pinckney Lugenbeel, who was born in Maryland, was appointed from Ohio. Four, three of whom, William P. Jones,* William H. Churchill, and Francis N. Clarke,† were certainly sons of officers of the army, were appointed "at large." The three named were born in Free States, and the fourth, Douglass S. Irwin, was born in the District of Columbia. In addition to those who were killed in battle, four lost their lives by casualties: William P. Jones (N. Y.) in 1841, at Fort McHenry, near Baltimore (named after James McHenry, Secretary of War, 1796–1800) by being thrown from his horse; Job R. H. Lancaster (Ohio) in 1841 by lightning in Florida, while on a scout; Thaddeus Higgins (Penn.) in 1845, near Corpus Christi, Texas, by the bursting of a steamer's boiler; and Horace B. Field (N. Y.) who was swept overboard, with many others, from the

* Son of Gen. Roger Jones, Adj. Gen.

† Son of Gen. Newman S. Clarke.

steamer San Francisco, on her voyage, as a transport, with troops, mainly of the 3d Artillery, from New York to California in 1853. Douglass S. Irwin (D. C.) was killed at Monterey, and John D. Bacon (Maine) mortally wounded at Churubusco, and seven others: James G. Martin (N. C.); William Hays (Va.); Bryant P. Tilden (Mass.); Charles H. Humber (Mass.); Pinckney Lugenbeel (Md.); Robert P. Maclay (Pa.); and Henry D. Wallen (Geo.) were wounded in the Mexican war. Two, George H. Thomas (Va.) and Douglass S. Irwin (D. C.) received brevets for gallant services in the Florida war, one of whom, Thomas, and seventeen others: Paul O. Hebert (La.); Charles P. Kingsbury (N. Y.); William T. Sherman (Ohio); William H. Churchill (N. Y.); John P. McCown (Tenn.); Richard S. Ewell (D. C.); James G. Martin (N. C.); George W. Getty (D. C.); Horace B. Field (N. Y.); William Hays (Va.); Oscar F. Winship (N. Y.); Charles H. Humber (Mass.); Reuben P. Campbell (N. C.); Pinckney Lugenbeel (Md.); William Steele (N. Y.); Oliver L. Shepherd (N. Y.); and William B. Johns (D. C.), received brevets for services during the Mexican war. Fifteen: Charles P. Kingsbury (N. Y.); John McNutt (Ohio); William T. Sherman (Ohio); Stewart Van Vleit (N. Y.); Francis N. Clarke (N. Y.); George H. Thomas (Va.); George W. Getty (D. C.); Henry Whiting (N. Y.); William Hays (Va.); James N. Caldwell (Ohio); John W. T. Gardiner (Maine); Pinckney Lugenbeel (Md.); Oliver L. Shepherd (N. Y.); Henry D. Wallen (Geo.); and Stephen D. Carpenter (Maine), were in the Federal service in the late civil war, of whom

Carpenter was killed, and nine: Paul O. Hebert (La.); John P. McCown (Tenn.); Richard S. Ewell (D. C.); James G. Martin (N. C.); Bushrod R. Johnson (Ohio); Reuben P. Campbell (N. C.); William Steele (N. Y.); Robert P. Maclay (Penn.); and Thomas Jordan (Va.), were in the Confederate service, of whom Campbell was killed.* Of the twelve, of whom no account except in reference to the Florida and Mexican wars is here given: William Gilham (Ind.); William H. Churchill (N. Y.); Fowler Hamilton (N. Y.); Bryant P. Tilden (Mass.); Oscar F. Winship (N. Y.); Charles H. Humber (Mass.); Henry Wardwell (R. I.); William Robertson (Tenn.); Joseph L. Folsom (N. H.); William G. Torrey (N. Y.); Daniel G. Rogers (Penn.), and William B. Johns (D. C.), most of them died in the army, while others resigned or were out of service. The history of Torrey since 1845, and that of Maclay since 1866, are unknown; Sherman, Van Vleit, Getty, Whiting, Robertson, Shepherd, Wallen, Johns and Jordan, were known to be living on the 1st of September, 1886.

William Hunter Churchill was promoted Second Lieutenant in the 3d Artillery, of which regiment his father was Major, July 1st, 1840. Into the same regiment went Jones, Gilham, Sherman, Van Vleit, Thomas and Field. He served on Governor's Island, Harbor of New York, then a depot for recruits; at various points on and near the east coast of Florida in the operations against the Seminole Indians; in assisting his father in mustering and discharging

* Note 98.

militia between the St. John's River and Tallahassee, to which duty he was temporarily detailed; at St. Augustine; at New Orleans Barracks; at Fort McHenry, and at Fort Moultrie, Charleston Harbor. Fort Moultrie was named after Major Gen'l Moultrie, who, in June, 1776, successfully defended the fort, then constructed of palmetto logs and sand, against the attack of a British squadron under the command of Sir Peter Parker. On June 27th, 1843, he became First Lieutenant in due course of promotion. In 1845, owing to the threatening condition of affairs with Mexico, a portion of the army was concentrated at Corpus Christi, Texas, under General Taylor. Lieut. Churchill was among the first who were ordered to that point, and he left, never to return. Early in March, 1846, the army advanced to the Rio Grande, occupied the bank of the river opposite Matamoras, and constructed a fort to which the name of Fort Brown was subsequently given. In April Gen'l Taylor, with the bulk of the army, went to the coast, a distance of a few miles, in order to obtain supplies, leaving the 7th Infantry and a small force of artillery as a garrison. It was determined that, on the return, two eighteen-pounders should be taken in addition to the rest of the artillery, and, in order that they might be used in action, in the event of the march of the army being contested, it was decided that there should be a proper force to work the pieces. Lieut. Churchill was detailed by Bvt. Lt. Col Childs* to the command of the force assigned to that duty, and was directed to report to Gen'l Taylor for orders. He did so, and the order was: "Well, hitch

* Note 99.

on." The guns were drawn by oxen. The wags of the army cracked many jokes on the subject of the novel battery, and suggested that a Board of Officers should be appointed to prepare manœuvres for Ox Artillery. The battery did excellent service in the battle of Palo Alto, and in August, 1846, the brevet rank of Captain was conferred upon Lieut. Churchill for his gallantry in that battle. It is understood that some of the oxen were converted into beef by the shot of the enemy during the action. Lieut. Churchill was left with the battery as a part of the guard of the wounded and train, and, therefore, did not participate in the battle of Resaca de la Palma, which occurred the 9th of May, 1846. In March, 1847, he was appointed Assistant Quartermaster with the rank of Captain, was stationed at Point Isabel, Texas, in a position involving great responsibilities, and died there on the 19th of October, 1847. After a temporary interment at Point Isabel, his remains were taken to Savannah, Georgia, and there re-interred.

As already stated, he married, at Savannah, Elizabeth Margaret Cuyler. Her father, Richard Randolph Cuyler, was born October 19th, 1796, and died April 6th, 1865, and his parents were Jeremiah Cuyler and Margaret (Clarendon) Cuyler. Her mother, Mississippi (Gordon) Cuyler, was born January 18th, 1800, and died February 15th, 1833. The children of R. R. C. and M. C. were George A., Elizabeth M., Richard M., and Margaret M., afterwards Mrs. Johnson.

Franklin Hunter Churchill graduated at the University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, in 1843, studied law in 1843 and 1844 at Keeseville, Essex and Clinton Counties, New York, with Simmons & Taber, Esqrs., was at the Law School of Harvard University during two terms in 1844 and 1845, and afterwards studied law in the city of New York with E. H. & R. B. Kimball, Esqrs., and Allens & Hudson, Esqrs. In January, 1847, at Albany, he was admitted as an Attorney and Solicitor. The General Term of the Supreme Court, composed of three judges, at which he was admitted as an attorney, was one of the last, if not the last, held under the old system, pursuant to which there were but four General Terms during the year, and which were held in New York, Albany, Utica, and Rochester, one in each of those cities. Law students assembled for examination at those Terms from all parts of the State, and, for those who had successfully stood the test of college examinations and knew that they were well prepared, of which fact they were fully competent to judge, the occasion was a very pleasant one and took upon itself a festive form. Robert S. Hale was among those examined in January, 1847. The students in attendance were so numerous that they were divided into two sections, to one of which R. S. H. and F. H. C. were assigned. Two of the examiners of this section, and the writer is not sure that there were more than two, were Edward Sandford, considered by many the best "all round" lawyer of the time in the city of New York, and who was drowned when the Collins steamer Arctic was lost in 1854, and Charles P. Kirkland, then of Utica and afterwards of New York.

In the fall of 1847 he was employed, as a clerk, in mustering volunteers into the service of the United States at Louisville and Smithland, Kentucky, and Nashville and Memphis, Tennessee. In the spring of 1848 he commenced the practice of his profession in New York, and his residence has been in New York and Brooklyn.*

* Note 100.

CHARLES COURSELLE CHURCHILL studied medicine and attended two winter courses of lectures at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in the city of New York. For the reason that he received a commission in the army, the studies were not formally completed, but the knowledge thus acquired proved very valuable in subsequent years. It happened, on more than one occasion, at some remote post, but temporarily established, and where a surgeon was not permanently stationed, that his acquirements were successfully applied. On the 3d of March, 1848, he received the commission of Second Lieutenant in the Third Artillery, to which regiment his father and brother had belonged, became First Lieutenant in due course of promotion June 30th, 1852, Captain, May 14th, 1861, and was retired for disability contracted in the line of duty, February 28th, 1862. While he was on active duty he served on the Northern Line in Mexico, at New Orleans, Fort Monroe, Fort Adams, near Newport, R. I., Indian River and in the Everglades in Florida, Fort Independence in Boston Harbor, Governor's Island in New York Harbor, San Francisco, Benicia Barracks, San Diego Barracks at the old Mission and San Diego, California, Fort Monroe, again, then, as now, an Artillery School of Practice, and where, at the beginning of the Civil War, he was on the staff of Gen. B. F. Butler and that of Gen. Wool as Acting Assistant Adjutant General, and at the Artillery Camp near the city of Washington. After he was retired he was on duty, in a military capacity, at Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Harrisburgh, and Carlisle. He and Mrs. Churchill reside at Newport, Rhode Island.

Richard Cuyler Churchill entered the Military Academy, as a Cadet, July 1st, 1862. In his first year he stood nineteenth in a class numbering 71 at the end of the year; in his second the ninth in a class of 51, and was a corporal; in his third the ninth in a class of 46, and was the Sergeant Major; and in his fourth, or as a First Classman, he was the thirteenth in a class of 41, and during the latter part of the year was the Adjutant of the Corps. His military positions at West Point were the same as those held by his father. On the 18th of June, 1866, he received the commission of Second Lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery, became First Lieutenant in due course of promotion, July 28th, 1866, and resigned in 1871, his resignation to take effect September 1st, 1872. While in the army he was stationed at Fort Whipple, near the city of Washington, Fort Delaware, Delaware; at Philadelphia, and at the Academy at West Point, where he was Acting Assistant Professor of Drawing. After his resignation he resided in the vicinity of West Point, in the city of New York, and in the town of Ossining, near the village of Sing Sing.

Josephine Young, whom R. C. C. married, as stated, was the youngest child, surviving them, of Henry Young, who was born in Westchester County, New York, in December, 1792, and died at Ossining in October, 1874, and Anne (Mason) Young, who was born in Rensselaer County, New York, in January, 1810, and died in the city of New York in September, 1876. Henry Young was twice married. The children by his first wife, May Lathrop Hyde,

surviving him, were : Henry Lathrop, Mary Caroline (Mrs. Barnes), James Hyde, and Martha Ann (Mrs. Leavitt), and those by his second wife, surviving him, were: Mason, Alice (Mrs. Eaton), and Josephine.

Spencer Fullerton Baird.

The father of S. F. Baird was Samuel Baird, who was born at Norristown, Penn., in 1786, and died at Reading, Penn., in August, 1833. He was a son of Samuel Baird, who was born in Franklin Co., Penn., in 1758, and died near Philadelphia in 1820. Samuel Baird married Rebecca Potts at Pottstown, Penn., in 1780. She was born in 1754 at Coldbrookdale Furnace, Penn., and died at Reading in 1830. The father of S. F. Baird married Lydia McFunn Biddle in 1815, at Philadelphia. She was born at Philadelphia, July 4th, 1797, and died at Carlisle, Penn., in June, 1871. Her father was William McFunn Biddle, who was born at Philadelphia in 1765, and died there in August, 1809. Her mother, Lydia (Spencer) Biddle, was born in the State of Delaware in 1766, and died at Carlisle in 1858. William McFunn B. and Lydia S. were married in 1796.

The following was prepared by the writer as a note, but he thinks it well to put it in another place, without any change of language:

It is entirely beyond my capacity to write anything at all adequate to Prof. Baird. A volume would not suffice for an outline of the narrative of his life and works, and for recounting his merits. But, all this is unnecessary. Nothing, which I could say, is not already known. His reputation was as extensive as was the knowledge of his name. There are probably few persons, who have devoted themselves to any branch of natural science, who have not heard of him, and to have heard of him, was to esteem and honor him. According to all natural anticipations he

might have reasonably expected ten years more of usefulness and activity; but, without those years, his life was well rounded and complete. He lived to see the successful results, still working and progressing, of his favorite enterprises. He had the happiness of enjoying in advance, if, with his unselfishness, he ever thought of the subject, the favorable verdict of the future. It is a matter of certainty that his reputation will increase with passing years.

If I should write of his characteristics, his social qualities, and even his domestic life, I would merely state what is also already known. He was the only person, active and progressive, and holding positions of responsibility, and vested with the control and direction of others, whom I ever knew, who was without an enemy. Every one, who knew him, was his friend, and those, who knew him well, loved as well as respected him. I have known persons who were warm in their sympathies and full of kindly feeling for others, but were not always well balanced and wise, and thoughtful and provident in counsel and in arranging and acting for the good of others. Prof. Baird united all those qualities in an equal and exceptional degree. It followed that his influence upon all the young gentlemen and other persons, who were ever, in any way, associated with him, was most beneficial to them. It was for this reason, with others, that he inspired so many with his love for science. As has been written of him already by another, "he healed many feuds, brought angry people to charitable and kindly feelings, and there were many things which he himself had forgiven."

A large proportion of his acquaintances knew

something of his domestic life, and will, according to the degree of that knowledge, agree with me that I am right in stating that, as a son, a brother, a husband, and a father, and, as it gives me pleasure to add, a son-in-law and a brother-in-law, he ranked with the best. He could not well have been more devoted, visibly, to his own parents than he was to mine, and the relatives and connections of his wife were as his own. For these reasons, if there were no others, my relatives and connections, having been grateful to him while he lived, will, during our lives, bear him in honored and tender remembrance.

NOTES.

NOTE 1. There is no evidence that John, Josias, and the two named William, or any two of the four, were related. It is opportune to refer, in this connection, to another point. I have seen persons of the name or blood of Churchill, and have heard of others, who are so weak and at the same time so ill informed as to believe that they are descendants of John Churchill, the first Duke of Marlborough. A lady showed me, at one time, a letter envelope, enclosing a note sent to her by a *Mrs.* Churchill, on which was an engraving, covering its entire face, of the Ducal Arms of Marlborough! Waiving the point whether any one should take pride in being a descendant of the first Duke, exceptionally great as he undoubtedly was, those who, in this country, make any such claims, are ignorant of a few facts which may be mentioned. John Churchill, of Plymouth, was married in 1644; Josias, of Weathersfield, in 1638; William, of New York, was a resident previous to 1672, and William of Virginia, was probably an adult in 1666; while John Churchill, who was made Duke of Marlborough in 1702, was not born till 1650. Besides this, his only son died in his minority, and the title passed to his oldest daughter Henrietta, Countess of Godolphin, from whom it descended to her nephew, Charles Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, a son of her sister Anne. The family name of the present Duke is Spencer-Churchill. I may add, as to any supposition of relationship with the ducal family, that there is no basis for such supposition other than the name, and that the facts stated show that any relationship must be very remote.

It has been suggested that, for the reason that the same Christian names are often found among the descendants of John and Josias, the two were related. I do not see any force in the suggestion. The fact is, and this sketch is an illustration of the fact, that, until the beginning of the present century, Bible, and, generally, Old Testament, names were much used in New England, and I do not attach much significance to the fact that any such name is found repeated in one family. The settlers of New England were but little inclined to name their children after the Christian Saints (admitting that they ever heard of them), and rarely did they take any name from the drama, romance, or profane history.

I think it well to add that everything, which is stated in this sketch,

concerning William Churchill, of New York, and William Churchill, of Virginia (including, even, their names), is based upon information received by me from the gentlemen in Boston to whom I have referred in the Preface. Except that I have seen the name of Josiah (properly Jo-ias) Churchill in the New England Historical and Genealogical Register, I know nothing about the ancestors of any persons of the name in this country other than as appears in the sketch. The name is far from being an unusual one in some of the States. In the fall of 1847 I attended an evening reception in Louisville, at which, as I was afterwards told, half a dozen gentlemen of the name were present.

NOTE 2. These two dates, according to the present system of distinguishing New Year's Day, are, beyond a doubt, January 12th, 1719; and March 24th, 1735. Therefore, Ichabod was born about two years and one month after William, and Lydia about two years and four months after Ebenezer. These intervals of time approximate to those between the births of most of any consecutive two of the other children. Prior to and until within a few centuries past, and, in some parts of the world, until long after the commencement of the 18th century, New Year's Day was not designated as at present. For this reason, and in order to remove all uncertainty, when an event took place before or on Easter Day, and it was necessary to make an entry or record of the event, those, who were aware of the confusion attaching to the subject, placed double dates on gravestones and other memorial structures, and in private and public records. It is on account of ignorance on this point, or carelessness, that historians and genealogists sometimes err in their statements concerning the years in which certain occurrences took place. The following extracts may be of interest: "Christmas Day, the Annunciation (March 25th), Easter Day and March 1st, have all, at different times and places, shared, with the 1st of January, the honor of opening the New Year; and it was not till late in the 16th century that the first of January was universally accepted as the first day of the year" (Chambers' Encyclopædia, Article *New Year's Day.*) "The Julian Calendar did not completely rectify the error [the error on one side, being that the year consisted of 365 days, and, on the other, involved in the Julian Calendar, that it consisted of 365¼ days], and Pope Gregory XIII, in 1582, reformed the calendar. The days from October 5th to 14th were suppressed, and, in order to prevent errors, the century years 1700, 1800, were not to be regarded as leap years. * * * By the reformation of the calendar by Pope Gregory XIII the year began on the first day of January, and, consequently, whenever and wherever the NEW STYLE of reckoning time was adopted, then and there the year commenced on that day. Previous

to the use of the Gregorian Calendar the years had different days of beginning at various times in the same and different countries, and, occasionally, at the same time in the same country. In most countries it began on one of the following days: Christmas Day, the 25th of December: Circumcision Day, the 1st of January; Lady Day, the 25th of March; or Easter Day, the day of the Resurrection of OUR LORD." (Sadlier's Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo for 1886. See, also, Appleton's Encyclopedia, Articles *Calendar* and *Chronology*.) It will be readily understood that, to the confusion arising from varying local customs as to the commencement of the year, was added the further confusion arising from the suppression of ten days by the Gregorian Calendar, whenever that Calendar, or, rather, the purely scientific improvement which it recognized and reduced to form, was adopted. The people of various countries clung to the old custom of designating days and seasons, and naturally could not account for or practically apply the omission of ten or more days. The New Style was not adopted in England till 1751, when an Act of Parliament was passed (24 Geo. II, 1751) by which it was enacted that in Great Britain and Ireland eleven days should be omitted after the 2d of September, 1752, so that the ensuing day should be the 14th. The Act, of course, extended to the Colonies in its effects, even if they were not named, and it is probable that many years passed before old ideas and customs were obliterated. I remember that, in my boyhood, in North Carolina, I often heard a middle-aged mulatto woman speak of Old Christmas in distinction from the Christmas which was then recognized and observed. If the use of the New Style was introduced within the time of persons whom she knew in her youth, Christmas came too soon, and the change must have caused much confusion in the minds of the mass of the people, and particularly in the minds of the negroes. With the latter the Christmas Holy days were holidays indeed, days when labor was, to a great extent, suspended and extra allowances of food were provided. It has often occurred to me that the expression "Old Christmas" was a relic of the confusion caused by the substitution of the "New Style" for the "Old Style." In England the people used to say: "Who stole the eleven days? Give us back the eleven days." See Chambers' Book of Days, Vol. 1, p. 105.

NOTE 3. It may be well to remark that, in addition to the children named here and in other parts of the sketch, there may have been other children who died in their infancy or in early youth. The intervals between the dates of the births of some of the children mentioned indicate that such may have been the case. Perhaps, too, children who did not survive their parents, or who did not leave descendants, may have been omitted.

NOTE 4. In the summer of 1835 Major Churchill and his family visited Woodstock. His father's farm was then occupied by his brother Levi, and, I understand, was owned by him On one occasion the four brothers, Levi, Joseph, Sylvester, and Isaac, with others, were assembled on the place. It was "haying time," and it was proposed by some one that the brothers should enter the meadow and mow in company. The proposition was approved, and Levi, then 63 years old, took the lead, and the others followed in due order, according to their years, as space was cleared for them. Finally, Isaac, then 48 years old, brought up the rear, and the four scythes, each cutting a broad swath, swung together as one. Though I was among the visitors at the farm, I did not see this, but my mother, who was present, told me that it was an interesting and touching spectacle.

NOTE 5. In the summer of 1835 Major Churchill and his family were in Montpelier and visited the new State House, then nearly completed, and the old State House which was in a condition of dilapidation, and I remember that my father called our attention to a portion of the latter building in the construction of which he had personally participated.

NOTE 6. I have recently received the present of a pamphlet, the title page of which is as follows: || An || ORATION || pronounced at || WINDSOR, || before the || WORSHIPFUL MASTER, WARDENS, AND BRETHREN || of || VERMONT LODGE, || on the 27th December, A. L. 5808, || at the Festival of || ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST. || *By Brother Hosea Ballou.* || *Published at the request of the Lodge.* || WINDSOR, || Printed at the office of the VERMONT REPUBLICAN, || *By Br.* SYLVESTER CHURCHILL. || 5809. ||

I suppose that "Brother Hosea Ballou" was the distinguished Universalist clergyman of that name.

I often heard my father mention the fact that he was an active Freemason in early life. At the time of his death he had not entered a Lodge for many years, for, at least, thirty years, and, probably, for nearly fifty years. Among my earliest recollections are those of hearing my elders speak of the Masonic and Anti-Masonic Parties, and of reading paragraphs in the papers relating to the same subject. I understood nothing of which I heard and read. In my opinion, irrespective of the deference which is due from me to any exterior authority, there is much that is objectionable in Freemasonry and simular organizations, but I have never been able to comprehend why a political party should have been

formed upon the issue of the merits or demerits of Freemasonry. When a political party is formed, it is, of course, to initiate or oppose legislation. I think that the issue was one to be decided by each individual for himself, and that there was no occasion for legislation concerning it. The Anti-Masonic Party grew rapidly, and as rapidly disappeared. Its rapid growth attracted to it those who are to be found in every community who are ready to "jump on" to anything which will give them publicity, place, profit or influence. It was a fanatical party also, and this fact had two natural results: one that it found an opponent in the Democratic Party, or, as it was then sometimes termed, the Jackson party; and the other that its coolheaded leaders encouraged this fanatical spirit. Anything which could be turned to account was a "good enough Morgan" for them. In order to illustrate the spirit of the rank and file of the party and that of its leaders I can repeat "a good story" which I heard many years ago. A newly-elected member of the Assembly (whether a Freemason or not was not stated, but he was not an Anti-Mason) on reaching Albany, where he was a stranger, inadvertently established himself at a hotel which was mainly frequented by the plainer Anti-Masonic members and their friends. Though he was devoted to his party, he knew that there was a time for all things, and he bore himself accordingly, but he complained bitterly to his political friends that the Anti-Masons at that hotel were not content with the discussions at the Capitol, but were spouting and arguing all the time. Finally, he said to them that he could stand it no longer, and had moved to another hotel, which he named. Though they knew that he would find the change an improvement, they could not help saying to their rural friend: "That will never do; don't you know that that hotel is the headquarters of ——— and ———, the leaders of the Anti-Masonic Party?" The answer was: "That's nothing; I can get along very well with such men as ——— and ———, but those damned fools at that other hotel are in earnest."

NOTE 7. My father was a subscriber for Niles's Register for some years. I remember that, whenever a weekly number arrived, no one was permitted to touch it until he had unfolded and smoothed it, then folded and refolded it, accurately adjusting the edges of the printed portions, fastened the back and then cut the folded edges with an ivory folder. When a sufficient number of the weekly issues of the Register had accumulated, he prepared them for the binder by stitching them together by means of a large needle and a long thread securely and uniformly fastened. I remember that on one occasion I watched the latter proceeding with much interest, but did not understand its purpose, and only

learned its importance years afterwards, when, on passing through the Hall of Records in New York, while "examining a title," I saw a bookbinder stitching, in the same manner, the leaves of some old "Libers" which had been brought to a bad condition by use and decay, and which were to be re-bound. The image of the proceeding, which I had seen and watched at Smithville, came up before me, and I remembered that my mother sat near, an interested spectator. This knowledge of the details of printing was of great service to my father in subsequent years, in preparing forms and instructions for mustering volunteers. In the fall of 1847, at Louisville, I saw him prepare such forms and instructions, and correct "the proofs" when they came from the printer.

NOTE 8. He told me once that, on the occasion of his inspecting a depot of army clothing, the person in charge—of course, not an officer of the army—while in one of the rooms in the depot, brought out from a secret place a bottle of whiskey, and asked him if he would "take a drink." He received a severe rebuke, my father telling him that, in the entire course of his service, no such proposition had ever been made to him. Far different was it when, while he was mustering a western regiment into the service of the United States during the Mexican war, a man approached him and said: "Old hoss, when do you think you will reach my company?" There may have been timely instruction, but there could have been no rebuke. In fact, my father was amused, and afterwards spoke of the occurrence, as illustrative of the manners and language of plain men in that part of the country, to my mother, who narrated it to me with much glee.

NOTE 9. I rarely read the word "profanity," or hear it spoken, that I do not think of a definition given to me by my much esteemed and admired friend, Judge Robert Safford Hale, of Elizabethtown, Essex county, New York, as he heard it: "Profanity is the *unnecessary* use of profane language." I formed the acquaintance of Judge Hale in 1839, when I was sixteen years old—he a Sophomore and I a Freshman in college—and was intimate with him till the time of his death, in 1881. There was never a word, or, I believe, a thought which tended to mar our friendship. I think that his social qualities were superior to those of any man (if my mother could be excepted I could say any person) I ever knew. He was not a man of learning in any special branch of knowledge (there was no call or opportunity for him to be such), but his reading of English authors was varied and wide, his information, consequently, of the

same character, his verbal memory and capacity to apply his attainments exceptionally great, and his wit and humor exuberant. He and I differed in some of our opinions, but such difference went for nothing between us. His sympathies and his friendship were not extended or withheld on account of the opinions of others on subjects which fairly furnished grounds for difference of opinion. For many years I was a welcome visitor at his house. His wife was and is one of my most esteemed friends, and his children have grown up under my eye.

NOTE 10. Sylvanus Thayer (born in Mass.): Cadet, March, 1807; Sec. Lt. Eng., Feb. '08; First Lt., July, '12; Dep't Com. of Ordnance (rank of Capt.), Sept. '12; Chief Eng. of Maj. Gen. Dearborn's Army, '12; and of the Right Div., commanded by Maj. Gen. Hampton, '13; Aid de C. to the latter, '13-'14; Capt. Eng., Oct. '13; Chief Eng. in the defences of Norfolk, '14; Brig. Major to Brig. Gen. Porter, '14-'15; Bvt. Major, Feb. '15; Bvt. Lt. Col., March, '23; Maj. Eng., May, '28; Bvt. Col., March, '33; Lt. Col. Eng., July, '38; Col. Eng., March, '63; Bvt. Brig. Gen., May, '63; retired, March, '63; died, Sept. '72, at South Braintree, Mass.

NOTE 11. It was far different in the war with Mexico, which commenced about thirty one years after the termination of the war of 1812-14. Gardner's Dictionary shows that not less than thirty-five officers of the Regulars, whose first commissions bore date before January, 1815, served in Mexico, and this number does not include the names of two or three officers whose presence in Mexico, though stated in the Dictionary, may be doubted. With but one or two exceptions, those officers were actually in the field, on the march, and in battle. They did not merely *accompany* the troops—merely moved along by the current of military operations; they actively participated in those operations, and, when their rank entitled them to high commands, they led. Those who led were not indebted, more than is usual, to the activity—mental or physical—or the suggestions, of younger men. They planned and executed. Old Blucher had no more *push* than had Taylor and Wool, Scott and Worth, Twiggs, Kearney and Churchill, and others. Most, if not all of them, were nearly 60 years old, and many of them had passed that time of life. A writer in the Army and Navy Journal stated, some years ago, that the Mexicans commented upon the fact that the American troops were commanded by *gray-haired* men. Possibly the high reputation which those old officers gained in the Mexican war was due, in part, to

the fact that, in the reduction of the army in 1815, there was an instance of the "survival of the fittest." Not only were those retained who had distinguished themselves, but those who had shown a special aptitude for military life. It cannot be doubted that, in the formation of the peace establishment, these points were kept in view.

NOTE 12. Much of all which has appeared, in poetry and prose, concerning the "embattled farmers" of the War of Independence, is rhetorical flourish, and, moreover, tends to lead our people to underrate military training and preparations for war, and to believe that the soldier, like the poet, is born and not made. It is true that the English Colonies had no standing army and no military schools, but they had a great amount of military experience, much of which was gained in actual warfare. I have read (I do not now remember where, but I know that I considered the statement one upon which reliance could be placed) that Massachusetts had, *at one time*, twelve regiments of troops in the English service, and it is known that Massachusetts was not an exception. I have no data at hand. There was warfare, or preparations for warfare, all along the line which separated the French and English colonies. Of the land forces, about 4,000 in number, which participated in the siege of Louisburg in 1745—a siege which was vigorously though unscientifically prosecuted for forty-nine days—nearly all, if not all, were from the colonies. Israel Putnam was present at the capture of Havanna in 1762, and in command of a regiment. There were colonial troops with Generals Braddock, Amherst, Abercrombie, Johnson, Col. Bradstreet, and others. For years at a time, from about 1690 till the capture of Quebec, the frontiers, from New England to Georgia, were disturbed, and offensive and defensive operations were carried on, and from an earlier date there had been warfare with the Indians, in which the mother country did not directly participate. Nearly all of the able-bodied men were expert in the use of fire-arms, and many had used them in warfare. A few of the principal officers in the War of Independence had been engaged in the occupation of surveying land, an occupation which eminently qualified those who had followed it for an important part of the operations of military life.

See Appendix A.

NOTE 13. I think it well to insert a copy of portions of the letter, as follows:

CARLISLE, Wed., Nov. 21, 1849.

Dear Frank:

* * * * * *

I had seen the oration of Mr. Van Buren upon Worth, Duncan and Gates before the receipt of the paper from you, and I have noted some of the errors and forwarded the paper to Charles * * * Ringgold, Duncan, etc., were not the *creators* of the *light* or any other artillery. Ringgold's *was* light artillery, of which we had a regiment (Porter, Fenwick and Eustis the field officers) in the war of 1812, in which *every man was mounted*, and I inspected repeatedly six or seven of the companies at Plattsburg and other places. And there were numerous companies, one of which I commanded while a lieutenant in 1812–3, like those of Duncan's, Washington's, with horses for the carriages, and called *field artillery*, the proper designation or name for that equipment. But in all the *artillery* arm, like that of *infantry*, there has been great improvement since the war with England; improvement in the carriages, ammunition and drill. We have now several systems of exercise and manœuvers for artillery—by American authors, and furnished by the government—whereas then *there was none*, and [here the letter proceeds as in the body of the sketch, and then takes up other subjects].

NOTE 14. Henry Dearborn (born in N. H., 1751; app'd from Mass). [Colonel in Revolution; Rep. in Cong., '93 to '97; Sec. of War, March, '01, to March, '09.] Maj. Gen. and GENERAL IN CHIEF, Jan., '12; disbanded June, '15. [Minister Plenipo. to Portugal, May, '22; died at Roxbury, Mass., June, '29.]

NOTE 15. Wade Hampton (born in 1754 in S. C.). Col. Light Dragoons, Oct., '08; Brig. Gen., Feb., '09; Maj. Gen. March, '13; res'd April, '14. [Died at Columbia, S. C., Feb., '35.]

NOTE 16. James Wilkinson. (Born 1757, in Maryland.) [Adj. Gen. in Gates' Army at Saratoga, '77.] Lt. Col. Com'd'g 2d Inf., Nov., '91; commanded on the Wabash, '91, and Feb., '92; Brig. Gen. March, '92; commanded right wing of Wayne's Army in his victory, Aug., '94, at the Maumee Rapids, and was distinguished; Gov. of Lou. Ter., Dec., '05 to '07; GEN. IN CHIEF OF THE ARMY from Dec., '96, to July, '98, and from June, 1800, to Jan., '12; Bvt. Maj. Gen., March, '12; Maj. Gen., March, '13; disbanded, June, '15. [Died near Mexico, Dec., '25.]

NOTE 17. George Izard. (Born 1777, in S. C.) Lieut. Art. and Eng., June, '94 [Lieut. in French Corps of Eng., '96, '97]; Engr. of Fortifications in Charleston Harbor, '98; Capt., July, '99; Aid de C. to Maj.-Gen. Alex. Hamilton, Dec., '99; retained April, '02, as Capt. Art; resigned June, '03; Col. 2d Art., March, '12; Brig. Gen., March, '13; Maj. Gen., Jan., '14; disbanded June, '15. [Gov. of Ark. Ter., March, '25 till he died at Little Rock, Nov., '28.] (My father held the military capacity of Gen. Izard in very high esteem, and thought that nothing but want of opportunity prevented his gaining great distinction.)

NOTE 18. While my father was on the Niagara frontier an occurrence took place which, as it resulted in his cutting a walking stick, which, I believe, is now in my possession, and, if such is the case, is a relic of the war of '12–'14, I think it well to mention. Whether I had the narrative from my father, or from my uncle, William Guy Hunter, or partly from each, or from other sources, I do not recollect; my memory is defective as to the details. There had been, on some occasion, a desultory cannonading by two batteries of the American and British Armies on the Canadian side of the river, until about sunset, when my father was directed to go out to the American battery with an order to cease firing and retire. My father and Capt. Towson (afterwards Paymaster General), who commanded the battery, were sitting on their horses chatting and awaiting the movements of the soldiers, when a shot from the enemy's battery turned up a hickory sapling by the roots, or tore off and shattered a branch of a hickory tree standing in the vicinity. Upon this Capt. Towson said that he would be damned if they should have the last shot, and ordered the soldiers to unlimber one gun and return the fire, and this they proceeded to do. In the meantime my father dismounted, and cut wood sufficient for a walking stick from the sapling or branch whichever it was. The narrative told me was that a walking stick was subsequently made, but that it had been broken and lost or thrown away as useless. I thought no more about the subject until some years after my father's death, when my cousin, Franklin Hunter Cutting, a nephew of my mother, made me a present of a walking stick, which, beyond a reasonable doubt, was made from the wood cut on the Niagara frontier. My cousin knew nothing of its early history, but knew that it had been at a remote time the property of my father. On conferring with two of my relatives I found that one had no knowledge of the matter, and that the memory of the other had failed. Finally, another nephew of my mother, Villeroi S. Aikens, some eight years older than I, told me that he had no knowledge of the early history of the stick, but that he remembered seeing it in his early childhood in the possession of his grandfather and

mine, Hon. William Hunter, in Windsor, Vermont. The wood is hickory. The handle is made of deer horn, a material much used by my father as handles for walking sticks, into which is set a silver plate marked S. C. The wooden part is very unsightly, with ugly crooks and with scars made by decayed branches which had fallen or been broken off. As my father was very particular in selecting materials for walking sticks, of which he collected a large number during his life, this fact alone proves that the material in this instance was procured and preserved on account of some unusual circumstance connected with it. The ferule is nearly four inches and a half long, three times the usual length of a ferule, and the wood has evidently been split and shattered nearly three inches above the ferule. I do not believe that the stick was broken after it was made; but, if such was the case, a stick so ugly would not have been repaired unless it had unusual value in the mind of the owner. I think that its "honorable wounds" were the result of the enemy's shot, which the plucky Capt. Towson so promptly returned; and that, for this reason, my father carefully preserved the wood, prepared the stick, and presented it to his father-in-law, who, himself, served in the Revolution under Montgomery, at Quebec and elsewhere.

NOTE 19. Alexander Macomb, Jr. (Born 1782, at Detroit; app'd from N. Y.) Cornet Cav., Jan., '99; Sec. Lt., Feb., '01; retained April, '02, in 2d Inf.; 1st Lt. Eng., Oct., '02; Capt., June, '05; Maj., Feb., '08; Lt. Col., July, '10; Acting Adj. Gen. of the Army, April, '12; Col. 3d Art., July, '12; Brig. Gen., Jan., '14; Bvt. Maj. Gen., for victory at Plattsburgh, Sept., '14; rec'd thanks of Congress, Nov., '14, with the presentation of a gold medal; retained, April, '15; retained, May, '21, as Colonel and Principal Eng. with brevets; Maj. Gen. and GEN. IN CHIEF, May, '28; Commanded the Army of Florida, March, '36; died, June, '41, at Washington.

NOTE 20. Daniel Parker. [Chief Clerk of the War Dept.] (appointed from Mass.) Adj. and Ins. Gen., rank of Brig. Gen., Nov., '14; Provisionally retained, May, '15; Paymaster Gen., June, '21; superseded, May, '22. [Chief Clerk War Dept., Nov., '41; died at Washington, April, '46.] ☞ For explanation of certain facts in this officer's history see note on Nathan Towson, below.

NOTE 21. It strikes me that the question may well be raised whether the administration had any design, during the war of 1812–14, of seriously

invading Canada, much less of making a conquest of British America, or any portion of it. Some of the "Armies of Invasion" did not even march up a hill, and those which did, marched down again. It appears to me that every one of the armies was very weak in numbers and equipment if it was expected to make a successful invasion, and to reduce, or hold, even temporarily, any portion of the country. No one, so far as I can see, can be compared in numbers and appointment with either one of the three armies commanded, respectively, by Sir George Prevost at Plattsburgh, Gen. Ross at Washington and Baltimore, and Sir Edward Packenham at New Orleans. But it would not be in accord with the spirit of our institutions and the genius of our people, to make a permanent conquest of a country occupied by a large and hostile population. To hold any such country indefinitely as a subject Territory, or to admit it into the Union as a State, would be contrary to all our ideas. Our acquisitions have always been of either sparsely settled regions or of those occupied by a friendly population. The people of Canada were not friendly to us at the time of our War of Independence. With but few exceptions the inhabitants of the French and English Colonies differed in language, religion, and historical antecedents. Their ancestors, the original emigrants, brought with them the impressions and effects produced by the long-continued hostilities of the mother countries. There was nothing in their experience, as colonists, to remove those impressions and effects. It seems strange that people in America should be at war with each other on matters strictly European in their character, such, for instance, as the Spanish Succession, but such was the fact. The aborigines were enlisted in the wars which resulted from those European quarrels. The Hurons and Iroquois had often been enemies. As a result of this the French found many allies among the former and the English among the latter; and, consequently, to the horrors of civilized warfare were united those which resulted from the methods followed by savages when on the warpath. To those obstacles in the way of gaining the participation, or, at least, the neutrality of the Canadians in the revolt of the English colonies, was added another which was the offspring of the bigotry of some of our people, and who were not content to unite with the mass of their countrymen in the statement of grievances. The Treaty between France and England, which resulted from the conquest of Canada by the English, guaranteed to the Canadians their religion, liberty and property in return for their allegiance and fidelity to the British crown. Strange to tell, this act of wisdom, as well as of justice, was considered a grievance and made a matter of public complaint by the English colonies against the mother country. The Provincial Congress (of Massachusetts), which sat in Boston in 1773, stated, in one of its addresses: "The late act, establishing the Catholic religion in Canada, is dangerous, in an extreme degree, to the Protestant religion, and to the

civil rights and liberties of America." Several of the other colonies had used similar language in communicating their grievances to England. In an Address to the People of Great Britain, adopted by Congress (of the several Colonies) in 1774, the following language was used concerning the same act, commonly known as the "Quebec Act," which did *not* establish a State Church, but simply guaranteed to the Catholics in Canada the free exercise of their religion and the rights of conscience: "Nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British Parliament should ever consent to establish in that country [Canada] a religion that has deluged your island in blood," &c., &c. In February, 1776, Congress appointed Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase, and Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Commissioners to proceed to Montreal and endeavor to induce the Canadians to join the Colonies in the struggle, or, at least, to remain neutral, and Congress requested Charles Carroll to induce his cousin, Rev. John Carroll, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore, and who had passed more than twenty years in various European countries, to accompany them to Canada. He did so, not for the purpose of gaining allies, but to obtain the neutrality of the Canadians. The mission was fruitless. In vain did the Commissioners appeal to later utterances of Congress and to the language of the "Address to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec," then presented by them. The Canadians preferred to remain under the rule of England, already tested, rather than to entrust their fortune to a people whose views had been made known freely, fully, and without disguise, and whose recent utterances, having been made for the occasion, were justly regarded with suspicion. For details upon this point I refer to the Life of Most Rev. John Carroll, D.D., in the "Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States," by Richard H. Clarke, LL. D.

There is no reason to suppose that the inhabitants of the English Colonies had become any more friendly toward the people of the United States in 1812–14 than they were in 1776. Old feelings of hostility may have been mollified, but others had taken their place, and they were entertained, not by the French Canadians, generally mild and peaceful, but by persons of English blood; pugnacious, intelligent and active, and possessed of much influence which they were prompt to exert. The English government had been liberal to the American Tories by grants of money and of land. On the other hand, the estates of the wealthy Tories had been confiscated, and, by means of the operations of some of the "Rings" of the time, without adequate returns into the empty treasuries of the States which had passed and enforced the acts of confiscation. Many of the Tories left the places of their birth and their homes, sullen and impoverished, accompanying the British fleets, and many of them settled in Nova Scotia and elsewhere in the English Colonies. I did not know, when, a boy 12 and 13 years old in 1835 and

1836 in Eastport, Maine, I noticed some little manifestations of hostile feelings on the part of persons from across the line, what was the ground of such feelings, but I afterwards came to the conclusion that those persons were either the descendants of the Tories, or had been influenced by them or their children.

Not all of the Tories left the United States, nor have their opinions failed to influence the opinions of some of their descendants. My mother told me that, when my father was stationed at "The Narrows," she knew some elderly ladies residing in the vicinity, one of whom was named Stewart, who did not fail to express a regret that the Colonies had separated from England. In the summer of 1850 I passed a week or so at the Fort Hamilton House, since destroyed by fire, and I noticed that the hotel had been built on each side of, and above, so as to include it, what undoubtedly had been a private residence of much pretension, and I saw, over the main door, a stone tablet on which the name of Stewart had been cut. I concluded that in that house had probably dwelt one of the old Tory acquaintances of my mother. Peace to their ashes.

NOTE 22. During the time my father was stationed in the Harbor of New York he was authorized to go to Vermont to enlist recruits Indeed, if my memory of what I heard is correct, he "raised" an entire company with the exception of a nucleus of a few non-commissioned officers and men. In order to show what were the methods of travel at that time it is well to say that, when the requisite number of recruits had been obtained, the detachment marched from Windsor to Hartford, Conn., and went thence on a sloop to New York. The detachment must have been accompanied by a subaltern, for I often heard my father and mother speak of the fact that they traveled in a private conveyance, starting on each day after the detachment had marched, overtaking and passing it, and going on to the country inn where it was to halt. Most of the recruits, as it may well be supposed, were "truly rural." My mother told me that, at one of the halting places, a recruit, having removed his shoes and stockings, provided himself with a large bowl of bread and milk, and, coming into the room where she was sitting, drew a chair toward the stove, sat down, thrust his naked feet beneath the stove, and consumed his simple repast at leisure. Those who knew her, can appreciate how immensely amused she must have been, and can understand that she let the proceeding pass without comment knowing that the recruit would profit by future experience.

NOTE 23. Jonathan Williams. (Born in Boston in 1750; app'd from Penn.) Maj. 2d Art. and Eng., Feb, '01; Inspector of Fortifications,

Dec., '01, and Supt. Mil. Acad'y; retained, April, '02, Maj. Eng.; Lt. Col. Eng., July, '02; resigned, June. '03; Lt. Col. Eng., April, '05; Col., Feb., '08; resigned, July, '12. [Elected Rep. in Cong. from Phil., '14; died May, '15.] (A son, Alexander J. Williams, who graduated from West Point in '11, was killed Aug., '14, in the defense of Fort Erie.

NOTE 24. Eleazer D. Wood. (Born in N. Y.) Cadet, July, '06; Sec. Lt. Eng., Oct., '06; Fst. Lt., Feb., '08; Capt., July, '12; Bvt. Maj. for services in defense of Fort Meigs, May, '13; distinguished in Battle of the Thames, Oct., '13; Act. Adj. Gen. to Maj. Gen. Harrison, Oct., '13; Bvt. Lt. Col. for gallantry in Battle of Niagara, July, '14; distinguished in defense of Fort Erie; killed, Sept., '14, in Brown's sortie from Fort Erie. (The County of *Wood*, in Ohio, containing the site of Fort Meigs, was named after him, and Maj. Gen. Brown erected a monument to his memory at West Point.)

NOTE 25. Winfield Scott (born in Va., Jan., 1785), Capt. Light Art., May, '08; Lt. Col. 2nd Art, July, '12; distinguished in assault on Queenstown Heights, Oct., '12; and made prisoner with nearly 800 others for the reason that the N. Y. militia, who, it had been arranged, should cross the river in order to support the force which commenced the attack, refused to do so, on the alleged ground that they could not be *ordered* beyond the boundary of the State; the real ground probably being that they were not "eager for the fray," which had commenced and continued within their hearing, if not in their sight. If, as is possible, they had been drafted, their assertion of State Rights' doctrines must be regarded as, at least, timely; Adj. Gen. (rank of Col.), March, '13; Col. 2nd Art., Mar., '13; led the attack in the capture of Fort George, outlet of the Niagara river, and badly injured by the explosion of a magazine, May, '13; Brig. Gen., Mar., '14; in the Battle of Chippewa, July 5th, '14; in the Battle of Niagara, July 25th, '14, and twice wounded, once severely; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for dis. services in conflicts at Chippewa and Niagara, and uniform gallantry and good conduct as an officer in army commanded by Maj. Gen. Brown, Sept., '14; received gold medal from Congress, Nov., '14; retained, April, '15; Maj. Gen. and GEN. IN CHIEF OF THE ARMY, June, '41; took command in person of the army in Mexico, Dec., '46, and made campaign from capture of Vera Cruz, March, '47, to capture of City of Mexico, Sept., '47; rec'd thanks of Congress, March, '48, for uniform gallantry and good conduct conspicuously displayed in the siege and capture of the City of Vera Cruz and Castle of San Juan de Ulloa, and the successive battles of Cerro Gordo, Contreras,

San Antonio and Churubusco, and the victories in front of the City of Mexico and the capture of the city; rec'd a gold medal from Congress; retired, on his own application, Nov., '61; died at West Point, May, '66.

(Gen. Scott was not only a great soldier, but a great man. He was educated at William and Mary College, had been admitted to the bar, and through life was a great reader, and, in some respects, a student. In whatever position he was placed he displayed superior ability. Some of his duties were not of a military character. Those duties were of a nature such as to demand the exercise of great delicacy and tact, and consideration for the sensitiveness of others, and prompt decisions and firmness. He met those requirements in an eminent degree. The most important matters, not of a military nature, in reference to which his influence was beneficially exerted, *under orders*, were: The Nullification troubles in South Carolina in 1832; the Northeastern Boundary question; the Canadian disturbances in 1838; the removal of the Cherokee Indians, and the threatened difficulties at Puget's Sound. United with these characteristics and with some qualities really noble, were conspicuous foibles. He was inordinately vain and egotistical, and, also, jealous in the extreme. He offensively meddled in the trifling affairs of others, such, even, as the pronunciation of a word, or the details of domestic life. He and I, on one occasion, were the only guests at the table of a gentleman of high social position in New York, and Gen. Scott did not hesitate to volunteer suggestions, necessarily followed, from considerations of politeness, as directions as to the method of obtaining, by the carving knife, the most delicate morsels of the principal dish, every part of which was "a feast for a king." But, if any one wishes to know the details of Gen. Scott's weaknesses, he will find them stated in the book of Gen. E. D. Keyes, entitled, "Fifty Years' Observation of Men and Events." His "hero," as he terms Gen. Scott, is but one of those, long since dead, of whom he speaks disparagingly.

I think it well to add that Gen. Scott has been unjustly accused of advising, in regard to the seceding States, that the course to be pursued by the United States toward them should be expressed by the words: "Wayward sisters, depart in peace." Gen. Scott *did not so advise*. He merely pointed out to the Administration, in a semi-official letter, that it would be necessary to adopt one of but three courses, of which he briefly indicated one by the words quoted. What was his own choice was sufficiently shown while he remained in command of the army.

My brother and I had made arrangements to go to West Point, before we had heard of the serious illness of Gen. Scott, in order to make a visit to our nephew, who was then in his last year, and the Adjutant of the Corps. We were among the spectators of the funeral. Gen. Meade commanded the escort, and was mounted. Gen. Grant, on foot, was in the procession. The interment was in the Cemetery at the Point.

My brother and I put up at the hotel near Buttermilk Falls, as they had always been called. Of late the name has not been agreeable to sensitive ears, and the falls are now known as Highland Falls. In my opinion the change is not an improvement. The former name well described the appearance of the falls when the stream was full, and was as much identified with West Point as was the name of Benny Havens. Further than this, if I am not mistaken, there are other falls known as Highland Falls in the vicinity. In the summer of 1860, I went over the road between Garrison's and Cold Spring, and saw some beautiful falls, which, as I think I was told by our driver, bore the name of Highland Falls. Many of our people are becoming wonderfully sensitive of late, and are substituting high-sounding and far-fetched and inappropriate names for those which, if common-place, are often appropriate or historical, and to which the old residents were attached. Thus: Holmes's Hole has become Vineyard Haven, and for Tubby Hook we have Inwood. If this sort of thing is to continue, what will become of Dobb's Ferry, a name full of historic associations? To some names have been affixed "on-the-Hudson," and, more recently, "on-the-Sound," when, in many cases, no other similar names existed, and in none, should the name of the State be used in addition to that of the place, was there the slightest chance of any confusion. But then, these additions "are English, quite English, you know."

NOTE 26. My father would sometimes say, forgetting for the moment his own rank and position, that he would be perfectly content if he could be a Captain of Ordnance, immovably stationed at some arsenal of his own selection, with an appropriation to be expended according to his tastes. On some occasion, in the latter part of his life, I went with him to the rooms occupied as the Headquarters of the Ordnance Department at Washington, and some one of the young officers whom we met laughingly said to my father that, if the wish still continued, he had no doubt that the action of almost any Captain of Ordnance could be secured in order to effect an exchange.

NOTE 27. During a portion of the time my father was stationed at Allegheny Arsenal a company of the 2nd Art. was also stationed there. I do not know why the arsenal was garrisoned, and can only surmise that the reason was that, years before the Revolutionary War, Fort Pitt was considered an important military point!

NOTE 28. Captain Hallett was a native of Maine, I understand, but his home, in the latter part of his life, was at the South. I have recently formed the acquaintance, in Newport, of a gentleman who had resided at Wilmington for some years before and since the Civil War. He told me that Capt. Hallett was a bright, and, in some respects, an intelligent man, but very illiterate as well as blunt in speech. In illustration of this he mentioned an occurrence which is worth telling. Soon after Capt. Hallett's arrival from one of his voyages he fell in with a Mr. Kidder, who was in trade in Wilmington, and said to him: "Mr. Kidder, I have some freight on my brig for you, and I wish you would send for it." "That can't be," said Mr. Kidder, "I have not ordered anything from New York." "I don't care for that," Capt. H. answered, "there is some freight for you on the brig, and I wish you would send for it; it is in my way." "Very well," said Mr. K., "I will go down during the day and take a look at it." Accordingly, he strolled to the brig, and asked Capt. H. to show him the articles, whereupon the Captain pointed to a number of barrels. "Why, Captain Hallett," he said, "those are not for me." "Certainly they are," Captain H. answered, "see how they are marked: if C-i-d-e-r don't spell Kidder what the devil do they spell?"

NOTE 29. Fort Johnson is situated on the right bank of the river, about two miles from its mouth.

NOTE 30. Fort Caswell was undoubtedly named after Richard Caswell, Governor of North Carolina, 1777–9 and 1784–7.

NOTE 31. George Blaney. [Born in and appointed from Mass.] Cadet, July, '13; Bvt. 2nd Lt. Eng., March, '15; Sec. Lt., Oct., '16; Aid de C. to Brig. Gen. Swift, '17, '18; Fst. Lt., Nov., '18; Adj. Mil. Acad., March, '20, to March, '21, and Aug., '22, to May, '24; Capt., July, '24; Bvt. Maj., June, '34; Died at Smithville, May, '35; Interred at Wilmington. (After the death of Maj. B. his widow made Carlisle, Penna., her residence, which place was the residence of her mother, one or both of her sisters and her two brothers. It was on the suggestion of Mrs. Blaney that my father made Carlisle his family residence for some years. Maj. B. left a son and three daughters. The son died in early manhood. One daughter married a lawyer of Carlisle; another is the wife of Bvt Maj. Gen. Washington L. Elliott, of the Army, retired, and the third is the wife of

Bvt. Lt. Col. William B. Lane, of the Army, retired. A daughter of Col. and Mrs. Lane is the wife of Fst. Lt. Joseph Garrard, 9th Cav., and another is the wife of Fst. Lt. John F. Guilfoyle of the same regiment.)

NOTE 32. John De Barth Walbach. [Born in Germany; Ens. Royal Alsace Reg., in French service, belonging to Prince Maximilian, afterwards King of Bavaria, Dec., 1782; Sec. Lt. Lauzun Hussars, in French service, Jan., '86; Fst. Lt., May, '89; Capt. Rohan Hussars in German service, Oct., '93; Maj., Nov., '95.] Vol. Aid de C. to Brig. Gen. McPherson, '98; (appd. from Penna.); Fst. Lt. Cav. Jan'y, '99, and Adj.; Extra Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Hamilton, May, '99; Ass't Adj. Gen. to Brig. Gen. North, Sept., '99, and on Staff of Maj. Gen. Pinckney; Fst. Lt. 2nd Art. and Engs., Feb., '01; Aid de C. to Brig. Gen. Wilkinson, Oct., '01; Retained April, '02, Fst. Lt. Art.; Adj., Dec., '04; Capt., Jan. '06; Ass't Dep. Qm., March, '12; Ass't Adj. Gen. (rank of Maj.), June, '13; Adj. Gen. (rank of Col.), Aug., '13; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct at battle of Chrystler's Fields, Nov., '13; Bvt. Lt. Col., for meritorious services, May, '15; Retained May, '15 in Art.; Maj. Art., April, '18; Bvt. Col. for ten years faithful service, June, '30, to date from May, '25; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for meritorious conduct, May, '50, to date from Nov. '23; Lt. Col. 1st Art., May, '32; Col. 4th Art., March, '42; Died June, '57, at Baltimore.

(I never had the pleasure of seeing this gallant soldier and elegant gentleman of whom all spoke with affection and respect. My father admired him greatly. He told me that Gen. Walbach's usual exclamation was: "By Jove! By Jove!!" and gave me an illustration. On the occasion of the inspection of some troops made by him, Gen. Walbach happened to be present, but merely as a spectator. When, after the other ceremonies of the review had been completed, the officers approached and saluted my father in the usual manner, he said to the group: "Gentlemen, I propose that we all proceed to that gallant old soldier (indicating Gen. W.) and pay our respects to him." They willingly acceded to the proposition, proceeded to the place where Gen. W. was standing, and saluted him, and each offered a friendly hand. The old gentleman was visibly moved, his eye filled with tears, and he exclaimed: "By Jove! By Jove!!")

NOTE 33. William McRee. [Born Dec., 1787 at Wilmington, N. C.] Cadet, April, '03; Sec. Lt. Eng., July, '05; Fst. Lt., Oct., '06; Capt., Feb., '08; Maj., July, '12; Chief of Art. under Maj. Gen. Hampton, '13; Chief Eng. of Army under Maj. Gen. Brown, '14; Capture of Fort Erie, July 3, '14; Battle of Chippewa, July 5, '14; Battle of Niagara, July 25, '14;

Defense of Fort Erie during its Bombardment, Aug. 13–15, '14; Assault upon it, Aug. 15, '14, and sortie from it, by which the siege was raised, Sept. 17, '14; Bvt. Lt. Col. for gallant conduct in Battle of Niagara; Bvt. Col. for services in defense of Fort Erie; on professional duty in Europe in examining fortifications and Military Schools, and the operations of the Allied Armies in France. '15–'16; Lt. Col., Nov., '18; Res'd March, '19; [Surveyor Gen. of the U. S. for Ills., Mo., and Ark. Ter., '25–'32; Died at St. Louis, Sept., '32.] (Fort McRee in Pensacola Harbor was named after him.)

NOTE 34. Those officers were: Capt. and Bvt. Maj. Reynold M. Kirby, of Mass., who died in service, Oct., '42, at Fort Sullivan, Maine; Capt. and Bvt. Maj. Churchill, and Fst. Lt. Matthew A. Patrick, who died in service, March, '34, at Williamsport, Md., of Vermont; Fst. Lt. Daniel D. Tompkins, who died in service, Feb'y, '63, in Brooklyn, N. Y., of N. Y.; Sec. Lt. Richard C. Tilgham, resigned March, '36, and died March, '78, in Queen Anne Co., Md., of Md.; Fst. Lt. George W. Corprew, resigned June, '33, and died in '40, near Columbus, Miss., and Sec. Lt. Isaac R. Trimble, resigned May, '32, and still living, of Va. The last named was appointed from Kentucky. He graduated in '22, and is one of the oldest living graduates of the Military Academy. He was in the Confederate service, and, as I am informed, was wounded at Gettysburgh. I read in the papers that he attended the annual meeting of the graduates at West Point in 1877.

NOTE 35. On the 3rd of May, 1831, my mother wrote a letter to her sister, the wife of Hon. A. Aikens, of Windsor, Vermont, an extract or two from which may be interesting. Lt. Patrick, mentioned in the letter, was a native of Windsor. He had been stationed at Allegheny Arsenal during a part of the time my father was in command, and, as I always understood, was very genial and companionable in disposition. After disposing of various family and Windsor topics, my mother wrote concerning the negro alarm, and then concerning the arrival of the troops, and their presence in Wilmington: "When the vessel arrived the officers came ashore and we were truly rejoiced to see, in the commandant of one of the companies, our old friend, Mr. Patrick. We found amongst them two other acquaintances, and you will not wonder I was ready to cry for joy when I tell you they were the first and only familiar faces I have seen since I left you." [After explaining why the family did not accompany my father to Wilmington she proceeds:] "So, I have been alone except occasional visits of a day or two from

Syl. since before Christmas. Some of the gentlemen often came with him, and Mr. P. and I have talked Windsor over largely. The Wilmingtonians are our nearest neighbors * * * and many of them pass their summers here; yet I have resisted all invitations and temptations to visit them, till, sometime in March, there was a grand Military Ball given " [by the officers in acknowledgment of the civilities of the Wilmingtonians], "and, as my husband was interested in the affair, it was considered indispensable that I should go. Only think of *me*, going thirty miles to a ball and leaving four children ! ! But I did it, went up with the ladies and gentlemen of our garrison in the steamboat in the morning, attended the ball (a splendid one) in the evening, received calls from more than thirty ladies and sundry gentlemen next day, the next returned them all, the 4th returned to my children, found all well—that's what I call doing business."

Possibly some of the present generation will be surprised to learn that the postage on this letter was 25 cents. Owing, in part, to the rates of postage existing at that time, letters were but few compared with the number written at present by an equal population, and the writing and the receipt of a letter, especially if it came from a distance, one hundred miles or over ! were events of importance. I think that letter writing was considered more of an accomplishment then and, therefore, more cultivated as one, than it is at present. This letter, now before me, covers over three pages of foolscap paper, and is written on close, unruled lines. As each separate piece of paper, however small, was subject to the full postal charge, large sheets, rarely smaller than letter paper, were used, and were so folded that the address, the amount of postage and the postmark were written and stamped upon the exposed portion of one page. Envelopes, as they were subject to full charges, were rarely used in private correspondence. One advantage of that system was that the letter and postmark were inseparable.

NOTE 36. While we were in Washington my father and mother and all of their children went to the White House and were presented to President Jackson.

We were presented by Rev. Obadiah Brown, a Baptist Clergyman, and a staunch personal and political friend of the President. He was then the Pastor of a church in Washington, and had been a resident of the city for many years. I have recently read, in the Magazine of American History, that, when the British troops under Gen. Ross captured the City of Washington in August, 1814, Rev. O. Brown induced the Commander to spare the building which contained the models and other collections of the Patent Office, on the ground that they related to industry and

science. The records, unfortunately, were in the Post Office building, which was burnt by the enemy. in 1835, Rev. O. Brown had recently incurred some disfavor with the members of various religious denominations for the reason that he was the author of a report recommending the Sunday Mail Service, and which report the Administration adopted. He and his wife were at Smithville, when my father was in command of Fort Johnson, on a visit to the Ass't Surgeon, then stationed there, who was a relative of Mrs. Brown. During our stay in Washington I attended, on Sunday evening, the services in the church of which the Rev. O. Brown was the pastor, and for the first, and, possibly, the only time, saw and heard a Precentor. He sat, and, when singing, stood, in an enclosed space below the pulpit, which, as was the style, was well aloft.

I remember that, boy though I was, I looked forward to being presented to Gen. Jackson with much curiosity. The anti-Jackson party of the time so uniformly represented him as being profane, rude and violent, that I expected to see in him the embodiment of all those and like characteristics, and therefore I was more than surprised when I was presented to an elegant elderly gentleman, slender, and, apparently, rather feeble, with a mild voice and very soft and delicate hands. It was amusing to hear, in subsequent years, during the latter part of Buchanan's administration, people regret that Jackson was not President, he who, when President, had been represented as almost a disgrace to the country. Few persons knew then, or ever knew that Gen. Jackson had had much experience in civil life.

On this occasion we children were amused on seeing, placed upon a piece of furniture, which stood in the corner of the room, what appeared to be a section of a tree, from which the bark had not been removed, having on its side, in gilt letters, the words: Old Hickory. Possibly it was an enormous snuff-box, and was a present to the "Old Hero."

NOTE 37. While my father was at Fort Johnson he completed the purchase of about 600 acres of land in the Town of Crown Point, Essex County, New York, and much of the conversation in the family was in reference to his project, or, rather, waking dream, of becoming a farmer. The purchase included the whole of the peninsula, if it may be so called, extending in a northerly direction into Lake Champlain and lying between Bulwagga Bay on the west side and the main body of the lake on the east. On the northern end, the point jutting into the lake, were the ruins of the French Fort, a small work constructed while the French had command of the Lake, and, at a short distance, were the ruins of the English Fort, a much larger and more substantial and scientifically arranged work, constructed by the English after the command of the Lake

passed into their hands. Near this fort was what was known as "The King's Garden," and there, in 1835, I saw evidences of former cultivation and traces of paths and garden plats, but who were the last cultivators was not known; at least, it did not occur to me, at that time of my life, to inquire. The Forts, at Crown Point, were not the scene of any important conflicts during the Old French Wars or subsequently. The position was much superior for defensive operations to that at Ticonderoga. Both were commanded by heights in the vicinity, but those near Crown Point were much more distant than those near Ticonderoga. It will be remembered that, in 1778, a portion of the British troops under Gen. Burgoyne, dragged cannon to the summit of Mount Defiance and compelled the Americans, under Gen. St. Clair, to evacuate the fort at Ticonderoga. The English erected substantial and well constructed stone barracks in the fort at Crown Point. In 1835 my father ascertained that the residents of the farm houses in the vicinity had made a mere stone-quarry of those buildings. He put a stop to this at once, placed a roof on one of the buildings, the walls of which were still in good condition, and, as I understand, there has been no further destruction. In 1839 he sold all of the property which he had purchased except so much as was "contained within the outer verge of the ditch which surrounds the English Fort (so-called) * * * containing, by estimation, eleven and a half acres of land." Of this he made a lease forever for a nominal rent, with the provision that, if the United States or the State of New York should wish to purchase the premises for military purposes, he should have the right to sell the premises to either on paying to those who purchased from him a sum stated and the value of any permanent improvements made by them on the barracks. The lease also provided against waste on pain of forfeiture.

NOTE 38. My father owned some horses in Essex County, purchased a carriage, and, taking the reins into his own hands, drove all the way from Lake Champlain to Eastport in Maine, a sea voyage from Portland to Bangor excepted. The route was as follows: Lake Champlain was crossed at Westport to Winan's Harbor, thence to Vergennes, Williston, Waterbury, Stowe, Montpelier, Woodstock and Windsor, Vermont. At Windsor the Connecticut River was crossed to Cornish, and thence the route was to Hanover, Lyme, Centre Harbour, and by the north shore of Winnipiseogee Lake and by other villages in New Hampshire and Maine to Portland. The country between Bangor and Eastport, Maine, had but a small population outside of the villages, and was very uninteresting. The forests had been largely leveled by the ax or destroyed by fire, and for miles little was to be seen but the charred remains of trees

still standing, and a scanty second growth, and acre after acre of red raspberry bushes, loaded with berries then in their prime.

To the whole party the journey was very interesting. Country inns and taverns were numerous and well kept. My parents renewed the old associations of rural New England, and, in Vermont, met many of their former friends and acquaintances. To the younger members of the family, whose experiences had been in Army life and in southern society, and who had not been travelers since early childhood, almost every experience was novel, and there was much which served to interest, amuse, and instruct them. They had never before seen a group of school children arrange themselves on the side of the road, and salute the passing travelers, the boys by removing their caps, and the girls by "dropping courtesies." I wonder if this custom continues. But, if it does, the railway travelers of to-day see nothing of it; and, indeed, they see very little of country life and customs. As may readily be supposed, we children were regarded with curiosity and attracted some attention. North Carolina was very distant in those days. I remember that a relative in Stowe, a boy some years younger than I, showed off my younger brother and me, as having come from North Carolina, quite boastingly to another boy, as if to say: "You have no such relatives in your family." There, for the first time, in response to our narratives, I heard the expressions: "Dew tell," "I want to know," and the like. No doubt some of our language and our pronunciation sounded strangely to the residents of Stowe. So, the softened expletives, which we heard in various parts of the country, such as "By gosh," "I swow," "I swan," "I vow," and, as we heard, to our immense amusement, when uttered by a middle-aged woman, who had charge of a toll-gate, "I vum," seemed very odd. The contrast between such words and those which we had heard from the lips of soldiers, who never watered their methods of expressing themselves, or *anything else*, was marked.

Since that time I have traveled in every one of the New England States; in Maine to but a limited extent; in all the rest more frequently and extensively. Excluding Maine, of which I am not able to judge, I think that Vermont is far the most attractive of those States, in scenery, soil, streams, forests and other features of nature.

NOTE 39. See Article Cherokee Case in the Cyclopædia of Political Science.

NOTE 40. Andrew Jackson. [Born March, 1767, in S. C.] [In U. S. House of Representatives from Tennessee, '96, '97. In U. S. Senate,

'97, '98] Maj. Gen. Ten. Mila. in U. S. Service, Sept., '12; Commanding in battle of Talladega, on the Coosa River, Ala., with the Creek Indians, Nov., '13; also in battles on the Emuckfau, &c., Ala., Jan., '14; and in the battle of the Horse Shoe Bend of the Tallapoosa River, Ala., March, '14; Brig. Gen., with Bvt. of Maj. Gen., April, '14; Maj. Gen., May, '14; Commanding in defense of New Orleans in battles of Dec., '14, and Jan., '15; Rec'd thanks of Congress with presentation of a gold medal, Feb., '15; retained April, '15, in command of the Division of the South; res'd March, '21. [Governor of Florida Ter., March, '21; in U. S. Senate, '23 to '25; Judge of Supreme Court of Ten., '25; PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, March 4th, '29, to March 4th, '35; Died at the Hermitage, near Nashville, June, '45.] (The Creek nation was completely crushed, as a military power, in the battles mentioned. The number engaged on each side was probably far greater than in any other battle between the whites and the Indians.)

NOTE 41. John Floyd. [Born 1769 in S. C.] Brig. Gen. Geo. Mil. in U. S. Service, Aug., '13, to March, '14; Commanding in battle with the Creek Indians at Autossee, Ala., Nov., '13, in which severely wounded; Commanding in battle with the same at Camp Defiance, Ala., Jan., '14; Commanded Brigade Geo. Vols., Oct., '14. [In U. S. House of Rep's, '27 to '29; died June, '39, in Camden Co., Geo.]

NOTE 42. Fort Kent and Fort Fairfield were, no doubt, named after Governors of the State of Maine.

NOTE 43. My mother had many amusing narratives to relate of their experience in those regions, then quite remote. She told me that, on one occasion, she and my father attended a picnic near one of the country inns at which they spent some time, and, naturally, were the honored guests. She said that, when the party started to return, the keeper of the inn, who was in his shirt sleeves, offered her his arm, which she accepted, and she added that he carried a rifle on his shoulder, and on the way home killed three squirrels. I asked: "Well, mother, what did you do while this was going on?" She answered, with a hearty laugh, "Oh, I waited till he had re-loaded his rifle and then resumed his arm and walked on."

NOTE 44. William T. Sherman. [Born in and appointed from Ohio.] Cadet, July, '36; Sec. Lt. 3rd Art., July, '40; Fst. Lt., Nov., '41; Acting Ass't Adj. Gen. Dep't of Cal'a, May, '47, to Feb'y, '49; Bvt. Capt. for meritorious services, May, '48; Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Persifor F. Smith and Acting Ass't Adj. Gen. Pacific Division, Feb., '49, to Jan., '50; Capt. Com. Sub., Sept.. '50; res'd Sept., '53: [Banker, San Francisco, '55 to '57, and at New York, '57; Maj. Gen. Cal'a Mila. '56; Superintendent Louisiana State Seminary and Mil. Acad'y, '59 to '61]; Col. 13th Inf., May, '61; Brig. Gen. Vol's, May, '61; Maj. Gen. Vol's, May, '62, to Aug., '64; Brig. Gen., July, '63; Maj. Gen., Aug., '64; Rec'd Thanks of Congress, Feb., '64 and Jan'y, '65; Lt. Gen., July, '66; Gen., March, '69; Retired, Feb'y, '84. (It is not to be expected that I would attempt to state the outlines, even, of Gen. Sherman's services.)

NOTE 45. Richard P. Hammond. [Born in and app'd from Md.] Cadet, July, '37; Bvt. Sec. Lt. 4th Art., July, '41; In 3rd Art., Sept., '41; Fst. Lt., May, '46; Adj., Oct., '48; Aid de C. and Acting Ass't Adj. Gen. to Brig. Gen. Shields, '47, '48; Bvt. Capt. for gal. cond. in Battle of Cerro Gordo, April, '47; Bvt. Maj. for gal. cond. in Battles of Contreras and Churubusco, Aug. 19, 20, '47; Distinguished in Battle of Chapultepec, Sept. 13, '47; Res'd, May, '51. [From the time of his resignation he has been a resident of California, and now resides at San Francisco. He was a lawyer in Stockton in '51–'2; Speaker of H. of Rep. of Cal'a, '52; Col. of Customs in San Francisco in '53–'5, and has held several civic positions.]

(My father had a great liking for Lt. Hammond, and twice, at least, requested that he be detailed to duty with him. On the last occasion, my mother, in expressing, in a letter to me, her gratification that the detail had been made, wrote: "He understands your father and your father understands him." The last detail was in the summer of 1846, and on completion of the duties involved, my father wrote to Lt. Hammond, as follows:

"INS. GEN.'S DEP'T, ST. LOUIS, July 19, 1846.

TO LIEUT. R. P. HAMMOND, 3d Art.,

Sir: The duties of mustering volunteers in several of the Western States, as directed in the instructions from Gen. H'd Qrs. of the 28th of May last to me, being completed, you are relieved from duty as my Assistant on that service, and, in compliance with the aforesaid instructions, you will proceed to join your company.

Wishing you all the happiness of earth and heaven, and sincerely thanking you for your attention to duty, and your ever ready and kind

assistance in a term of nearly three years, I am, Sir, your ob't servt. and friend,

S. CHURCHILL, Ins. Gen.")

NOTE 46. Thomas Sidney Jesup. [Born in Va., 1788; app'd from Ohio.] Sec. Lt. 7th Inf., May, '08; Fst. Lt., Dec., '09; Brig. Maj. and Acting Adj. Gen. to Brig. Gen. Hull, '12; Capt., Jan., '13; Maj. 19th Inf., April, '13; Trans'd to 25th Inf., '14; Bvt. Lt. Col. for services in the Battle of Chippewa, July 5th, '14; Bvt. Col. for services in the Battle of Niagara, in which he was severely wounded, July 25th, '14; Retained May, '15, in 1st Inf.; Lt. Col. 3rd Inf., April, '17; Adj. Gen. (rank of Col.), March, '18; Quar. Mas. Gen. (rank of Brig. Gen.), May, '18; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for ten years' faithful service, May, '28; In command of the Army in the Creek Nation, Ala., May, '36; In command of the Army in Florida, Dec., '36; Wounded in action near Juniper Inlet, Jan., '38; Returned to his Dep't, May, '38; Died in the City of Washington, June, '60. (The Artillery Companies, then stationed at Fort Monroe, went to Washington to act as the Funeral Escort, or a part of it. My brother went with the troops from Fort Monroe.)

NOTE 47. Zachary Taylor. [Born in Va., Nov., 1784; son of Col. Richard Taylor, of the Rev. Army; app'd from Ken.] Fst. Lt. 7th Inf., May, '08; Capt. Nov., '10; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct in defense of Fort Harrison, Sept., '12; Maj. 26th Inf., May, '14; Commanding in affair with British and Indians at mouth of Rock River, Aug., '14; Retained as Capt. 7th Inf. with his brevet, May, '15—declined; Retained as Maj. 3rd Inf., May, '16; Lt. Col. 8th Inf., April, '19; In 1st Inf., May, '21; Col. 1st Inf., '32; Com. a Brigade under Brig. Gen. Atkinson in Battle of Bad Axe, Aug., '32; Transferred to 6th Inf., July, '33; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for services in Battle of Okeechobee, Dec., '37; In command of the Army in Florida, May, '38; In command of the "Army of Occupation" in Texas, July, '45; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for conduct in Battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, May 8th and 9th, '46; Maj. Gen. June, '46; Rec'd Thanks of Congress, July 16th, '46, with the presentation of a gold medal; In command in the victory of Monterey, Sept. 23rd, '46; Rec'd Thanks of Congress, March 2nd, '47, with the presentation of a gold medal, for victory at Monterey; In command in the Battle of Buena Vista, Feb. 22 and 23, '47; Rec'd Thanks of Congress, May 9th, '48, with the presentation of a gold medal for victory at Buena Vista; Res'd Jan., '49. [PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES from March 4th, 1849; Died in office at Washington, July 9th, 1850.]

NOTE 48. On or about this date my father commenced a journal, extracts from which appear in the sketch, and continued it, with, apparently, occasional breaks, during the rest of his life. It was kept in a number of small-sized and lightly bound blank books, which I found, with a large amount of manuscripts of the drafts of his official letters and reports, among his effects after his death. It is highly probable that some of the books, containing portions of the journal, were lost or mislaid. There was no reason why at any time he should have suspended making such entries. I am not aware that any one ever heard of this journal. Its existence was not known to me. It is probable that it was written in order to employ the hours of his solitary journeying, or the more solitary hours of his waiting, at remote points, for orders or for means of conveyance, and without a thought that it would be read by any one. At times it enters into details. At other times it merely notes the number of miles of travel, the names of the places left or reached, and the means of conveyance. It is, I think, very interesting, illustrating, as it does, the local customs and methods of travel of the day, as well as containing narratives of unusual personal experiences. I may mention here, that I saw, at one time, a journal kept by him during the march of the Army commanded by Gen. Izard, from Lake Champlain to the Niagara Frontier, in 1814. My father's responsibilities on that march were important for the reason that it was his duty, as an officer of the Staff, to ride in advance of the Army, at the close of each day, select the place of encampment, and lay out the camp. This journal has been lost.

NOTE 49. Mr. Ruggles was a native of Rhode Island, as I understood, had been at sea in early life, and had visited many of the islands in the Pacific Ocean when their inhabitants had not changed materially from their primitive condition. By means of one of those strange events or accidents which occur in the lives of wanderers, he came to Smithville, or its vicinity, and married. He kept a small "store" near the fort, and my father and he were great friends, and spent hours in playing backgammon. As Mr. R. was quite deaf he was always ready for backgammon during the day, and whist in the evening. He was a kind-hearted and unassuming man, and noted for his integrity, the simplicity of his character, and the directness of his language.

NOTE 50. It may be well to state that they desired to *rescue* the prisoners, not for the benefit of the latter, but for the purpose of settling old scores with them, to whatever length, in order to accomplish this, it might be deemed necessary by them to go. No doubt they believed that "the best Indian is a dead Indian."

NOTE 51. The following entry in the journal is written out of the order of dates:

Oct. 2, 1836. In the march from Fort Mitchell to Cloud's Ferry to-day, I passed the late residence of Capt. Winship (or Winslet—have forgotten which is the name—) who, with Maj. Rogers, a half-blood Cherokee chief, spent several days at Smithville, most of the daytime at my quarters, in 1833. They came there in company with Maj. Smith [Paymaster, U. S. A. We saw him and his family in Norfolk, where he resided, in 1835, on our way north. He visited Smithville several times in order to pay the troops, and was always a guest of my parents] from Norfolk. After my arrival at Fort Brooke [Tampa Bay], in Oct., I learned that Winship had been at that place the winter and spring before in the public service, and had died there in May. He was a white man, but brought up and had lived all his life near to and among Indians,—possessing a *strong* body, constitution and *mind*, but without learning, with a very retentive memory. In 1835 Maj. Smith informed me that, a year or more after the visit at Smithville, he was traveling in the interior of Florida, and arrived late one dark night at a hut where he saw Capt. W. standing in the light of a bright light-wood fire, and, as he saw him, called out from the carriage or wagon: "How do you do, Capt. Winship?" The latter replied immediately, knowing who it was, who had spoken to him, by the voice: "Very well. How do you do, Maj. Smith? How did you leave Maj. Churchill?" When Major Smith told me this, I supposed the part relating to me was an embellishment of his own; but, in the spring of 1837, Maj. Graham, with whom I had just become acquainted, related the circumstance in nearly the same words.

NOTE 52. On the 30th of Oct., 1836, Col. Henderson, of the Marine Corps, was in command of the Post at Tampa Bay, but my father, having been a Major for but about a year and a half, was in command of all the *Army* troops, which consisted of 15 companies, one of the 1st Art., four of the 2d, four of the 3rd, three of the 4th, two of the 4th Inf., and one Washington volunteers. This fact shows that but a portion of the Field Officers of the Army, at that time, were capable of performing campaign duty, and proves that there should always have been a "Retired List." Such was the case, also, during the Mexican war. Capt. and Bvt. Col. Justin Dimick, 1st Art., told me that, at one time, he was in command of his regiment in Mexico, and this fact is stated in Gardner's Army Dictionary. Yet, he was not a Major till April, 1850. In February and March, 1846, my father inspected the "Army of Occupation" commanded by Gen. Taylor at Corpus Christi, Texas. The draft of his report, which I have before me, states that eleven companies of

Artillery, serving as Infantry, formed a part of the 1st Brigade under Gen. Worth, and were commanded by Capt. and Bvt. Lt. Col. Childs of the 3rd Art. The report further states that the Major of Artillery, who had been assigned to the command of a battalion of four companies of Light Artillery, was not able to ride on horseback "at review, drill or march, in consequence of varicose veins in his legs, and the parade was commanded by Maj. Ringgold [Bvt. Maj. and mortally wounded at Palo Alto], physically and by practice well qualified for field service." It is merely to be added that, when such of those junior officers as survived the war, returned to the duties of peace, they fell back to their grades, and were commanded by old or enfeebled men, gallant old soldiers, who had ably served their country, but who should have been in honorable retirement with a generous governmental support.

As bearing upon the same subject, I think it well to make an extract from a report submitted in the latter part of 1849, and entitled "General Remarks," as follows: "Serious obstructions to proficiency are found * * * in the broken or scattered condition of the Infantry [he inspected one regiment of Infantry which occupied *nine* posts], which precludes a knowledge of the evolutions of the line, and, in many instances, those of the battalion, both essentially necessary to efficiency in that arm. There are now in service, and will be whenever the troops are required to take the field, as at the commencement of the late war with Mexico, many officers who are not capable of performing those manœuvres, and some will not learn them by either study or practice unless *forced* to it. Much improvement might be made by study and recitation two or three evenings in a week, during the winter months by all the officers and men of each post, including, always, the commanding officer, whatever may be his rank."

NOTE 53. The Indians owned horses or ponies, cattle, swine, and *negro slaves*. It was by constant scouting and scouring the country, and thus, when warriors could not be found, by capturing the live stock and slaves of the Indians, their squaws and children, and preventing them from raising crops and accumulating supplies of provisions, that the Indians were crippled and finally subdued.

NOTE 54. I make, here, several extracts from the journal, or references to its contents:

In February, 1837, Gen. Jesup, while in the interior, received messages from some of the chiefs to the effect that they wished to have a "talk" with him with a view to a capitulation. Arrangements were

made, and, accordingly, on the 6th of March, the chiefs came to Fort Dade and the negotiations commenced. My father, in his journal, gives the names of five of the chiefs, and he mentions the fact that the *royal* descent is by the female line. He also states that Abram, a free negro, who, like all the "Indian negroes," spoke English, was always present at the Councils, and frequently interpreted what was said, but seemed, publicly, to have no voice or influence. In point of fact, however, though not a chief, he had much influence.

(An Indian Funeral and an Indian Beauty). "March 8. To-day, the son of John Ho-pon-ney, a youth of much promise for an Indian, who died last evening, was buried. John is a Captain of a company in the Creek regiment, a Chief, in whom, for fidelity and judgment, the general confides more than in any other. He resided many years ago in Florida, was at first hostile, but submitted to Gen. Jackson, and, when he went, some years since, for what cause I do not know, to the Creek Nation, he left many relatives here, among whom is one of his daughters, apparently about 20 years old, who arrived this morning from among the Seminoles, and just in time to see the dead body of her brother and attend his funeral. She is dressed in a calico frock of unusual length, with a border or flounce at or near the bottom, her breast covered with silver plates of various sizes, like scales, nine ornaments hanging pendant from her ears; a broad band of silver, about four inches, on each wrist, and a ring on each finger with an oval centre-plate from one inch, the smallest, to one and a half inches, the largest, long, all of plain silver; and BAREFOOTED and bareheaded, without any hair ornaments, and no beads. Appears solemn, but little grieved. John walks to the grave *barefooted* and *bare-legged* with a black silk handkerchief laid or spread over his head, the corners falling on his shoulders (he generally wears a black beaver hat) looking sedate and afflicted, but no *tears* are seen. The dead boy was supplied with a haversack of provisions, &c., laid on the coffin in the grave for *his* use, and a volley of musketry fired over the grave for the use of 'whom it may concern.' The general and Staff and many other officers and soldiers joined in the funeral procession: a *company* performed the honors. The boy was much attached to his father, and, on a march or anywhere in company, was invariably seen riding next behind him. About two hours after the funeral I called on a visit of condolence, found John in his tent very solemn—and the lass, who is rather small and pretty, and married, they say, with her hands, fingers, RINGS, and all, in the kettle stirring sofka." (What is, or was, Sofka? F. H. C.)

"March 20th. The moon, for three nights past, has been vertical, or directly overhead, at her southing, casting no *length* of shadow from a rod or straight stick, suspended by a thread!!! (It was, therefore, from this parallel of latitude, and possibly, from this spot, that Jules Verne's travelers started some years afterwards on their expedition to the moon. F. H. C.).

NOTE 55. The following is from the journal, but much condensed:

On the 18th of March Micanopy, Head Chief of the Indians, ratified, at Fort Dade, the agreement for capitulation and emigration already made by some of the Sub-chiefs, and afterwards he and many of the Sub-chiefs and Indians proceeded to Tampa Bay, and went into camp about eight miles from Fort Brooke. It was hoped and believed that the "war" was at an end, that the rest of the Indians would come in, and that all would be removed from Florida by the transports which had already been engaged. About the 1st of June, Gen. Jesup was apprised of a design on the part of some Indians from the interior to approach the camp of Micanopy, and force him and all those enrolled for emigration back to "The Nation," but he did not deem it prudent to guard Micanopy and his camp openly, as it would disclose to him that there was apprehension of *some* danger, which, it was hoped, was *not* real, and would produce the worst of consequences if he and his people were then acting in good faith.

The result proved that there was ground for apprehension of danger. A party of Indians came to Micanopy's camp, and, as was alleged, *forced* him, Jumper, Cloud, and all their people off to the interior, and it became necessary to renew the wearisome, thankless, and, generally, fruitless task of hunting for and harassing the Indians, and this at a time when a part of the cool season had been lost, and the heat of summer had commenced. Micanopy sent friendly messages, after he had been "forced off," but I think that it is not to be doubted that Gen. Jesup greatly erred, and that he should have made every Indian understand that, if he should "come in" after a "talk," resulting in terms of capitulation and emigration, he would come in "to stay" and as a prisoner. It was on account of this information received by Gen. Jesup, and in order to be prepared for any attack or disturbance, that my father loaded his pistols.

NOTE 56. Mention is made in the journal that Judge Crane's house was in the old Spanish fort, in which the Englishman, Arbuthnot, was found and taken by Gen. Jackson in May, 1818, and where he and Robert C. Ambrister were tried, executed (Arbuthnot hung and Ambrister shot) and buried.

I add a few lines. Florida, in 1818, was a colony or dependency of Spain. Arbuthnot and Ambrister were British subjects, the former, to be accurate, being a Scotchman, and the latter a native of the Bahamas. Gen. Jackson, who, in these proceedings as in others, "took the responsibility," ordered that the two be tried by a Court Martial, by which they were found guilty of having incited the Indians to warfare, and of having supplied them with arms and ammunition, and sentenced to death.

There had been a number of engagements, on a small scale, in Georgia, between the Florida Indians (Seminoles and Micosukees) and the U. S. Troops, and Gen. Jackson, who was then in command of the Division of the South, in order to crush the Indians in their homes, *invaded* Florida. He did not confer with the Administration, that of Mr. Monroe, as to the propriety of carrying the sentence of the Court Martial into effect, and yet it was thought that there was no such necessity for immediate action as to justify him in failing to ask for instructions. These proceedings on his part, and his subsequent capture of Pensacola, made a great sensation, and irritated England and Spain. At home, Gen. Jackson was assailed and censured fiercely by a portion of the press, by men in public life and in Congress. J. Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, sustained him in the Cabinet, which was divided. See article on Andrew Jackson in Appleton's Encyclopædia.

NOTE 57. Sept. 17th, 1837. Met with another accident by the upsetting of a two-horse stage in the northern part of Georgia.

NOTE 58. On or about the 10th of Oct., '37. at Augusta, Georgia, Maj. C., having completed his work in Georgia, and, after having taken his seat in the stage for Savannah, on his way to Florida, received an order from Gen. Jesup to proceed to Jackson Co., Ala., in the N. E. of that State, to muster into service a regiment of volunteers and accompany it to Black Creek, Florida. There is a break in the journal from Oct. 10th, till Nov. 24th, when it was resumed at Tallahassee, Florida, which place the regiment had reached. It arrived at Black Creek on the 4th of Dec., and the journal notes the travel to that point from Augusta as having been 130 miles by stage and 906 on horseback.

NOTE 59. In Dec., '37, Maj. C. had an attack of chills and fever, and, as of the 25th, being then at Newnansville, made this entry: "My visitor calls again before breakfast, and, while others are *merry* around me, I am shaken severely both by the ague and the jarring vibration given to the frail tenement (the house which must have been *nearly* made *without* hands) in which I *stay*, by the dancing or jumping of the rude company assembled for the 'compliments of the season' in a dance which lasted from sunset till sunrise after—and the thumping on the *loose* floor by the heel of the negro fiddler in beating or pounding time." My father wrote in his journal about this time, that his cart was driven by a man named Burke. Burke was a private in Co. A, 3rd Art., commanded by Capt. (afterwards Bvt. Brig.) Childs, at Fort Sullivan, Eastport, Maine, in 1835–6. He was not in the service in Dec., '37, but re-

enlisted and died at the Soldiers' Home near Washington. He called upon me in New York on his way to the Home, and afterwards called upon my father in Washington.

NOTE 60. While Maj. C. was in the discharge of this duty, he received a letter as follows:

"PHILIPSBURG, MISSISSQUI BAY,
28th June, 1838.

SIR:

Understanding that you arrived at Swanton yesterday in command of a detachment of United States troops, I take the opportunity offered by that information, of placing myself in communication with you, and of expressing my readiness to unite with you in the preservation of tranquility on this part of our frontier and of the neutrality due to each other from the subjects of two nations whose governments are at perfect peace.

I deem it right to state to you that the subjects of Her Majesty, the Queen of England, on this side of the Province Line, are most quietly and peaceably disposed, and that nothing is farther from their thoughts than to disturb and meddle with the affairs of their opposite neighbors; but in the event of any untoward act on the part of the refugees from Canada, and their aiders and abettors in Swanton and its neighborhood, an incursion should be made, as a military man, you must be sensible how difficult, if not impossible, it would be to check men justly exasperated at a wanton attack on their homes and families, in pursuit of the success which would undoubtedly attend their efforts to repel such an attempt so immediately in the vicinity of the Province Line.

I beg to introduce to you the bearer of this letter, Lieutenant Taylor of the Mississqui Volunteers, who will furnish you with any information which he possesses and you may desire, respecting this part of our frontier; —and in the hope that we may soon witness a check to the feelings of antipathy which so unfortunately at this moment exists between the people in our immediate front,

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
With respect and consideration,
Your most obedient Servant,

W. S. WILLIAMS,
Major in Her Majesty's Service, and
Com'd'g the Mississqui District.

TO MAJOR CHURCHILL,
&c., &c., &c.,
Swanton."

The answer to the above was as follows:

"FRONTIER OF VERMONT,
Swanton, July 2, 1838.

TO MAJ. W. S. WILLIAMS,
in Her Majesty's Service,
Com'd'g Mississqui District, Canada.

SIR:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, by Lieut. Taylor, of your letter of the 28th ult., on the day of its date. I thank you, Sir, for the prompt and friendly manner in which you have opened a communication with me; and I reciprocate your wish to be instrumental in preserving the tranquility of our respective borders, and shall cheerfully cooperate in such measures as are best calculated to promote and secure it. From no information which I have obtained should I infer that there is any preparation, or intention, on the part of the people of the Vermont frontier, to disturb the amicable relations now existing between our governments, and which it is so desirable to maintain. They will, I presume, equally with yourselves, be disposed to resist any invasion of their homes and rights, but I feel justified in saying that they will not be the aggressors.

Allow me to introduce to you Lieut. Freeman, 4th Art., Army, the bearer of this communication. With it I enclose for your *own* information, some printed laws of Congress, and an order of Maj. Gen'l Macomb, commanding the Army.

With great respect, I am, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
S. CHURCHILL,
Maj. 3rd Art.,
Com'd'g Frontier of Vermont."

It would have been delicate, to say the least, if Maj. Williams had limited himself to expressing his readiness to unite with Maj. Churchill in the preservation of neutrality, and to introducing Lieut. Taylor, and had refrained from informing Maj. C., "as a military man," or otherwise, what might be the consequences of an attack upon the homes and families of persons residing north of the line. But the tendering of such information was characteristic, and might have been expected, at that time, from a "Major in Her Majesty's Service." The memory of Waterloo and of England's overthrow of Napoleon and of his death, a solitary prisoner, in a distant island, was still fresh, and the naval superiority of England, established at least a half century before, and which, for the reason that steam had not been introduced as a motive power in ships of war, still continued, made her the most powerful of nations. It

is not strange that England played the bully at times, or that Englishmen, often, carried the same spirit into their intercourse with foreigners. It is said that the average Englishman of the period described every foreigner as "some sort of a creature, you know." It must be admitted that the Americans, not only on the frontier of Vermont, but on the entire frontier, irrespective of their opinions concerning the grievances, real or imaginary, of which the "Canadian Rebels" complained, had feelings of hostility, inherited from past generations, toward England. It is a curious circumstance that the course of England toward the United States had served but to perpetuate and intensify the hostile sentiments which resulted from the differences which led to the War of Independence and from the war itself. Until 1796 various posts, not less than eight in number, from Macinac to Lake Champlain, all lying within the territory of the United States, were garrisoned by British troops, whose officers exercised jurisdiction over the surrounding country. It was with great difficulty that Gen. Wayne, after his victory over the Indians in 1794, restrained his troops from assailing and capturing a newly built British fort, just south of Detroit, which they met in the pursuit of the Indians. It is true that England alleged that there were good reasons for retaining possession of those forts, but, still, the fact was a cause of irritation. In addition to this the British fleets in 1783 carried away about 3 000 negroes, contrary to the terms of the treaty of peace, and, for them England refused to make payment. Then came, during the wars in Europe which followed the French Revolution, the measures adopted by England which tended to cripple and destroy the commerce of the United States. And finally, and this was the most galling of all the proceedings of England, and which principally led to the war of 1812–'14, England claimed the right, and actually enforced it, to search American vessels, even ships of war, for subjects of Her Majesty.

If, in the lapse of time, the feelings of hostility, which have been mentioned, had been obliterated or buried, they were renewed, during our late civil war, on other grounds. The well-known if not avowed sympathy of England for the Seceding States, based as we believed, and still believe, not upon love of them, or dislike of us, but upon jealousy of the whole country, and the building, equipping, and furnishing with fuel, provisions, men and munitions of war, in English ports, of cruisers, which were Confederate but in name, and which substantially destroyed American commerce; these facts revived all the feelings of 1775-'83 and 1812–'14. I doubt whether the officers and crew of the Kearsarge could have enjoyed more the putting into the Alabama of every shot which they planted in her if she had flown a British instead of a Confederate flag. The most offensive feature of all to the individual American was that he was obliged to listen to the expression of regrets that the Union would never be restored. An Englishman said to me, with a shake of

the head: "I am sorry, I am sorry, but I am afraid that you will never succeed." I believed that, though he did not intentionally speak falsely, he was unconsciously exultant and was not sorry, but what could I say? We *did* succeed, and we now feel and say that we forgive, even if we cannot forget. I can state, however, as to my English friend, for we were well acquainted and were friends, that he understood and appreciated my views and wishes better than did many of my own countrymen, who considered all of us Democrats more or less disloyal because we did not conform in our views to *theirs*. As to them, also, we now feel and say that we forgive even if we cannot forget.

My father had had another opportunity, long before this, to fire a return shot. During the war of '12–'14, he was sent on a vessel to the northern end of Lake Champlain on some matter connected with an exchange of prisoners. This was not long before the invasion conducted by Sir George Prevost, and which the English hoped would have results which Gen. Burgoyne had failed to accomplish. Counting too much upon the political hostility of the New England States to the Administration of Mr. Madison, they hoped that the capture of Albany by the British Army would cause so much disaffection in the East that the Administration would be glad to make peace on terms advantageous to England. Hence the air was full of surmises as to the proposed invasion and its possible results. On this occasion, while my father was busily engaged in the cabin of the vessel with the officer appointed to confer with him concerning the exchange, another officer came in, with much bluster, and said to my father: "Can you tell me, Sir, what is the distance from Whitehall to Albany?" My father answered: "I do not know the exact distance, but I have always understood that Saratoga is about midway between the two points, and that it is (stating the distance) miles from Whitehall." What was the real object of the question can only be surmised, but it was clear that the officer saw the reference to Saratoga, the place where Burgoyne surrendered, for he "took nothing by his motion," said nothing further, but turned upon his heel and departed. My father enjoyed telling me of this, and I enjoyed hearing it.

NOTE 61. William Grigsby Freeman. (Born in and appointed from Va.) Cadet, July, '30; Bvt. Sec. Lt. 4th Art., July, '34; Ass't Com. Sub., July, '36; Bvt. Fst. Lt. for gallantry and services in Florida war, March, '43 to date from Nov., '36; Adj. & Capt. Reg't mounted Creek Vol's, Sept., '36, and Maj., June to Sept., '37; Fst. Lt. July, '38; Ass't Inst. Art. & Cav., M. A., Feb., '40, to Aug., '41; Ass't Adj. Gen. (rank of Capt.), Dec., '41: (rank of Maj.) March, '47; Capt., Sept., '47; Bvt. Lt. Col. for meritorious conduct, March, '49, to date from May, '48; Resd., March, '56. [Died, Nov., '66, at Cornwall, Penn.]

NOTE 62. William Jenkins Worth. (Born in N. Y., 1794.) Fst. Lt. 23rd Inf., March, '13; Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Lewis, '13; Aid de C. to Brig. Gen. Scott, March, '14; Bvt. Capt. for gallant conduct in the Battle of Chippewa, July 5th, '14; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct in the Battle of Niagara, July 25th, '14, in which he was severely wounded; Capt., Aug., '14; Retained, May, '15, in 2nd Inf.; Instr. Inf. Tac. and Com'd't of Cadets, March, '20, to Dec., '28; Maj. Ord., May, '32; Col. 8th Inf., July, '38; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for gallantry in Florida war, March, '42; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for services at Monterey, Sept., '46; Rec'd a sword by resolution of Congress, Mar.. '47; Com. Div. in Gen. Scott's army; Distinguished at Vera Cruz, Puebla, Churubusco, and Mexico; Died May, '49, at San Antonio, Texas.

NOTE 63. Abraham Eustis. (Born in Mass., 1786). Capt. Light Art., May, '08; Maj., March, '10; Com. his Reg't in capture of York, U. C., April, '13; Bvt. Lt. Col. for meritorious services, Sept., '13; Retained, May, '15, in Light Art.; In 4th Art., May, '21; Lt. Col. 4th Art., May, '22; Bvt. Col. for 10 years faithful service, Sept., '23; Bvt. Brig. Gen., June, '34; Col. 1st Art., Nov., '34; Died June, '43, at Portland, Maine. (Gen. E. had two sons in the Army, graduates of the U. S. Mil. Acad.: one, William, now residing in Phil., and the other, Henry Langdon, for many years Prof. Lawrence Sci. School, Harvard University, who died in 1885, at Cambridge, Mass.)

NOTE 64. Walker Keith Armstead. (Born in and app'd from Va.) Cadet, May, '01; Sec. Lt. Eng., March, '03; Fst. Lt., June, '05; Capt., Oct., '06; Maj., July, '10; Lt. Col., July, '12; Ch. Eng. of Army on the Niagara, Oct., '12; In bombardment of Fort Niagara, Nov., '12; Eng. for defence of Norfolk, &c., '13; Col. & Chief Eng., Nov., '18; Retained, May, '21; Col. 3rd Art., June, '21; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for ten years faithful service, Nov., '28; Died at Upperville, Va., Oct., '45.

NOTE 65. William Gates. (Born in and app'd from Mass.; Son of Capt. Lemuel Gates of the Army.) Cadet, March, '01; Sec. Lt. Art., March, '06; Fst. Lt., Nov., '07; Capt., March, '13; In bombardment and capture of Fort George, U. C., May, '13; Retained, May, '15, in Art.; In 2nd Art., May, '21; Bvt. Maj. for 10 years faithful service, March, '23; Maj. 1st Art., May, '32; In 2nd Art., Aug., '36: Lt. Col. 3rd Art., Dec., '36; Col. 3rd Art., Oct., '45; Retired, June, '63; Bvt. Brig. Gen., March, '65; Died in city of New York, Oct., '68.

NOTE 66. John Rogers Vinton. (Born in and app'd from R. I.) Cadet, '14; 3rd Lt. Art., July, '17; Sec. Lt., Oct., '17; Fst. Lt., Sept., '19; In 4th Art., June, '21; In 3rd Art., Dec., '21; Aid de C. to Gen. Brown, March, '25, to May, '28; Bvt. Capt. for 10 years faithful service, Sept., '29; Capt., Dec., '35; Distinguished in action, Feb. 8th, '37; Bvt. Maj. for services at Monterey, Sept., '46; Killed at Vera Cruz, March, '47.

NOTE 67. Isaac H. Baldwin. (App'd from Va.) Ass't Sur., Aug., '36; Res'd, May, '41.

NOTE 68. George C. Rodney. (Born in and app'd from Del.) Cadet, '33; Sec. Lt. 3d Art., July, '37; Fst. Lt., July, '38; Ass't Com. Sub., Dec., '38; Died, Nov., '39, at St. Augustine, Fla.

NOTE 69. While on the steamboat Forester and near Brunswick, Geo., my father made this entry in his journal: "North of B. saw the bow of the steamboat Clarendon, which was burnt, by accident, last winter and sunk; thought of 'How swiftly glides the Clarendon o'er the smooth Cape Fear,' and looked at the 'smoke' of the Forester in memory of *pious* Mrs. W. of Wilmington." That the significance of this entry may be understood an explanation is necessary. During our residence at Smithville the Clarendon was put upon the Cape Fear River to ply between Smithville and Wilmington, taking the place of a much smaller steamboat. By most of the people of the vicinity, including all of the negroes and all of the boys, except such of the latter as had had the advantages of travel, the Clarendon was considered a miracle of marine architecture, never before equaled and never thereafter to be surpassed. "*Pious* Mrs. W." was a lady of high social position, and not only pious, but poetical and sentimental withal. In those days, and in that part of the country, piety was of a stalwart type, and religious tenets were held without dilution or concession. If any one had undertaken to broach the theory of probation of the present day, the Sheol of the Revised Version would have been considered too mild for him. Bvt. Maj. Geo. Blaney, of the Army, was fond of telling that he happened to find himself a fellow-passenger, on the Clarendon, with Mrs. W., on a pleasant and calm day, and that, while they were sitting together, she broke out with: "How swiftly glides the Clarendon o'er the smooth Cape Fear," and that, suddenly, a change in the course of the boat, or in the direction of the light wind, brought into view the dense volume of the black smoke rising from the pine wood fuel and pouring forth from

the chimney stack, whereupon Mrs. W. exclaimed: "Oh! Shocking! Shocking! Shocking! that smoke makes me think of the torments of the damned!"

NOTE 70. I think that the political supporters of Mr. Clay were more devoted to him, personally, than were the supporters of any other public man, who has made a name in the history of the country, to their leader. His supporters were, each and all, his personal friends. Their devotion was not due, as is often the case, to his connection with important events, to his skill and wisdom in dealing with any crisis, or to the prestige which results from success. His supporters continued to cling to him in spite of defeat. He was often nominated for the Presidency, and as often was unsuccessful. His friends regretted the fact that he was not the nominee of a Whig Convention as much as they regretted his defeat when in nomination, and their disappointment served merely to induce them to renew their efforts on his behalf. In 1840, when cowardly considerations of availability gave the nomination to another, it is safe to say that Mr. Clay would have been elected if nominated, and "Harry of the West" would have carried with him, when he entered the White House, the best wishes of all the people.

Mr. Clay's supporters in Burlington were such as I have described. I mention one by name, Lewis Higbie. He was a farmer, who resided in the vicinity, of average intelligence, and having the appearance and deportment of his class, but possessing a bright mind and ready wit, and such command and flow of language, marked with good sense, that he did not fail to make himself heard, acceptably, at Town Meetings and similar gatherings. I do not know what were his habits ordinarily, but he rarely failed, on important occasions, to partake freely of the cups which inebriate as well as cheer. He was an ardent Whig, and, of course, a devoted admirer of Mr. Clay, and to him the visit of the latter to Burlington was a very great event, which he deemed it his duty to *celebrate* in the usual manner. It was necessary for Mr. Clay, in going from the steamboat to the carriage provided for him, to pass through a narrow lane on each side of which stood a pile of boards built up to the height of a man's head. Higbie was sufficiently tall, but, being determined to see everything and to attract Mr. Clay's attention, and taking Zacchaeus as his example:

Lewis Higbie, he,
Henry Clay to see,
Did climb a ———

pile of boards, and, as Mr. Clay passed in front of him, stooped and extended his hand. In his condition at the time, the effort was too much

for him, and he would have pitched headlong to the ground, had not Mr. Clay, comprehending the situation, sustained Higbie by his own outstretched arm and a vigorous grasp of the hand, until some persons standing on the pile restored his admirer to a sure footing. It was the proudest moment of Higbie's life. No sooner had he gained his equilibrium than, waving his hat frantically, he screamed: "Three cheers for Henry Clay, who has saved his country three times and Lewis Higbie once."

The fame of this occurrence extended beyond the limits of Burlington, or, even, the State of Vermont. In the Spring of 1844, being then a resident of Keeseville, New York, I joined a party of Whig gentlemen residing at Burlington, and accompanied them to Baltimore, and was there during the sitting of the Whig National Convention which nominated Clay and Frelinghuysen. There I saw and heard, for the first time, Daniel Webster, by far the most imposing man I ever saw. After the nominations had been made our party went to Washington, and one evening a number of us called upon Mr. Clay. According to my recollection we were presented to him in what appeared to be the parlors of a private house. In addition to our party, fifteen or twenty other persons, ladies and gentlemen, were present. One of the Vermonters presented a sprig of evergreen to Mr. Clay and told him that it came from the farm of Lewis Higbie. This led to so much merriment that some one of those, who were not of our party, asked Mr. Clay for an explanation. Accordingly, he told the story in his inimitable style, and added that that was not the first time he had narrated it. He said that, in some one of his journeys in the Southern States, a toast or a speech complimentary to him referred to his services with such exactness and so specifically as to their number as to remind him forcibly of Higbie's statement that he had saved the country three times, and that, in his answer, he said that the sentiment expressed recalled to his recollection an occurrence which had taken place at Burlington, in Vermont, and then proceeded to narrate it in full. So much for Lewis Higbie. May he rest in peace.

See Appendix D.

NOTE 71. Edward O. C. Ord. (Son of Lt. James Ord, who served in 1813–15; Born in Maryland, and app'd from D. C.) Cadet, Sept., '35; 2nd Lt. 3rd Art., July, '39; Fst. Lt., July, '41; Capt., Sept., '50; Brig. Gen. Vol's, Sept., '61; Maj., 4th Art., Nov., '61; Bvt. Lt. Col., for services at Battle of Dranesville, Dec., '61; Maj. Gen. Vol's, May, '62; Bvt. Col., for services at Battle of Iuka, Sept., '62; Severely wounded in Battle of the Hatchie, Oct., '62; Wounded in capture of Fort Harrison, Sept., '64; Bvt. Brig. Gen., for services at Battle of the Hatchie, March,

'65; Bvt. Maj. Gen., for services at assault of Fort Harrison, March, '65; Lt. Col. 1st Art, Dec., '65: Brig. Gen., July, '66; retired, ; Died, July, '83, at Havana, Cuba.

NOTE 72. Eugene Van Ness. (App'd from N. Y.) Paymr., Dec., '39; Dep. Paymr. Gen., Feb., '55; Died, May, '62, at Baltimore.

NOTE 73. I do not find in Gardner's Dictionary any Lt. Martin of the 7th Inf. I think that the officer must have been John W. Martin, of Va. Sec. Lt. 2nd Inf., July, '39; Res'd, Nov., '46; Sec. Lt. 3rd Drag., July, '47; Bvt. Fst. Lt., for gallant conduct, Oct., '47; Died, June, '48, at National Bridge, Mex.—or, Wilmot Martin, of Penn., Sec. Lt. 3rd Inf., March, '37; Fst. Lt., July, '39; Res'd, May, '40.

NOTE 74. James S. Sanderson (Mass.), Sergeant; Sec. Lt. 7th Inf., March, '38; Ass't Com. Sub., Dec., '38; Killed, May, '40, at Levy's Prairie, near Fort Micanopy.

NOTE 75. I think it well to copy here a few entries made in the journal in the early part of 1841. "Jan. 19.—The catkins of white maple out on the Suwannee river, and leaves of blackberry briar an inch long. 22nd.—Leaves of white elder, one inch; buds of peach quite large, not opened, at Col. R. Gamble's (Weelanee, or Yellow-water Creek). 25th.—Cherry red, and plum in blossom. 30th.—Leaves of Althea out, and of *morus multicaulis;* peach in bloom, or some blossoms out full. 30th.—Strawberries in bloom."

NOTE 76. On the termination of this service my father received a letter, of which the following is a copy:

"HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF FLORIDA.

TAMPA, May 4th, 1841.

SIR:

Your communication of the 26th ult., announcing the final completion of your duties as mustering officer of the Militia, has been received and laid before the Commanding General.

The General cannot suffer this opportunity to pass without expressing

to you his high gratification at the zeal and fidelity with which you have discharged the arduous and responsible duties so long confided to you. He is satisfied they could not have been in better hands. * *

I am, sir,
Very resp'y,
Yr. obt. serv't,
W. W. S. BLISS,
Ass' Adj. Gen'l.

MAJ. S. CHURCHILL,
3rd Art.,
Tallahassee,
M. F."

Bvt. Lt. Col. Bliss was born in N. Y., and appointed from N. H. He graduated in 1833, and died in 1853. He was in the Adj. Gen'l's Dep't from '39 till the time of his death. He married a daughter of Gen. Taylor, as did Jefferson Davis, and was long on his staff. He was a son of Capt. John Bliss, of the Army, who was appointed a Cadet from N. H. in '08, and graduated in '11.

NOTE 77. Charles Mapes. (App'd from New York.) Paymaster, January, '35; Disbanded, Sept., '42. [Died, June, '52.]

NOTE 78. Samuel P. Heintzelman. (Born in and app'd from Penn.) Cadet, July, '22; Bvt. 2nd Lt. 3rd Inf., July, '26; 2nd Lt. 2nd Inf., July, '26; Fst. Lt., March, '33; Ass't Com. Sub., April, '36; Ass't Quarm. (rank of Capt.), July, '38; Capt., Nov., '38; Bvt. Maj., for gallant conduct in Battle of Huamantla, Mexico, Oct., '47; Bvt. Lt. Col., Dec., '51; Maj. 1st Inf., March, '55; Col. 17th Inf., May, '61; Brig. Gen. Vols., May, '61; Wounded in Battle of Bull Run, July, '61; Maj. Gen. Vols., May, '62; Bvt. Brig. Gen., for gallant conduct in Battle of Fair Oaks, May, '62; Contused in Battle of Glendale; Bvt. Maj. Gen., for gallant conduct in Battle of Williamsburg, March, '65; retired, Feb., '69; Died in the city of Washington, May, '80.

NOTE 79. Kemp was a soldier in Co. D, 1st Art., at Fort Johnson, Smithville, N. C., during all the time my father was in command of the post, which was from '28 to '35. He was detailed more than once, I think, as an Orderly in my father's service, and, I have been informed,

was his Orderly at Buena Vista, Mexico. At the time mentioned in the journal, he was in the 2nd Art. I saw him at Fort Adams, near Newport, in '48 or '49, and he was then in Capt. and Bvt. Maj. W. T. Sherman's Battery, in the 3rd Art. He was afterwards at Fort Independence, in Boston Harbor, in another Battery in the same regiment. He served, I am informed, eight enlistments, and was *always* a private, except that he once rose to the dignity of being made lance-corporal, but held that grade only until next pay day. In '51 or '52 it was out of the question to pass him for re-enlistment, but he was very averse to going to the Military Asylum, as it was then called, near Washington, which was established after the Mexican war. His feelings must have been like those of Betty Higden. He was finally persuaded to go to the Asylum, but became disgusted and remained for a short time only, went back to Fort Independence, though not as a soldier, and after '52 I have no trace of him. He was entitled to a renewal of the small pension which he received after his discharge from the Army, but forfeited on going to the Asylum. My brother, who knew him at Smithville, and afterwards at Fort Adams and Fort Independence, told me that, in the course of a conversation with Kemp as to his future, he asked him why he did not go to his friends, and that the answer was: "I haven't a damn-the-friend." Such, no doubt, was the case. An ignorant man, and, probably, of common-place origin, who had passed all his life in the Army, and, as it may be presumed, had had no communication with his relatives and the acquaintances of his youth, must have been long considered as dead, if he had not been entirely forgotten; and it was reasonable to believe that, if, in his old age, he had visited the home of his youth, he would have found no one who knew him, or had ever heard of him. My brother told my mother of this conversation, and afterwards, whenever it was mentioned, she would say and repeat: "Poor old Kemp."

NOTE 80. John Ellis Wool. (Born in and app'd from N. Y.) Capt. 13th Inf., April, '12; Distinguished and severely wounded in assault on Queenston Heights, Oct., '12; and, I believe, made prisoner; Maj. 29th Inf., April, '13; Bvt. Lt. Col. for gallant conduct in Battle of Plattsburgh, Sept., '14; Retained, May, '15, in 6th Inf.; Insp. Gen. (rank of Col.), Sept., '16; Lt. Col. 6th Inf., Feb., '18; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for 10 years faithful service, April, '26; Brig. Gen., June, '41; Commanding Central Div. of the Army in Mexico, and united afterwards with the Div. of Gen. Taylor; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for gallant and meritorious conduct in Battle of Buena Vista, Feb., '47; Retired, May, '62; Died, Nov., '69, at Troy, N. Y.

NOTE 81. Nathan Towson. (Born 1784 in Maryland.) Capt. 2nd Art., March, '12; Bvt. Maj. for capturing the enemy's brig Caledonia under the guns of Fort Erie, Oct., '12; Wounded in repelling attack on outworks of Fort George, July, '13; Bvt. Lt. Col. for conduct in the Battle of Chippewa, July, '14; Retained, May, '15, in Light Art., Paymr. Gen., Aug., '19; Col. 2nd Art., June, '21; Negatived by Senate, May, '22; Re-app'd Paymr. Gen., May, '22; Bvt. Brig. Gen., June, '34; Bvt. Maj. Gen., May, '48; Died at the city of Washington, July, '54. (It was Gen. Towson who, as stated in a former note, had the *last shot* on the Niagara Frontier in 1814.)

NOTE 82. Roger Jones. (App'd from Va.) [Sec. Lt. Marines, Jan., '09; Fst. Lt., May, '09.] Capt. 3rd Art., July, '12; Brig. Maj., May, '13: Ass't Adj. Gen. (rank of Maj.), Aug., '13; Bvt. Maj. for services in Battle of Chippewa, July, '14; Bvt. Lt. Col. for services in sortie from Fort Erie, Sept., '14; Retained May, '15, in Art.; Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Brown, June, '15; Adj. Gen. (rank of Col.), Aug., '18; Retained, May, '21, in 3rd Art.; Bvt. Col. for ten years faithful service, Sept., '24; Adj. Gen. of the Army, March, '25; Maj. 2nd Art., Feb., '27; Bvt. Brig. Gen., June, '32; Relinquished rank in the line, April, '35; Bvt. Maj. Gen., May, '48; Died at the city of Washington, July, '52.

NOTE 83. My father's family residence, at that time, was Burlington, Vermont, and my mother and sister, my younger brother and I were living at the Pearl Street House, which afterwards became a Convent. Major (afterwards Bvt. Brig. Gen.) Ethan Allen Hitchcock, a grandson of Ethan Allen, of Revolutionary fame, and who captured the English Fort at Ticonderoga, 8th Inf., happened to be in Burlington, and, having learned, in some way, of the appointment, called upon my mother to inform her of the fact, of which we were entirely ignorant, and to congratulate her upon the distinguished honor conferred upon her husband. It was a pleasant September evening, and our intimate friend, Robert S. Hale, was present, when Major Hitchcock arrived, and, after the latter left, remained with us to join in the family rejoicings.

NOTE 84. As has already been made apparent, it was not merely matters of a public and serious nature which attracted my father's attention and were noticed in his journal. I find, in his handwriting, the following:

"Epitaph on the gravestone of Serg. Amasa Snow, 2nd Inf., died at Fort Niagara, April 17, 1829.

Here lies poor Snow
Full six feet deep,
Whose heart would melt
When caused to weep;

Though winter's blast
May freeze his frame,
Yet death's cold grasp
Can't chill his fame."

My father's first inspection of Fort Niagara, when probably the epitaph was copied, was on the 12th of June, 1842. My mother and sister were with him. On the 21st of July, '53, I went from New York to Buffalo, where my father, mother and brother had arrived from the Upper Lakes and intermediate points. On the 22nd we went to Niagara Falls, where I remained over night, and the next day overtook the rest of the party at Youngstown, near which village Fort Niagara is situated. I did not hear of Serg. Snow by name or "fame;" but, on my mother's telling me that Dr. Thomas J. C. Monroe, Ass't Surg., of Va., who was stationed at Smithville in or about 1833, was buried in the little U. S. Cemetery, I went to it, and saw the stone which marked his grave. He died in '39. *He* was a *character*.

NOTE 85. William J. Hardee. (Born in and app'd from Geo.) Cadet, July, '34; Sec. Lt. 2nd Dra., July, '38; Fst. Lt., Dec., '39; At the Cavalry School of Saumer, France, '40–42; Capt., Sept., '44; Captured in skirmish of La Rosia, 30 miles above Matamoras, April 25, '46, and held as prisoner of war till released, May 10, '46; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct, March, '47; Bvt. Lt. Col. for gallant conduct, Aug., '47; Engaged, '53–'56, in compiling "Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics," being chiefly a translation by Lt. Benét, Ord. Corps (now Brig. Gen. and Chief of Ordnance), of a French Military work, which, as modified by a revising Board of Officers, was adopted March, '55, for the use of the Army and Militia of the U. S., and commonly known as Hardee's Tactics; Maj. 2nd Cav., March, '55; Com. of Cadets, July, '56, to Sept., '60; Lt. Col. 1st Cav., June, '60; Res'd January, '61. [In Confederate Army; Died, Nov., '63, at Wytheville, Va.]

NOTE 86. George Croghan. (Born 1791 in Ken. Son of Maj. Wm. C. of Rev. Army, and nephew of Gen. Geo. R. Clark.) Vol. Aid de C. to Col. Boyd in command of Brigade in Battle of Tippecanoe, Nov. '11. [Col. John P. Boyd was born in 1768 in Mass.; was in the Mahratta Service in the East Indies, and rose to the rank of Comdr. of 10,000

Cavalry; Was in the U. S. Army 1808-'15; Was Naval Officer of Port of Boston, and died at Boston, Oct., '30.] Capt. 17th Inf., March, '12; Maj., March, '13; Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Harrison, and distinguished in defense of Fort Meigs and in the Sortie, May, '13; Distinguished in defense of Fort Stephenson, Lower Sandusky, and repulse of British and Indians, Aug., '13; Bvt. Lt. Col. for conduct at Fort Stephenson, Aug., '13; Lt. Col. 2nd Rifles, Feb., '14; Retained in 1st Inf., May, '15; Resigned, March, '17. [Postmr. at New Orleans, July, '24.] Insp. Gen. (rank of Col.), Dec., '25; Rec'd gold medal from Congress for conduct at Fort Stephenson, Feb., '35; Died, Jan., '49, at New Orleans.

NOTE 87. Named after Maj. Jacob Brown, 7th Inf., of Mass., who was in command of his regiment and of the fort at the commencement of the bombardment, was mortally wounded on the 6th of May, and died on the 9th.

NOTE 88. Braxton Bragg. (Born in and app'd from N. C.) Cadet, July, '33; Sec. Lt. 3rd Art., July, '37; Fst. Lt., July, '38; Bvt. Capt. for gallant conduct in defense of Fort Brown, May, '46; Capt., June, '46; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct at Monterey, Sept., '46; Bvt. Lt. Col. for gallant conduct at Buena Vista, Feb., '47; (Maj. 1st Cav., March, '55, Declined); Resigned, Jan., '56. [In Confederate Army; Died, Sept., '76, at Galveston.]

NOTE 89. I copy the following entry in the journal; "On Christmas day the enemy were reported as being near in the morning; the troops were prepared for action, and the tents were mostly struck."

NOTE 90. William Orlando Butler. (Born in Ken., 1793.) Serg. Ken. Vol's, '12; Ensign 2d Inf. and Sec. Lt., Sept., '12; In action at Frenchtown, Jan. 18th, '13; In battle and defeat at River Raisin, and made prisoner, Jan. 22d, '13; In 17th Inf., April, '13; Capt. 44th Inf., Aug., '13; Bvt. Maj. for gallant conduct at New Orleans, Dec., '14; Retained in 1st Inf., May., '15; Aid de C. to Maj. Gen. Jackson, June, '16; Res'd, May, '17. [Rep. in Cong. from Ken., '39-'43.] Maj. Gen. Vol's for Mexican war, June, '46; Distinguished and wounded at Monterey, Sept., '46; Rec'd sword by res. of Cong. for gallantry and good conduct at Monterey, March, '47; In command of Army in the Valley of Mexico, Feb., '48; Disbanded, Aug., '48. (Gen. Butler was the candidate for the Vice-

Presidency on the Democratic ticket in '48; I have not the date or place of his death.)

Gen. Butler was a member of a distinguished Pennsylvania family of that name, to which, so far as my reading enables me to form an opinion, sufficient attention has not been paid in general history or in that of their native State. I understand that they were not related to the Tory, Col. Walter Butler, who, with Joseph Brant, the Indian Chief, overran the Mohawk Valley, and was engaged in the massacre at Cherry Valley, and the other Tory, Col. John Butler, who, with Brant, attacked the forces commanded by Col. Zebulon Butler, at Wyoming, defeated them and massacred the settlers. I have seen the monument, some three or four miles from Wilkesbarre, erected on the battlefield, and beneath which are the remains of the slain. There were five of the "Butler Brothers," regarding whom, on one occasion, Gen. Washington gave as a toast. "The five Butlers; a gallant band of patriot brothers." They were: *Richard*, who served in the Revolution, and was killed in Nov., '91, in St. Clair's defeat by the Indians on the Miami River; *William*, who served in the Revolution; *Thomas*, who served in the Revolution, and, afterwards, was a Major commanding a battalion from Carlisle in Col. George Gibson's regiment, and was twice wounded at St. Clair's defeat, the Colonel being mortally wounded; *Percival*, or, as I have seen it in print, *Pierce*; and *Edward*, who also was in Gibson's regiment. *James R.*, a son of *Richard*, served in the war of 1812-'14, and was "Military Storekeeper" at Alleghany Arsenal, from March, '26, while my father was in command of the Arsenal. *Richard*, a son of *William*, was in the Army from '93 to '99. *Thomas E.*, a son of *Percival*, was in the Army from '09 to '15. *Robert*, a son of *Thomas*, was in the Army from '12 to '21. *William Orlando*, the subject of this note, was another son of *Percival*. *Edward G. W.*, a graduate of the M. A., Class of 1820, a son of *Edward*, was in the Army from '20 to '31, and again in '47-8. Some of these members of the family, of the second generation, were specially distinguished. Gardner's Dictionary mentions *John Russell* as a *son* of *Percival*, and states that he was Aid de C. to M. Gen. W. O. Butler. I saw him at Memphis in the fall of '47. He was, apparently, not over 25 years old, and I understood that he was a nephew of Gen. B. If such was the case he was a grandson of *Percival*. The same dictionary also mentions Richard B. Butler and John B. Butler, but does not connect them with the "Butler Brothers." The facts stated in the dictionary concerning them, and my own recollection, lead me to believe that they were sons of Capt. *James R. Butler*. I remember that Capt. B. had two sons, "Dick" and John. They were so much older than I that they were companions of my brother William, and, if I am not greatly mistaken, a companion of the three was "Dan Rice," who subsequently won a national reputation. Two persons of the same name, and no doubt the

same persons, were in the army commanded by Gen. Wool, and are mentioned by my father as under his immediate command. Capt. John G. Butler, of the Ord. Dep't, who graduated in '63, was born in and app'd from Penn., and William P. Butler, who graduated in '66, and is not now in the service, was born in and app'd from Ken., but it does not appear affirmatively that either is of the Butler family.

NOTE 91. On this occasion Gen. Wool wrote to my father as follows:

"HEADQUARTERS, CENTRE DIVISION,
CAMP AT LA ENCANTADA,
MEXICO, January 4th, 1847.

COL.:

As you are about to leave me after having been with my command more than four months, I cannot, in justice to my own feelings as well as what is due to you, permit the occasion to pass without expressing my deep regrets at losing one to whom I am so much indebted for the part he has taken, on all occasions, in maintaining the discipline and improving the efficiency of the troops under my orders, and who has, at all times, so ably and faithfully performed all the duties that have devolved upon him.

My kindest wishes, Colonel, will attend you wherever you may be called, and I shall hail with pleasure any event of the ever changeable state of things incident to our profession that may again bring us together.

Very truly and sincerely,
Your obt. serv't,
JOHN E. WOOL,
Brig. Gen'l.

To COL. S. CHURCHILL,
Ins. Gen'l,
U. S. Army."

NOTE 92. I copy from the journal as follows: "Monday, 22d, at 9 A. M., the enemy was reported as in sight from and advancing upon our advance position, Col. Hardin's. The troops were immediately formed and marched to that part of the ground, the tents being struck and baggage loaded into wagons which were ordered to remain where they were, and an express was sent to Gen. Taylor. [He had gone, with an escort, on the 21st to Saltillo, where all the munitions and supplies of

the Army, except those in camp, were stored, in order, probably to make arrangements for a defense against an attack in the rear at that place.] By noon, the enemy, in large force, occupied the ground from one to two miles in front of our position, and at two o'clock commenced a fire of field pieces, and by skirmishers on the hill opposite our left, and at about the same time Santa Anna sent a flag to Gen. Taylor, reporting that he, with more than twenty thousand troops in position, was prepared to attack, and demanding an unconditional surrender. The firing, though not brisk or general, continued till sunset, the troops of both armies resting on their ground for the night, and without covering or fires, except the enemy's on the mountain. Our force consisted of less than 5,000 men of all arms. The firing recommenced at reveille, on the morning of the 23d, by the enemy, and the battle raged with intense interest, and much of the time very general and animated, the enemy gaining considerable ground against and on our left for a portion of the day, till about 5 o'clock P.M., when we regained the ground lost, and, when the firing ceased, at about sunset, we were on the lines occupied by us in the morning, and again the troops lay on their arms as before, expecting a renewal of the fight the next day. At day-light, on the morning of the 24th, it was discovered that the enemy had retired, leaving his killed, many wounded, arms and ammunition, on the ground. He retired to Agua Nueva, where he remained till the 26th, and then continued the retreat, in much disorder, toward San Luis. Our loss was 272 killed, 386 wounded, and 6 missing—664. The enemy lost, as near as could be ascertained, in the battle, about 2,000 killed and wounded, and more than that, in a few days, by desertion."

I have mentioned Col. Bissell and his services in the Battle of Buena Vista. I think that what I am about to add will be interesting.

I found, among my father's files of letters, one written to him by Col. Bissell, on the 21st of Jan., 1848, and covering three pages of letter paper. It is of no importance now, but is evidence of the high regard which each had for the other. In a letter written by my father in Jan., '49, to Senator Douglass, concerning the Battle of Buena Vista, and which was afterwards printed in some of the newspapers in Illinois, my father speaks of Col. B. as "the modest and gallant Bissell." He praises the 2nd regiment highly, and I think that I cannot do better than to copy a portion of it, premising that he, himself, was "the staff officer" mentioned. A statement of the condition of affairs, as disclosed by the letter, is also necessary. On the morning of the 23d of February, 1847, Gen. Wool placed the 2d Ill's Reg't (Bissell's) with the exception of four detached companies, on a part of the plateau, and, on its left, with an interval of about two hundred yards, the 2d Ind. Reg't (Col. Bowles's) with the exception of two detached companies. Both regiments faced the south, and, in their rear, was a ravine, which had its head or highest

portion near the mountain on the left, and which terminated, on the right, at the valley, through which ran the road upon which the Mexican Army was approaching from the south. Gen. Wool subsequently advanced the Ill's Reg't a distance of about two hundred yards, so that its right rested on the head of a shorter ravine which also extended to the valley. The entire plateau, on the left or east of the road, was intersected by ravines parallel to each other, terminating on the road, and some of them extending on the East to the mountain, and the rest to less distances. Gen. Wool then left for the road, a distance of about three-fourths of a mile, having directed my father, who was the senior staff officer, to remain and "take charge in that quarter, and give such orders in his (Gen Wool's) name as he might think necessary." But, before leaving, Gen. Wool said to Brig. Gen. Lane: "I am going down to the road, and I rely upon you to defend this part of the field till I return." It is proper to state here that Gen. Lane's command was limited to the 2d Ind. and Lt. O'Brien's section (three guns) of Washington's battery. On the approach of the enemy in that part of the field being announced, Gen. Lane, without consulting any one outside of his own command, advanced the regiment and the three guns. My father, whose attention at the time was directed elsewhere, supposed that Gen. Lane intended merely to advance to a position near the centre of the plateau, so as to be within musket range of the enemy, as they would rise from the ravine. Had he known the purpose he would have interposed. But Gen. Lane advanced the troops out of sight from Bissell's position, and placed them in a position facing the road, or to the West, and exposing them to a flanking fire from a battery of three guns which had been in sight all the morning. Col. Bowles ordered the regiment to retreat, but the men did not retreat: they broke into a panic, and fled, and but seventy-two took any part, thereafter, in the action. I quote now from the letter: "The 2d Ind. retreated by order of its Colonel, was *obliged* to retreat from *that* position. It had then lost nearly a quarter of its men. Was *that* any evidence of cowardice on the part of the company officers and men? The first military fault of the men * * * was in electing as their colonel * * a man * * they hoped and expected would be very kind and indulgent to them * * and no doubt was so, but inefficient as a commander, protector, or tactician. Their second * * consisted in continuing their flight instead of halting and rallying on the first suitable ground. By that flight the whole plateau to the left of the 2d Ill's regiment, about half a mile to the mountain, was open, the enemy firing upon that regiment and approaching it in large force, evidently with an intention, certainly with the chance in its then position, to turn its left flank, gain its rear, and thus effect its capture. Seeing this; foreseeing the inevitable destruction of the regiment by death, capture or flight, in a very few minutes; that the main plateau *must* be held by that regiment alone, as infantry,

till another, then in sight approaching, should arrive, or the battle would be inevitably lost, the staff officer took upon himself * * the responsibility of moving that regiment to the rear and placing it near its first position on the verge of the ravine, so that the enemy would not be able, easily, to gain its rear. Yet the movement was a hazardous one; a retreat movement, under fire, is always more or less dangerous, even with regular veteran troops. In this instance the regiment had been but a few months in service, officers and men; had never before been in battle, not even in a skirmish, and had just then witnessed the flight of another regiment, till then its left hand pillar, in a panic; and more, when faced about, would see that regiment still running from the field; the *panic* was likely to be contagious. But he resolved to save the regiment and hoped, thereby, to save the battle; failing, he would lose but his own character. He directed Col. Bissell to retire with his regiment and take another and better position, contiguous to and on the right of a light battery. This order was given when the regiment was receiving a heavy and killing fire from the advancing enemy, and many of its members had fallen. But the order was executed with cool precision and steadiness, and, after marching about two hundred yards, it was halted by word of command, faced about and resumed its fire, and not a man was out of place, nor out of *alignment*, and all the while under a destructive fire. By this firmness and good conduct, which was witnessed by many persons with the most intense anxiety, the regiment and its worthy commander earned and received great praise; satisfied and relieved the anxiety of him who gave the order, held the position until reinforced, and thereby opportunity was afforded for much more and like hard work, by that and other regiments, during the day and before the victory was finally ours."

My father, in his narrative of this affair to me, said that all the mounted officers of the regiment had dismounted. but that he was on horseback at the time; that, consequently, he was a conspicuous object, could be seen and was seen by all the men, and, therefore, steadied and guided them and gave them confidence.

It was in reference to this transaction that the controversy arose in the House of Representatives, which I have mentioned in the sketch, a member stating that southern troops held the ground from which northern troops had fled. My reading heretofore does not enable me to state what regiment it was which was seen "approaching," and I have not the means of ascertaining the fact to a certainty, though they indicate that it was a Kentucky regiment, the Colonel of which, Wm. R. McKee, and the Lt. Col., Henry Clay, Junr., a son of HENRY CLAY, both graduates of West Point, were killed later in the day; but it is certain that the ground was held by the section of artillery and the 2d Ill's Regiment, and that the movement and conduct of the latter have rarely been paralleled in

warfare. My father further wrote in the letter: "There can be no doubt that the power and assistance which every arm, every corps, and, indeed, every man rendered * * * were important, as *auxiliary* to the efforts of all others, in winning that battle. * * * The artillery arm, considering the relative strength of corps, performed the most prominent part; and no artillery was ever served with better effect—in *that* there was no moment of mistake or fault." But, if any balancing of the merits or demerits of regiments from different parts of the country in that battle is deemed necessary, I am satisfied that the behavior of the 2d Ark. Cavalry was no better than that of the 2d Ind. Regiment, though it was never in the trying position in which that regiment was placed.

When I visited Col. Bissell at Belleville, in the winter of 1847–8, he went with me to various parts of the village, and introduced me to a number of the former members of his regiment, who were residents of the place, and it will be readily understood that it was a sufficient introduction for him to say: "This is a son of Col. Churchill."

NOTE 93. During the summer of 1847 Col. Churchill visited northern New York and Vermont, and, while he was in Woodstock, the following correspondence took place:

"WOODSTOCK, Aug. 19th, 1847.

SIR:

The citizens of Woodstock desire to extend to you a cordial welcome on your return to your native town, and beg leave to be allowed to pay you their respects, at a public dinner, which they propose to give at such time, to be designated by you, as shall suit your convenience.

Very respectfully, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
NORMAN WILLIAMS,
EDWIN HUTCHINSON,
ELI. DUNHAM,
Committee of the Citizens of Woodstock.

TO COL. SYLVESTER CHURCHILL,
Inspector General, U. S. Army."

"WOODSTOCK, Aug. 20, 1847.

GENTLEMEN:

With profound respect I return my sincere thanks to the citizens of Woodstock for their cordial welcome on my return to my loved and native town; and I would gladly embrace the opportunity to meet them at the dinner to which you, on their behalf, have so kindly bidden me in

your letter which I received late last night, but my engagements to return to Washington and my public duties are such that I shall be obliged to leave town to-morrow afternoon, and must, therefore, deny myself the pleasure of accepting and enjoying the invitation.

With my best wishes for the health and prosperity of yourselves and the esteemed citizens of Woodstock, I am, Gentlemen, your and their obedient servant and friend,

SYLVESTER CHURCHILL.

To Norman Williams, Edwin Hutchinson and Eli. Dunham, Esquires, Committee of Citizens of Woodstock."

(The word Eli. was an abbreviation of the word Eliphalet.)

Note 94. I may mention:

A report made by him in 1859, after having had an interview at Fort Snelling with Gov. Ramsey, of Minnesota, and some officers of the Army, and another at Milwaukee with Gov. Dewey, of Wisconsin, upon "the affairs of, and apprehended dangers from, the Indians, the intruders of last winter, and others." To enable him to make the investigation a number of papers and several newspaper slips were sent to him from Washington, and the investigation extended to the Sacs and Foxes, and the Sioux and Chippewas. He attended a Council held by Gov. Ramsey for the purpose of adjusting the difficulties and complaints between the Sioux and Chippewas. Large numbers of Indians from each tribe or nation were present. My mother was with my father on this occasion, and her description of the Indians and of the proceedings was very interesting.

In a report made in November, 1851, he states that he saw at Fort Trumbull, New London (and, apparently, for the first time), a performance by Co. A, 3rd Art., of the bayonet exercise pursuant to a French work translated by Capt. (afterwards Gen.) McClellan. The company was commanded by Bvt. Maj. Geo. Taylor, afterwards lost at sea from the steamer San Francisco. In a subsequent report my father, who was naturally inclined to regard, with favor, anything promising improvement, commended the translation and the exercise highly, but suggested a number of queries, such as the substitution of English for French words of command, as more intelligible to the soldiers, and the use of the "*shortest* command possible."

I copy a portion of a report of an inspection of the U. S. Armory at Springfield, Mass., made in November, 1853, as follows: "My attention was called to an examination of the arms of recent make by the new model and those made years ago by the old model, with a view to comparison of workmanship. Seven muskets made in the year 1853, and

back to 1847 inclusive, and the same number from 1840 back to 1834, were placed side by side, and taken apart, so that each piece of the arm could be thoroughly examined. I called to my aid in this six master mechanics [naming them], now employed at the Armory, and also [name given] not now, for several years, employed. All appeared by their conversation and manners to be highly respectable, well informed, and unbiassed in judgment. I took the opinion of each separately; and we decided, unanimously, that each of the seven muskets of the last make is superior in workmanship to any one of the former period, with the additional advantage, in those of the new model, of every part fitting to any musket of the same pattern, and having cast-steel bayonets instead of shear-steel. I found, in the end, without any intimation of it before, that the musket of 1853 had been *assembled* from the parts promiscuously, without having been inspected as a complete arm, and that the one of 1840 had been recently selected by a Board of Commissioners at the Armory as a superior or sample arm." It may not be generally known that it was at this Armory that the principle of interchangeability was first applied, so that, from a pile of all the parts of two or more muskets of the same pattern, as many complete muskets could be put together. This was in 1842, when the new percussion arm was introduced. This was an American invention, and the same principle is applied to the manufacture of the Waltham watches. These facts I learn from a gentleman, now residing in New York, who was formerly an officer of the Ordnance Department. The terms of this report, and the minuteness of the inspection indicate that all had reference to a proposition made at that time to transfer the superintendency of the Armories from officers of the Ordnance Department to civilians. I have no doubt that the end sought by the proposition was that the Armories might be used as a means of dispensing political patronage.

In the spring of 1855 he and Bvt. Brig. Gen. Newman S. Clarke went to Fort Riley, in the present State of Kansas, for the purpose of making an investigation in relation to the military reservation in and around that fort. This, I think, is the most distant point in that direction which my father reached.

Within a brief period prior to March, 1856, the remnant of the Indians still remaining in Florida had murdered a number of the whites, and on the 19th of March of that year, my father was directed to furnish to the Adjutant General's Office such information as he might acquire in relation to Indian affairs during his inspection of the troops serving in Florida. The inspection was made in April and May (my mother and a colored man servant being with him), and I find the draft of an elaborate report upon the subject mentioned, containing an estimate, gained from a number of sources, of the number of Indians, the names of their leading men, their haunts and reported places of residence, and the methods to

be pursued in protecting the whites, and in pursuing, killing and capturing the Indians. The report is very interesting, but I have not space for inserting extracts from it. It would be instructive reading, at the present time, to any one who should wish to compare the Florida of to-day with the Florida of a third of a century ago.

NOTE 95. James B. Fry. (Born in and app'd from Ill's.) Cadet, July, '43; Bvt. Sec. Lt. 3rd Art, July, '47; Sec. Lt. 1st Art., Aug., '47; 1st Lt., Feb., '51; At M. A., as Ass't Ins. of Art., '53-4; and as Adj.,'54-9; Recorder of Board to revise Programme of Studies at M. A., '60; Ass't Adj. Gen. (Bvt. Capt.) March, '61; Ass't Adj. Gen. (Capt.), Aug., '61; Col. Staff (add'l Aid de C.), '61-4; Ass't Adj. Gen. (Major), April, '62; Ass't Adj. Gen. (Lt. Col.), Dec., '62; Col. Staff (Pro. Mar. of the U. S.), March, '63; Brig. Gen. Staff (Pro. Mar. of the U. S.), April, '64; Bvt. Col. for services at Bull Run (First), March, '65; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for services at Shiloh and Perrysville, March, '65; Bvt. Maj. Gen. for services in Pro. Mar. Gen.'s Dep't, March, '65; Retired as Colonel, June, '81. (Gen. Fry was for a long time on the staff of that able and excellent officer, Gen. Don Carlos Buell, who was not appreciated, but, on the contrary, was unjustly suspected and ill-treated by the government.)

NOTE 96. There are those who entertain the supposition of a relationship between my mother's family and the celebrated physicians, brothers, named Hunter, of London. I know of nothing to sustain the supposition, and all the facts are opposed to it. William Hunter, one of the brothers, was born in Lanarkshire, Scotland, in 1718; was in Edinburgh in 1740; in London in 1747; and died in 1783. John Hunter, the youngest of the children, was born in the same county in 1728; studied in London in 1749-50; married in 1771, and died in 1793. My grandfather was born in 1754. My memoranda do not give the dates and places of birth of his father, David, and of his grandfather, Jonathan; but it does appear that the latter was married in Mass. in 1729. As to other persons of the name or blood of Hunter in this country I have no information, and venture no opinion.

My grandfather, William Hunter, was a prominent man, and his descendants may be satisfied with his personal merits. He was in Montgomery's Army in the War of Independence; a Judge of Probate in Windsor County, Vermont; a Member of the Legislature and of the Council of Censors of Vermont (the latter consisting of thirteen persons, elected every seven years, to serve one year, whose duty it was to take a retrospective view whether the Constitution had been preserved inviolate,

and of the manner in which all duties had been performed by the legislative and executive officers, and, in their discretion, to call a convention), and of the U. S. House of Representatives. He lived honored and respected, and his good reputation long survived him. I think that, if any one's ancestor displayed exceptional merits, the fact should be an incentive to exertion and emulation, and not a ground for pride.

NOTE 97. At Elizabethtown, Essex County, New York, nine miles from Lake Champlain, resided Dr. Safford E. Hale, a brother of Hon. Robert S. Hale, whom I have mentioned. His wife was my father's niece. She died in 1871. Dr. Hale still resides at Elizabethtown. It was they whom my parents visited. They were welcome guests, and, with the exception of my sister's house, there was no house in which they were so much at home, or where they enjoyed themselves so much, as at Dr. Hale's. They, who welcomed them so cordially, were hospitable, generous, genial, and kind-hearted. Each was full of wit and humor, and their wit and humor were without severity, and left no stings behind. Often, in subsequent years, when sitting on the piazza of the house, it was a pleasure to me to recall my mother sitting there, and gazing on the beautiful landscape, or my father conversing with Dr. Hale concerning some of the numerous projects of farming, or gardening, or building a residence in the vicinity, with which his mind was filled.

NOTE 98. It is quite remarkable how the fortune (or misfortune) of war has varied in different classes. Thus: of the class of '36, forty-nine in number, six were killed in battle; of the class of '37, fifty in number, seven were killed; of the class of '38, forty-five in number, four were killed; of the class of '39, thirty-one in number, three were killed; of the class of '41, fifty-two in number, fourteen were killed; of the class of '42, fifty-six in number, four were killed; of the class of '43, thirty-nine in number, four were killed; and of the class of '44, twenty-five in number, seven were killed. I count those who died of wounds among the killed.

No one can examine Gen. Cullom's Register without being struck by the fact that, in addition to those killed in battle, a large proportion of the graduates of the Military Academy, compared with the same number of graduates of colleges, have lost their lives by casualties, such as by drowning at sea, or in the inland waters, by being thrown from horses, by explosion of steamboat boilers, and the like. It is true that civilians lose their lives from the same causes; but it is clear that officers of the Army, in the ordinary discharge of their duties, are exposed to unusual

dangers. Many, too, have died at posts, which they could not leave, from cholera and yellow fever. In the cemetery at St. Augustine I saw the graves of a number of young officers, all of whom, as I understood, died of yellow fever.

NOTE 99. Thomas Childs. (Born in and app'd from Mass.) Cadet, April, '13; 3rd Lt. 1st Art., March, '14; Sec. Lt. 1st Art., May, '14; Transferred to Corps of Art., May, '14; Retained, May, '15; 1st Lt., April, '18; Asst. Com. Sub., April, '20; 1st Lt. 3rd Art., June, '21; Capt., Oct., '26; Bvt. Maj., for planning attack on Indians, and good conduct in the affair, Aug., '36; Bvt. Lt. Col., for galiant conduct and repeated successes in the war against Indians in Florida, Feb., '41; Bvt. Col. for conduct in Battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, May, '46; Maj. 1st Art., Feb., '47; Bvt. Brig. Gen. for defense of Puebla, where he commanded, Oct., '47; Died at Fort Brooke, Florida, Oct., '53. (Frederick L. Childs, a son of Gen. Childs, graduated in '55, and resigned in '61, and was in the Confederate Army. A daughter married Daniel P. Woodbury, of N. H., who graduated in '36, and died in the service at Key West, Aug., '64. Their son, Thomas C. Woodbury, graduated in '72, and is now a First Lieut. in the 16th Inf.)

NOTE 100. Having retired, entirely, from the practice of my profession, and being at the end of all personal participation in the affairs of active life, I take pleasure in expressing my high appreciation of the beneficial influences exerted by the study and practice of law upon the members of the legal profession, and of their general high character as a class. My practice was limited, and I was but little known, but the practice continued for nearly forty years, and I necessarily had corresponding experience and opportunities for observation. I consider the legal profession, when measured by merely human standards, the best a man can follow. Its members necessarily learn to study and decide questions on general principles, and in all their bearings. The range of the subjects, which claim their attention, is as extensive as are the occupations and interests of mankind, and they are obliged to carry their inquiries into diverse and wide fields. In every community, from the smallest village to the largest city, the resident lawyers are among the most important of the population. By natural processes they take the lead in politics, diplomacy, and legislation. As they study questions abstractly, so, in matters of administration, their measures have a wide and comprehensive scope. I believe that it is admitted that the best Secretaries of the Treasury we have had have been lawyers.

Concerning lawyers personally my recollections are generally agreeable. They are free from cant and all forms of humbuggery. Such things go for nothing. If a man enters upon the practice of his profession possessed by the spirit of conceit, assumption, or vanity, it is soon knocked out of him. In matters involving litigation he meets his equals, and he knows that even the result of his work in his office may soon come before the eyes of other members of the profession and be criticised as severely as any brief could be. I have found lawyers, generally, to be men of integrity. There are black sheep among them, but they are known. There are tricksters among them, but, even they, as a class, are true to their word when once given. Most of them separate the important issues of any matter of litigation from matters formal, accidental and non-essential. On those issues they fight hard, and give blows, as they are ready to receive them, without stint, but they are not strenuous as to the other matters. It is true that there are pettifoggers who resort to measures calculated to trip, balk, annoy and delay their adversaries, without gaining a point on the merits, but they are known by those who occupy the bench as well as by those who sit before it, and, being known, they are marked. As a rule, lawyers are a social set, and are "good fellows," and this is saying much.

It used to amuse me, and others, also, to hear my father introduce me, as was his custom, as: "My son, sir, not in the army; a lawyer."

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

But, say some, a portion of them truckling to a low popular sentiment, others excusable on account of their ignorance, and the residue fanatics of the "On to Richmond" class, who place the "earnest" and noisy ignoramus above the trained West Pointer, upon whom, because he does not sling patriotic rhetoric, they look with suspicion: "It is safe to believe that, among the 60,000,000 inhabitants of the United States, there are many who possess more military genius than is to be found among the few hundred graduates of West Point." No doubt this is so. It is as safe to suppose the existence of a village Napoleon as of a village Hampden. So, it is safe to suppose the existence of a person whose natural legal capacity surpasses that of all the John Marshalls of the land combined. For all that he would make a sorry show if pitted in Court against an average lawyer. We must have military schools if we wish to prosecute war with success, as we have schools of law, of theology and medicine, of science, of art, and of literature.

No Cæsar, or Frederick the Great, or Marlborough, or Napoleon, or Wellington ever sprung, ready made, from civil life. They, and all great soldiers, had long and careful training and experience. Napoleon, possibly, had less than the others named, but he was so exceptionally great in all things, as not to be mentioned as an example.

There are others, who, conceding the advantages of a military education, assert that the learning acquired at West Point enured quite as much to the benefit of the Confederate States as it did to that of the United States. It would be sufficient to dismiss this assertion by saying that the Civil War is a thing of the past, and that nothing like it will ever occur again, did it not include the idea that a system, which educates a person as a soldier, tends, directly, to suppress the feeling of patriotism, and to make him a mere mercenary. Many of those, who have made this assertion, know that the fact is not as they state it, and it is useless to argue with them and such as they, but, as to others, if they will take the trouble to read the Preface to Gen. Cullom's "Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Acad-

emy," and the statistics in the same work, they will see that the assertion is entirely without foundation. I cannot go into details, and must limit myself to stating a few facts which this work makes apparent. Of the 99 graduates, who went from civil life, at the South, as I understand, into the Confederate service, all but one were born in or were residents of slave States. Of 350 graduates, born in, or appointed from slave States, who were in the Army at the time of secession, but about one-half went into the Confederate service, in which they were joined by 16 from the free States, making, in all, 184, while the rest, and all from the free States except the 16, remained loyal. Of the 292 loyal graduates, who were in civil life, at the North, as I understand, at the time of secession, 115 entered the military service of the United States, including two-sevenths of those who were over 45 years old, and all below that age, except 39, who, from disability and other causes, did not take an active part in the war, though many performed useful services in civil capacities requiring military knowledge, while others, who tendered their services, were unable to obtain commissions. It should be remembered that appointments to cadetships are according to the representation of the several States in the House of Representatives, to which are added a few appointments "at large." Of the 1249 graduates, supposed to be living at the time of secession, over three-fourths remained loyal, more than the proportion of graduates from the loyal States. It may be added, in order to show what the graduates, who served in battle, did for the Union, that one-fifth were killed, and more than one-third, and, probably, one-half, wounded. The fact just stated, while it does not prove anything in favor of the person who was killed or wounded, against another, who stood or moved by his side, but was not hit, does prove that the West Pointers were in posts of danger.

If it should be said, as it has been often said, that men, educated gratuitously by the United States, had no right to "rebel," the answer is that they claimed that they were not "rebels," that a State has a right to secede of its own will, and to decide when it will exercise this right, and that, when a State secedes, the question arises whether a person's paramount allegiance is due to the State of his birth or residence or to the United States. These were legal questions, which each graduate was obliged to solve for himself, and no one had or has a right to doubt his sincerity in coming to a conclusion. The graduate from Virginia, for instance, believed that he was educated at West Point by Virginia, acting with other States, each of which had a right to secede and to judge of the time and occasion, and that she had paramount claims upon her sons; and, if his theory and reasoning were correct, we cannot quarrel with his conclusions. I have, in good faith, endeavored to understand the grounds of the theory, and to see the force of the reasoning, but without success. In appealing to the sword, merely on an appre-

hension of danger, the Seceding States assumed a fearful responsibility and with results disastrous to themselves. That, for many years, they had been insulted and abused and uncharitably criticised, their internal peace threatened and jeopardized, and their constitutional rights largely ignored, on account of the existence of an institution for the inception and establishing of which they were no more responsible than were the people of the Northern States, an institution which had necessarily become a part of their organizations, social, industrial and political, and which seemed to be irremovable and remediless, I do not doubt. That common honesty and fairness required that those, who were not willing to perform the conditions of the constitutional contract, should agree to a peaceable separation, and not proclaim themselves "the party of high moral ideas" as a justification for violating those conditions, and for declining to cherish that fraternal spirit, without the existence of which a happy union was not possible, or any union desirable, I, also, do not doubt. In the end there were folly, violence, outrages, and aggressions on the other side, resulting in no benefit to the South, alienating the Democrats of the North, and leading, naturally, to the formation of the Free Soil and Republican parties. Finally ensued one of the most skillfully managed political proceedings of which I ever read. A small but active minority in the Southern States, bent upon secession, so manipulated events that there could be no step backward, and that the next step in advance became a necessity and led to another. The deliberate and carefully considered judgment of the people, "the sober, second thought of the people," was not sought, obtained, or given. The course pursued prevented any such judgment being formed or made known. Unfortunately, the South Carolinians, the fanatics of the South, took the lead. The wiser, more deliberate, and considerate people of Virginia, of English origin and with English traditions, a State to which, I think, we are more indebted for our institutions than to all the other original States combined, did not determine, as would have been well, whether there should be any action and what it should be.

Secession, to use the mildest language, was a dire mistake. The Southern States should have fought their battle in the Union and under the Constitution. They should have waited, after the election in 1860, for some act of national legislation hostile to their rights. I firmly believe that none would have been proposed by even a small minority, and that, had any such proposition been made, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated by the votes of the Southern members and of members from the North of both parties. Free Soil, alone, would have been secured, by legislation, forever. Had there been any hostile legislation and action under it, the Southern States would have found allies in the Northern Democracy, barely a minority of the people of the North, and rightly claiming, as its own, the honorable history of the past. But, in-

stead of adopting this course, they resorted to acts of war, and compelled the Democrats of the North to be "enemies in war." When peace came, the same Democrats were "in peace, friends," and did not doubt the good faith of those who accepted the results, bitter though they were, and did not exact or expect declarations from the secessionists that they were sorry for what they had done, and rather liked the flavor of humble pie. I believe that the vast majority of the Southern people, although they justly regarded the measures of reconstruction, and, especially, much of the military rule, the invasion and rule of the "carpet-baggers," and the subjection of the whites to the blacks, as unnecessary, cruel and vindictive, have always accepted the result of the war in good faith, and that they are now perfectly content. On my own part, I regard our Union and Constitution as the greatest work of man, and, therefore, I the more warmly condemned any attempt, in whatever part of the country made, to destroy or weaken either. I see no reason why the civilized nations of the world should not be united on the plan of our Union.

While on the subject of secession, it is well to call attention to the fact that the idea of secession was not a novelty in 1860. It had been broached at various times. There were projects for separation in Kentucky before 1795, and in Western Pennsylvania, at the time of the Whiskey Insurrection, from 1792 to 1795. It was threatened in New England when the acquisition of Louisiana was proposed, and for years afterwards. In January, 1811, Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, a Federalist, when speaking in the House of Representatives on the Louisiana enabling act, which became a law February 20th, 1811, said: "It is my deliberate opinion that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States, which compose it, are free from their moral obligations, and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must." He was called to order, but the House decided that he was in order. Ex-President Adams, in reply to a copy of this speech, could only say that; "Prophecies of division had been familiar in his ears for six and-thirty years." See Article on Secession and the Article on Louisiana in the Cyclopædia of Political Science, &c., mentioned in the Sketch. Jefferson Davis and others did what Josiah Quincy and others asserted it would be the duty of some as it would be the right of all of the States to do. Josiah Quincy died full of years and honors, and the political heirs of the party to which he belonged canonized that midnight assassin and murderer, that would-be inciter of servile insurrection, John Brown, as a saint and martyr, threatened to "hang Jeff. Davis on a sour apple tree," claimed for themselves a patent for loyalty, and branded as disloyal the Democrats of the Northern States, and mainly for the reason that they insisted that the war should be pros-

ecuted, under the Constitution, for the Union, and that, in the loyal States, the Constitution should be respected and observed.

I have often thought it singular that, among the Constitutional amendments, recently adopted, there was not one declaring the alleged right of secession as without ground. Perhaps this was not necessary or expedient. Facts are more important and significant than declarations. The results of the Civil War proved that the people of the United States consider the Union as paramount to all things else. Their love of the Union had not been appreciated by themselves or the world. It was manifested, when secession came, in a manner which amazed us, and taught a lesson, not to be forgotten, to other nations. If the people of the North were not substantially united, in act and spirit, at all times during the war and till the end, the fault lay with the party in power. Would that the affairs of the country could always have been administered by the party, which, from the beginning, has understood and been animated by the spirit of the Constitution and the genius of the whole people. May it be always so administered hereafter.

Aside, entirely, from the legal question of the right of secession, the fact stated by Gen. Cullom, that but one-half of the graduates of the Academy, from the South, who were in the army when secession took place, went into the Confederate service, proves that the *influences* exerted by an education at West Point were in favor of the Union, and did not weaken the sentiment of patriotism, or tend to make mercenaries.

There are objections to the system of education in force at West Point and to its influences, which differ entirely from those to which I have referred, and which it is opportune to mention. The institution is unique in its character; a small proportion only of the cadets are above the middle class of the communities from which they come, in social position and antecedents; all of them live in a position of isolation and study for the same object; the course of instruction and study is limited and one-sided, and, if the graduates continue in the army, the isolation largely remains, though generally, and often very much, modified, by travel, changes of station, and varying social surroundings. The result of this condition of affairs is a disposition, in the minds of cadets and graduates, to overestimate the West Point course, and to underrate the curricula pursued in the universities and colleges of the United States. I have so often noticed the manifestations of this disposition that I am satisfied that it is the result of the course of instruction, and not merely the expression of individual opinions independently formed. Some years since I read what purported to be an address delivered to the members of the graduating class, in which the speaker advised them not to *look down upon their fellow-citizens*. It is not to be supposed that, by their fellow-citizens, he meant the unlettered masses of the people. If the speaker thought that the ideas of the graduates were without

foundation, and wished to give them good advice, he should have expressed his opinion without reserve; whereas the advice merely served to confirm their ideas of superiority. I am much better informed than most civilians concerning West Point, and its graduates, and I have a fair knowledge of the scope and results of university and college teaching, and I am satisfied that the graduates of West Point should look upon liberally educated men with respect and with *upward glances*, and would do so if they were aware of their own deficiencies. There is this to be said, it is true, that, whereas almost any one could "go through college" in former years (and I do not know that such is not the case at present), a cadet must reach a required, and that, a high, standing, or leave the Academy, and that, therefore, all the graduates are "honor men." But, there is little in the course of instruction at West Point which tends to make the cadets citizens of "The Republic of Letters," the most ancient and widely spread and comprehensive of Republics, and which is sure to continue till the end of time. On the other hand, the opportunities and advantages of students in universities and colleges, as compared with those of the cadets, are very great. While the cadets are educated at the expense of the Government, without which probably many of them might not receive an education, the students in the other institutions generally have parents who are above the middle classes of the community, who understand the importance of an education, and are able to educate their sons, or, at least, to pay a portion of their expenses while obtaining an education. In their studies the students are naturally brought, to some extent, in contact with the master minds of various ages and countries, and they acquire, almost unconsciously, a taste for literature. They have some knowledge of current events and tendencies in other literary institutions. The Greek Letter Societies, and even the rowing and other athletic organizations, act as a means of intercourse with such institutions. In after life they meet the graduates of many colleges. Those who adopt professional pursuits largely extend their spheres of study and inquiry. There are few who do not retain a taste for general reading, and many become devoted to literary pursuits. As to the relative importance of the teaching at West Point of certain branches of education as compared with the teaching of the same branches at other institutions, it should be mentioned that there have been great changes in recent years. I remember that, when the construction of railroads began in this country, the graduates from West Point were considered the best qualified for any enterprise calling for engineering skill, that, consequently, there was a great demand for the graduates, and that many resignations of young officers were the result. At the present time, if I am correctly informed, there are several scientific schools in the country, in which everything, which the civil en-

gineer, the architect, the chemist, and others need know, is taught even more extensively and thoroughly than at West Point.

My interest in the Academy and the Army lead me to add that I regret to notice that appointments to cadetships are frequently conferred by means of competitive examinations which are limited to testing the acquirements of the candidates. This system relieves Members of Congress of responsibility, annoyance, and the probability of making enemies, but I think that it is wrong. I believe, thoroughly, in civil service reform, and, more than that, permanency of civil tenure. The reform, though there seems to have been an undue pedantic spirit in shaping its framework, and though there seems to be an undue martinet spirit in administering the system, is shown to be wise in theory and beneficial in the results. The other system has made the body politic rotten, and tends to create, not statesmen, but professional politicians, great and small, whose sole object it is to obtain for themselves and their followers, offices and spoils, and, often, plunder. But, in my opinion, cadetships should not be conferred by means of the processes applicable to the civil service. The cadet's acquirements will be tested at West Point. In conferring appointments regard should be had to the tendencies, dispositions, tastes, and general morale of the candidates, and their social positions, antecedents and surroundings, and those of their families. I think that the sons of gentlemen should be appointed; not mere "money-bags," but gentlemen, whether rich or poor, fashionable and conspicuous, or plain and lowly. People gentle in instinct and in grain, and refined through life by favoring circumstances, are numerous and easily found. The men among such people are what I term *gentlemen*. Further than this, I think that it would be well to continue families in the Army from generation to generation in the appointment of cadets.

I do not intend to convey the impression that it is my opinion that an education received at West Point is the sole, or, necessarily, the best preparation for a military life which can be obtained. I merely wish to urge the importance of a due preparation, and I refer to the results of the instruction received at West Point as proofs which support my proposition. There are now numerous officers of the Army, not graduates, who are as well qualified as could be desired for the discharge of the duties pertaining to the branches of the service to which they belong. At all times there have been officers who were appointed from civil life, and the history of the Army shows that such officers were not inferior to any in the same branches of the service. But, I do not doubt that every one of those officers regretted that he was not better prepared than was the case, at the outset, for the discharge of his duties. I often heard my father thus express himself, and I know that he had recourse to every means within his reach to supply the deficiency. Appleton's Cyclopædia states that General (then Captain) Scott passed the year of his suspen-

sion by sentence of Court Martial, in 1808–9, in studying tactics. **The** officers appointed from civil life, who are now high in rank in the Army, were not lifted at once, and without preparation, to the positions to which they were appointed. They won their commissions by their merits, and had proved, in the civil war, that they were soldiers.

That all other things being equal between individuals, the Military Academy is now the best source of supply for officers of the Army, I think all will admit; but it is not absolutely, and under all circumstances, the best, and still less the only source. Given a well appointed Army, including, especially, a well organized staff, and the officers might all be appointed from civil life, except those whose duties require special preparation, scientific as well as military. But, in order that there should be no deterioration in the standard of the service, great care should be exercised in making the selections. The qualifications of candidates, their attainments, character, antecedents, and manners should be ascertained, and the best should receive the commissions. It is not merely in the interest of the service at large that I urge this care in making selections. I have in mind the interest of the enlisted men. A gentleman is never more of a gentleman than in his dealings with those who are his inferiors in rank. Soldiers are accurate observers and severe critics. I have heard of their using such expressions as, "he is not a gentleman; he is a nigger-driver." I think that suitable studies should be required of officers appointed from civil life, and that there should be examinations for promotion of *all* officers; those examinations not to be conducted in the spirit of the martinet or the pedagogue, but by officers possessed of common-sense and broad views.

For the reasons which I have already stated, I think that an infusion into the Army of liberally educated gentlemen from private life would be of service. The companionship between them and the West Pointers would be an advantage to both classes.

Each system of preparation has its merits and demerits. The education received in the camp or the garrison tends to "pipe-clay;" that derived from books to pedantry. Each tendency is good; the extremes are injurious. I have seen the manifestations of the tendencies in all their degrees.

It is not always the result of giving a military education to a boy that he is made a soldier. I have known graduates who were entirely out of place in the Army. I remember one who stood very well in his class, of whom it was said by another graduate that the only military duty which he ever performed well was the tendering of his resignation.

I think that the conferring of commissions upon enlisted men is an excellent practice. It at least serves as an incentive to the enlisted men, and teaches all, officers and men, that there is not a bar-

rier over which the latter cannot pass. I venture the suggestion that it would be an additional incentive to the enlisted men if the names of those who have been retired should be published in the Army Register. In order that this should be done, an Act of Congress might be necessary, though, possibly, a regulation of the War Department would suffice.

APPENDIX B.

The language used by those, who criticised slaveholders, fairly justifies any one in forming the opinion that they intended to charge those who introduced slavery into the country, and those who, finding the system established, continued it, with sinning against their own consciences, and as being willing to "shock the conscience of civilization." They took, as their standard of conscience and morality, the judgment of "this enlightened nineteenth century," as formulated and expressed by themselves. Admitting their authority in the premises, it may be asked whether the judgment of the present century upon any topic is irreformable of itself, and, therefore, final. Such is not, generally, understood to be the case. Many thoughtful persons see grounds for intense anxiety concerning the probable results of some of the tendencies and practices of the times, and the more so for the reason that they are not accidental or superficial, but because they are inherent and organic, and the necessary and legitimate results of ideas and principles now existing. Should some man of learning in the year 2000, with all the records of the past before him, publish a book entitled "Looking backward," the picture presented by him might be as severe a criticism of the nineteenth century as that contained in a recent work of fiction having the same title. Moreover, the work of fiction relates mainly to the material conditions of the present day; the supposed author would have a wider scope and treat of morals and religion as well as of material conditions. It would be well for us, when discussing past centuries, to be a little modest, if we can.

Further than this, admitting that the standard of the present day is correct, it is but fair that, when an opinion is expressed concerning the introduction of slavery into the British Colonies, and its subsequent continuance in the Colonies and the United States, the opinions and practices of contemporaneous times should be considered. Charity requires that this should be done. In former times the slave trade, as well as slavery, was quite commonly recognized as a lawful occupation. James W. Gerard, in his interesting work entitled: "The Peace of Utrecht," states that, on the first of May, 1713, a compact, afterwards ratified by a formal treaty, was made between the English and Spanish Governments, to the effect that an English Company, under the patronage of Queen Anne, was to have a monopoly to supply the *Spanish West Indies with negro slaves*, for the space of thirty years, to the extent of 144,000 negroes, at the rate of 4,800 yearly. In order that it may be seen that the royal assent was not given as a mere formality, while, possibly, the

private views of the Sovereign revolted against the contract, it may be added that Mr. Gerard further states that the Queen, the two Ministers and Lady Masham were to have a share in the profits of the enterprise. If, in the negotiations which resulted in a peace made in the cause of humanity, and in which all Europe was interested, it was deemed important to secure this monopoly by one of the several treaties, which, unitedly, constituted the general treaty, it can be readily understood what was the line of action of Queen Anne and the two Ministers and Lady Masham concerning supplying the British Colonies with negro slaves. For that purpose a treaty was not necessary, and the Queen could give the monopoly to whom she chose, and dictate who, in addition to herself, should share in the profits. It is well known that some of the Colonial Governors were instructed to render assistance to the English companies engaged in the importation of slaves. Not only were English companies engaged in the trade. In 1636 a Salem ship began the importation of negro slaves from the West Indies, and thereafter Pequot Indian slaves were constantly exchanged for negroes from the Barbadoes.

The colonists, generally, had no desire that slavery should be established among them. The system was not in accord with their tastes and customs. There was no branch of industry so important as to make it desirable that there should be a large class of persons in the community who could not rise above manual labor of the rudest kind. It is true that tobacco was the most valuable agricultural product, as a subject of commerce, but it never had the importance which cotton afterwards acquired. The culture of tobacco, with other causes, made Virginia the richest, most populous, and most influential of the Colonies. It resulted in much direct trade and intercourse between Virginia and the mother country. A large proportion of the Virginians, who rose to distinction in the agitations which preceded the War of Independence, and in the war itself, had been educated in England at the Universities and elsewhere. In view of all these circumstances and the fact that there was an established church in Virginia, an outgrowth of the Church of England, and that its clergy were Tories almost without exception, it is quite remarkable that the people were generally Whigs. Perhaps one reason was that they had been staunch supporters of the Stuarts, and regarded the members of the House of Hanover as intruders. A narrative which I had from a gentleman, a native of Virginia, led me to understand that his grandfather was the only Episcopalian clergyman who was not a Tory, and he attributed this to the fact that he was a supporter of the Stuarts, was engaged, though not of age, in the Battle of Culloden, in the Army of Charles Edward, afterwards studied at an English University, was ordained, came to Virginia, and settled in or near Williamsburgh, and, during his entire life, was unfriendly to the House of Han-

over. It is a curious fact, however, that the adherents of the Stuarts, who fled to America, and settled in North Carolina, were Tories.

The fact remains that, after making due allowance for all local or class influences in favor of the importation of negro slaves, the mass of the people of the Colonies were opposed to it. It is sufficient evidence of this fact that the Continental Congress in 1774 resolved to discontinue the slave trade, in which resolution it was anticipated by the Conventions of Delegates of Virginia and North Carolina. A fact, probably not generally known, may be mentioned here, that the Constitution of the Confederate States forbade "the importation of negroes of the African race, from any foreign country other than the slaveholding States or Territories of the United States of America." The draft of the Declaration of Independence, prepared by Jefferson, made the slave trade one of the grounds of complaint, but the clause was omitted from the Declaration as adopted. Upon this point Jefferson wrote in his Memoir as follows: "The clause, too, reprobating the enslaving the inhabitants of Africa, was struck out in complaisance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it;" and further: "Our Northern brethren also, I believe, felt a little tender under those censures; for, though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others." I make this statement on the authority of a letter appearing in The Evening Post, and purporting to be written by Prof. Alexander Johnston, of Princeton. The Constitution of the United States provided that Congress should not prohibit the importation, before 1808, of such persons as any of the States then existing should think proper to admit, but Congress passed laws prohibiting the carrying of slaves by American citizens from one country to another, and the introduction of slaves into states which had forbidden the slave trade. Finally Congress, by Act of March 2nd, 1807, prohibited the importation of slaves after the close of the year. The number of slaves imported from 1787 to 1808 is not known, and the estimates differ. Charleston alone, in the four years, 1804–7, imported 39,075, consigned to 91 British subjects, 88 *citizens of Rhode Island*, 10 French subjects, and 13 natives of Charleston. The whole number of negroes imported at all times into the British Colonies and the United States did not exceed 375,000 to 400,000. Small additions were made to the number of slaves by illegal importations (few in number, and but one case of the arrival of a slave vessel, that of the yacht Wanderer, is *certainly known*) and the acquisitions of Florida and Louisiana. The slaves in Texas were undoubtedly all from the United States, by birth or origin. Substantially, the 5,000,000 colored persons, who resided in the United States in 1870, were the descendants of those imported before 1808.

It was certainly a fortunate circumstance that the cotton gin, or its

equivalent, was not in use before Eli Whitney, of Connecticut, invented it in 1793 in Georgia, where he resided. Had the invention been made twenty years sooner, the history of the slave trade and slavery would not have been what it is. The difference between the separation of five or six pounds or one thousand pounds of cotton from their seeds by a slave in one day was soon manifested. Within five years after Whitney's invention cotton supplanted indigo as the great Southern staple, and in eleven years the exportation of cotton increased nearly eighty-fold. Moreover, the former slave States, by exceptional conditions of soil and climate, have, so far, proved to be better adapted for the cultivation of cotton than any country in the world.

Contrast the state of affairs in the United States with that in those countries where there was a constant and increasing demand for slave labor, and the importation of slaves was not prohibited. To the slaveholder in the United States the birth of a slave was an increase of his capital, and, if for no other purpose than to consult his own interest, he raised the infant with care, and sought to prolong its life in health and strength. Every one, who knows the facts, knows that, as a general thing, the slaves were not overworked, and were carefully treated. In the West Indies and South America the planter, not being restricted to the slow process of *raising* his slaves, found that he could better maintain a sufficient supply of labor by importing negroes—adults, or nearly grown. Moreover, the negroes imported were mostly males, a fact that had a bad effect upon the moral condition of the slave population, and made further importations necessary. In these importations American vessels from Northern ports were largely, and probably, in most cases, engaged. The result of the system is seen in the fact that, prior to 1833, when emancipation took place in the British West Indies, 1,700,000 negroes had been imported into those islands, and that their descendants numbered but 660,000 in that year. It is reasonable to believe that, under a system such as that described, and especially when many of the owners of the plantations were absentees, as was the case, slaves were often overworked and treated with cruelty. I have no statistics or specific facts as to the Spanish or French West Indies, or Brazil. In those tropical countries the culture of sugar cane and the coffee tree was always profitable, and this circumstance could not fail to have an effect upon the slave trade and slavery.

The facts which I have stated prove that, so far as the introduction of slavery into the British Colonies and its gaining a footing among the people are concerned, the responsibility rested upon all parts of the country.

As to the abolition of slavery, after the institution had become a part of the social, industrial, and political system of the community, it could not be destroyed at once, and as a part of the *ordinary* current of events. Slavery

is not, in itself, or intrinsically, a sin, and not necessarily an evil. Consequently, in maintaining it, slaveholders were not sanctioning or practising a system inherently wrong. But, it is not consistent with the highest and best organization of society. It has its defects and objectionable features, and so had villanage and serfdom, and the fact that these defects and features existed is no reason why the system should be removed in a day or at the cost of a social upheaval. With us the matter was complicated by the problem what were to be the relations, after emancipation, of the two races in a country where, politically, classes were not known, and all were equal in the sight of the law? This is a problem yet to be solved; one worthy of anxious thought, and which must be met and answered.

Many Southerners, seeing the evils and disadvantages of slavery, desired to find a way out of the difficulty, and, not finding it, wished that a way would open itself. Many are on record in these respects. It is idle, after the event, to surmise what would have been the issue of these desires and tendencies. That the action of the abolitionists had any moral effect in emancipating the slave, I do not believe; that it made his condition worse, I know. It is true that their professed sentiments were in harmony with the sentiments of the times, and sentiments growing stronger and becoming more widely diffused, but their action was, at best, that of a fanatical, blind, and headlong philanthropy, and one largely infidel in its spirit, in that it was not content to await the effects of this growing sentiment, and to permit events to shape themselves under the Supreme Being. On the contrary, philanthropy of that type tends to make the advocates of any movement deify their prejudices and opinions; in other words, deify themselves. That the agitation of the matter of emancipation was one of the causes which led to the civil war, I admit; but I do not see how any one can find a ground for self-satisfaction in the thought that he participated in producing a result so fearful. That, in my opinion, is all that the abolitionists ever accomplished toward the abolition of slavery.

The issuing of the Proclamation of Emancipation had two effects. One was that it tended to conciliate those in all parts of the world who shared in the sentiments of the times concerning slavery, to which I have referred, and, possibly, prevented the intervention of foreign power; and the other was that it secured to the Administration, for the further prosecution of the war, the support of those who had begun to grow lukewarm. It secured their votes as an expression of their support. But it did not produce all the results which were expected by some persons. Mr. Lincoln received the promise that, if he would issue the proclamation, "the volunteers would swarm along the highways." The proclamation was issued, but there was no swarming of volunteers. Substitutes were still in demand, and the rate of bounties was not reduced. On the other hand, the issuing of the proclamation tended to alienate

those who had been generous supporters of a war for the Union. Had the Union been preserved without the abolition of slavery, slavery would have received a serious, and, probably, a fatal blow. There would never have been a consent that any slave, who had been, in fact, free within the Union lines, should be re-enslaved, and the slaves within the Confederate lines, having heard of freedom, would never again have been content as in former years. The result would have been the same if the Seceding States had achieved their independence. No military or police forces on earth, working on both sides of the line, could have enforced a fugitive slave law among a people once released from constitutional obligations to discharge a duty which it had been repugnant to their feelings to discharge. It always seemed strange to me that the secessionists were so blind as not to see this, and not to understand that the best degree of safety for the "peculiar institution" lay in the Union.

The most objectionable feature of slavery, and one which invited attack and presented a vulnerable point, was that it involved the severing of family ties, the separation of parents and children and of husband and wife. Marriage, whatever degree of sanctity was attached to it, had ever the element of being of a transient nature. This fact necessarily had a demoralizing result. It is true that practice was better than the ordinary legal status of master and slave. Slave owners encouraged matrimony, such as it was, from the best of motives, and because it tended to good morals and good order and to their own advantage. Legislation, in some States, local customs, and the efforts of individuals united to mitigate the evil; but, in spite of all this, the evil remained.

To this condition of things all the various religious denominations in the South, though they included, under their several names, all the people, succumbed. When a slave husband and wife were separated, the fact was regarded as an abandonment, and each party was at liberty to form new relations. Many years ago I read, and I believed the statement to be well founded, that the Southern Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, seeing the evil, and desiring to remove or mitigate it, conferred informally among themselves concerning the adoption of measures pointing in that direction, but that, owing to the excited and sensitive condition of the Southern people, caused by the action of the abolitionists, they came to the conclusion that the measures were impracticable, or that it was not opportune to attempt to introduce them. Certain it is that those denominations were not able to grapple with the subject.

In the religious denominations I, of course, do not include the Catholic Church. But Catholics were not numerous except in Maryland and Louisiana, in which their social influence was great, and, apparently, in no State did they constitute a majority of the people. In most of the States the Catholic Church was but little known beyond the limits of the principal cities. Consequently, it did not exert an influence upon

any owners and slaves other than those who were its own adherents. How its influence would have been regarded if it had been exerted, is a mere matter of surmise. My friend, Algernon S. Sullivan, lately deceased, told me that he had heard gentlemen of Virginia say that they would not like to see the Catholic Church gain a footing in the slave population, for the reason that the result would be the creation of a third and independent class, and one exercising a great influence, between the owners and the slaves. Those ideas were akin to that once expressed to me by a Protestant gentleman, who said that, if his wife were a Catholic, he would not like her to go to confession. It is, of course, impossible to argue against such opinions, founded, as they are, upon erroneous ideas. No doubt those Virginians did not know that no influence has ever done so much to ameliorate the condition of those held in servitude, whether known as villains, serfs, or slaves, as has that of the Catholic Church, and that that influence has not tended to cause commotion or insubordination in respect to lawful authority.

The Catholics of the South, white and colored, owner and slave, received the same Sacraments, and knew that a marriage, properly contracted, was indissoluble. On account of the lax notions prevailing among others, embarrassing questions often arose. The late Bishop Lynch, Catholic Bishop of Charleston, told me that the colored people attached various degrees of importance to the binding effects of the marriage ceremony, whether the person officiating was white or colored, a clergyman, white or colored, or a layman. Those distinctions were not, of themselves, of any importance in his eyes. But other circumstances were of importance, and he said that a colored couple never came to him to be married that his heart did not sink at the contemplation of the necessity of ascertaining the facts as to any former relation of either of the persons, and the difficulty of ascertaining them. It sometimes happened that a Catholic husband and wife were separated for life by the sale of one of them, and then the future condition of each was very trying. The late Father Hamilton, of Savannah, told me in that city, in the fall of 1868, that he had known of such separations; that naturally, the new owner of the slave desired that he or she should re-marry, and that they (the priests) had exerted themselves to find a purchaser who would not urge the matter. He told me, further, that *Catholic slaves, as a class, had a higher market value than others.* One of his narratives is worth repeating. He said that, at one time, when traveling in a remote part of the country, he received a message from a gentleman requesting him to call upon a slave who wished to see him. He found that the man was from Maryland or Virginia, and was a Catholic, as was his wife; that he had been sold and taken South, and had pleased the person who then owned him so well that he had been entrusted with the care of a mill; that for some years there had been communications between him and his

wife, but that they had ceased, and he did not know whether she was still living; that for many years he had not seen a Catholic priest, and that he had not re-married and had lived in perfect purity. "Truly," said Father Hamilton, in closing his narrative "he was a saint in ebony."

We "Anglo-Saxons" think ourselves superior to the rest of mankind in so many respects that, possibly, it may be a shock to our self-conceit to learn that, in the matter of African slavery in the Western Hemisphere, we were inferior to those who are not of our boasted origin. I can write with confidence of the slaves in Cuba only; but it is safe to infer that the conditions prevailing there prevailed throughout the Spanish West Indies and in Brazil. My informant is an intelligent gentleman, a native of South America, of Spanish origin, a lawyer by profession, and who resided and practiced his profession for twenty-five years in Cuba. He has been much in Europe, and, of course, is thoroughly familiar with what is known to lawyers as the Civil Law. What I have heretofore written concerning the inducements which existed for importing slaves into Cuba, the undue proportion of males imported and the results of those facts should be borne in mind.

In Cuba the Sacraments of the Catholic Church applied to owner and slave alike. Therefore, marriage between slaves was indissoluble, and under the laws the legal status of husband and wife and parents and children were the same as if they were white. In reality, however, marriages were but few in number. Contrary to what was the condition of affairs in our Slave States, the usages of the slaves were not on a level with the legal rights of which all could avail themselves. In any case of cruelty, ill treatment, or want of proper care and support, the slave had a right to call his owner into court and the matter was tried and judgment rendered as in the case of any other litigants. A slave could own property of any kind, our distinction of real and personal property not being known, could receive it by gift, will, or otherwise, and so dispose of it. He could make a contract of any kind concerning his property. He had a right to purchase himself, and, if his owner and he once agreed upon the price, the owner could not demand a higher price thereafter. If they could not agree, the price was determined by a proper tribunal, and the decision was binding upon both parties. It was one of the duties of a public official, known as a Syndic, to represent and protect the slave in all legal proceedings. Though the laws did not forbid the sale, by the owner, of the children of his slaves, the customs of society, which were potent and could not be ignored, and the courts, whenever the matter came before them incidentally, forbade the practice, and the prohibition applied to all slave children, whether their parents were sacramentally married or otherwise. My informant tells me that the Cubans regarded the practices prevailing in the United States, as to the separation of husband and wife, the sale of children, and the rearing of children for sale,

as cruel in the extreme. In referring to the contrast presented by the two systems, I cannot but refer again to the inability or disinclination of the religious denominations in the *South* to grapple with the subject of slavery, and to remove its repulsive features. The majority of the adherents of the religious denominations of the *North* asserted that they could not listen to a compromise with what they deemed a sin, and, consequently, their influence did not tend to ameliorate the condition of the slave or to the gradual extinguishment of slavery.

Slavery is at an end in Cuba. The voluntary acts of owners have co-operated with the proceedings of the government. The slaves have been manumitted by degrees, and the system has disappeared gradually. There has been no violence or revolution, or social disorder, and no disturbance of the industries of the Island. In Brazil slavery is approaching an end; and there, too, the change has been wrought gradually and without commotion.

Slavery was abolished in Jamaica by Act of Parliament in 1833, and, after a brief term of apprenticeship, all the slaves were set free. The immediate results were very injurious. As to the condition of affairs afterwards there was much dispute. Many years ago the English Quarterlies teemed with articles upon the subject, and each writer claimed to have a knowledge of all the essential facts, but it happened that the facts always confirmed the opinion which he had formed previously. To the reader, impartial and wishing to be informed, the result was as unsatisfactory as is the reading of the reports ordinarily made by the majority and minority of a Congressional Investigation Committee.

I have always considered it one of the most fortunate circumstances of my life, and, I may say, one to be envied, that its events were such as to cause me to visit many parts of the country east of the Mississippi, and to become acquainted, and, sometimes, intimately acquainted, with the residents of every part of the United States. The result has been that, though I have lost the pleasure of regarding any place as "home," with all the surroundings and associations of family residence and childhood, I have been free, I think, from sympathizing with the miserable feelings of prejudice and antipathy which existed in nearly every part of the country against some other or all other parts, and which were stronger, if possible, than the affections, natural and laudable, which one has for the place or State of his birth and residence. I have seen much which I liked in the local characteristics of the people of every part of the country. I admit that I have seen much which I exceedingly disliked.

It was the institution of slavery which made the most marked distinction which existed between any sections of the country, and it was this institution which gave a peculiar character to the communities in

which it was established. Its influences affected their lives in their social and domestic relations, in their industrial pursuits, in their politics, and in matters moral and religious. It has been my lot, from my childhood, and without interruption till the present time, to have close relations of friendship with many Southern people. The friendships formed in North Carolina sixty years ago are not all extinct, and they, in the course of years, have led to others. Several times since, various events, some of them naturally happening through the army life of my family, have been the cause of friendships with the residents of several Southern States. I have survived most of those whom I knew, but a few still remain. My frequent visits to Washington before the war served to extend the range of my acquaintance with the Southern people. My visits to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, had the same effect, though in a less degree. It was an army station, and, besides, some of the resident families had Southern friends. It is the seat of Dickinson College, and many of the students were from the border Slave States. The college is under the patronage of the Methodists, and the members of that denomination hold a much higher position, socially, in that part of the country, and thence southward, than is the case of the Northern and Eastern States.

I write, then, with some claim of knowledge concerning the characteristics of the Southern people. The industries of the South were almost exclusively agricultural, and the immense majority of the people were engaged or interested in agriculture. The agriculture, as was necessarily the case, the laborers being slaves, was of a crude nature, and consisted of raising a few staple crops. Scientific agriculture was all but impossible, and, therefore, not practiced. With the exception of New Orleans, there were no large cities south of the Potomac; indeed, measured by the standard existing even at that time, it was the only city. The planters were the leading class, socially and politically, and the control of public affairs was in the hands of residents of the country, the rural population. Property consisted, mainly, of real estate and slaves, and what are now known as "capitalists" and immense corporations with large issues of stocks and bonds, subsidizing legislatures, controlling elections, and, even, influencing courts, were but little known. It is true that it has been mainly since the war that such capitalists and corporations have acquired an immense, and, as some think, a dangerous power, in the Northern States; but they always possessed a power not known in the South. Commerce and trade were legitimate, and consisted in transporting and selling the crops and supplying the wants of the people. There was little room for speculation. Property remained long in the same families, and might have remained for generations had it not been for the spendthrift and extravagant habits of many of the planters. Too often were their crops pledged for advances, and even their plantations mortgaged to secure the debts which they had con-

tracted. Still, property, generally, was stable, and a class of permanent resident owners existed. In the spring of 1860 I went down the James River on my way to Fort Monroe. I, of course, admired the beautiful plantations which lay along the shores. Each had its private landing, and, as the steamboat drew near any one of them, a party approached from the residence, often the owner and members of the family, young ladies and gentlemen, coming to meet their friends, or to receive the mail, or for curiosity's sake, attended, also, by a retinue of young negroes and beautiful dogs. I asked the captain, with whom I had much chat during the day, what was the price of land along the river. To my surprise, he told me that he had never known one of those plantations to be sold. He was a young man, and, therefore, spoke to some persons who were sitting near us upon the subject, and the answer to his inquiry was that *one* of the number remembered a sale. The result of the war was that those plantations were abandoned, and were given to desolation. If, in the re-organization of industry which has taken place, they are again cultivated, it is probable that they are not now cultivated and occupied by their former owners. The general condition of affairs may be better for the community at large than that of former years, but, truly, those owners have been compelled to drink a bitter draught. Why, after having been subjected to those humiliations which were the necessary consequences of their defeat, any persons should have cried *vae victis*, and have placed upon them the other humiliations of some of the measures of reconstruction, I cannot comprehend. It appears to me that the spirit which governed those persons was as truculent as that which animated the Jews in their treatment of the inhabitants of the land which they invaded. When I heard those statements on the steamboat I remembered a conversation which I had had with an acquaintance on a Hudson River steamboat in 1857. In the height of the panic of that year he and I were going from a village on the river to New York. He knew, by name and reputation, the occupants of many of the beautiful houses which were in sight, most of them more costly and substantial than those which stood on the shores of the James River. Like himself, those occupants were engaged in business in New York, and as he named them, I learned that all, with hardly an exception, were *shaky*. Probably not one of the occupants was born where he resided, and it is probable that very few, if any, of those houses are owned by the descendants of those who owned them in 1857. It is sad to contemplate the vicissitudes of fortune wherever they may occur, and it may be said that it is not fair to institute a comparison between the residents on the shores of the James and of the Hudson. This criticism is true, and its truth merely serves to justify me in speaking of the permanency of property in the Slave States. The dwellers on the Hudson were engaged in business, and were aware of the risks to which they were exposed; the dwellers on the James, themselves or

their families, would be living now where they lived in 1860, had not the war disturbed them in their possessions. They were a portion of a rural class, which had control in political as well as in social matters. That class, so potent, did not exist elsewhere in this country. I think that the influence of a class such as that is better than the influence exercised by powerful corporations or the party leaders and "bosses" of large cities.

The characteristics of the Southern people were the results of their modes of life. Not being engaged in commercial pursuits or in trade, and not being capitalists in the sense which I have mentioned, they were not moved by the spirit of speculation or the desire to make a fortune by methods akin to gambling. Pecuniary affairs had not an undue importance with them. They furnished to the country some of its ablest lawyers, and their legislators and statesmen were of the first rank. Their statesmen acted on questions of public policy upon fundamental and constitutional principles, and not from motives of temporary expediency. The South exerted a paramount influence in establishing the organic features of our political institutions, and in shaping our legislation so as to preserve the relations which should exist between the General Government and the several States.

The South produced few authors, poets, artists, musicians, architects, scholars or men of scientific attainments; and, as a general thing, the tastes and thoughts of the Southern people did not tend to create a condition of affairs of which such men are a result and an expression. Such men are generally to be found among people dwelling together in large numbers, where there is a constant attrition of mind against mind, and the efforts and attainments of a person engaged in any pursuit instruct and stimulate all others similarly engaged.

There were marked foibles among the Southerners; and, with many, the younger members of society particularly, the foibles ceased to be harmless foibles, but became offensive in their manifestation. There were ostentatious and untimely references to "blood," often groundless, and not a possession or merit by any means exceptionally their own, and being mainly a result of the permanency of property which has been mentioned, and which applied to but a small fraction of the population. There was needless talk about honor and chivalry; and the young men too often wished it to be understood that they were "sudden and quick in quarrel." But foibles are found everywhere.

It was the prevailing idea at the North that Southern ladies led lives of indolence. Such was not the case. A married lady's life was one involving large responsibilities, from the discharge of which she could not escape. Hotel life was, of course, not known, and each married lady was the head of a household larger or smaller according to her means and position. The confectioner and the caterer, with all their ap-

pliances, did not exist outside of the cities. If the lady had a skillful cook or an expert waiter, each had been taught by her, or some other lady. No servant did half the amount of work which is required of a servant at the North. Each of those servants often had two or more children; and all, servants and children, lived upon the premises, and outnumbered the white members of the family. All, from birth to burial, required and received the care of their mistress. I have reason to believe that, as emancipation has banished the young and the old and the sick, among the colored, from Southern households, and has made them no longer subjects of care and thought, Southern ladies feel that they, too, have been emancipated. Truly, in the olden time, the virtuous woman, as described in Holy Writ, was to be found throughout the Southern States.

In private and domestic life, the fidelity of husband and wife, and the devotion of parents and children in Southern families, were not surpassed in any part of the world. In the broader relations of life the people of the South could not suffer by comparison with the people of any State or any Nation. Legislation and the administration of public affairs in State, County, City and Town were pure. Public men were upright and free from suspicion. Curruption and venality were rarely known. The cases were so few that they proved merely the demoralization of individuals. Men were upright in semi-public positions, as officers and employees of corporations. In the only case of a defalcation, of which I ever heard, the relatives of the defaulter were humbled and walked lowly thereafter. It was painful for me to meet one of them, whom I occasionally saw in New York, so anxious did he seem to be to avoid the glance of the eyes of one who knew the sad story. The President of a Southern Railway Company told me that he sent the Superintendent of the road, or the Chief of some Department, to the North to obtain railroad supplies, and that the employe said to him, on his return, that, at various establishments, he had been offered, to his great surprise, a commission if he would make the purchases from them. His surprise was less than his anger. He regarded the offer as a proposition to steal from his employers. That those good qualities of the Southern people were largely due to the fact that they were substantially an agricultural community, were not engaged in financial operations, and were not exposed to the heated rivalries, and the anxieties and excitements which prevail in large cities, I admit. It is an old adage, and a true one, that half of our virtues are from the absence of temptation. But the facts were as stated, and they prove that the Southern people were not, as was too often alleged, and particularly by New Englanders and their descendants, subjects for some sort of missionary enterprise in order that they might be raised to the higher standard of morality which prevailed among their Northern neighbors.

Slavery is at an end, and with it has disappeared forever social con-

ditions which could not exist in a community where all were free. That the sudden emancipation of millions of slaves took place quietly, with but a few instances of violence or disorder, and without producing conflicts between the two races, is one of the most wonderful events in history. The fact proves that the colored race, by long contact with the white race, had imbibed something of that respect for law which has always characterized the latter.

The future of the colored race is an important problem. They have the best wishes and will have the aid of all well-meaning men. The reign of the carpet-bagger and the scalawag is at an end. The colored race will not vote, as heretofore, largely on one side; but it is to be feared that the change will make them venal and the prey and tools of corrupt politicians. In all things they will find that their best friends are the classes with whom they were most closely connected when they were in a condition of servitude.

After my manuscript had been placed in the hands of the printers, a letter addressed by Pope Leo XIII to the Bishops of Brazil, on the occasion of the termination of slavery in that Empire, and dated May 5th, 1888, was made public. I saw it in The Catholic Review (Weekly) of June 17–23, and doubtless it has been published in other periodicals. It is the work of a master mind. In its lucidity and the logical sequence of all its parts, it reads like a legal argument prepared by a Charles O'Conor, or a state paper prepared by a Daniel Webster. It is a pleasure to read an able and exhaustive paper, whatever may be the subject of which it treats; it is a pleasure, immensely greater, to read this letter, the utterances of the divinely appointed Head of the Visible Church, upon a subject so important as slavery. It sets forth, with sufficient fullness and in the most lucid manner, the course of the Church, its views, influences and action, concerning the institution of slavery, from its own foundation, through all centuries, till the present time. It gives no countenance to the proposition, first broached by the Abolitionists, that the word *servant*, as used in the Bible, does not include, in the entire scope of its meaning, *a slave*. On the contrary, many passages are cited from the Bible in order to show the position of the Church concerning this very matter of slavery. It would have been singular, indeed, if, at a time when slavery was universal, and a large part of mankind were slaves, the Church had not condemned slavery as a sin, if it was a sin, or had not given instructions to owners and slaves, as to their respective duties. It did not condemn slavery as a sin. This is a fact which all intelligent persons, not blinded by fanaticism, have ever understood. It did give the necessary instructions. and. till the end of time, they will serve as a

sufficient guide to all who hold the relation of superiors and inferiors in domestic life.

The letter shows how tenderly and gently, and with what patience and prudence, and yet, how firmly, and with what encouraging progress and final success, the Church has dealt with the subject of slavery. Would that its counsels and influence had had free scope, from the time that slavery was first established among us, upon owners and slaves and the whole community. It may be that, owing to existing circumstances and conditions, there were an "impending crisis" and an "irrepressible conflict," and that "the war had to come;" but there was nothing in the nature of slavery itself which made a conflict necessary or required that a shot should be fired or a drop of blood shed. Unfortunately, evil counsels, erroneous ideas and uncharitable feelings prevailed, and their legitimate results followed. It was not true, as was asserted at the North, that "Slavery was the sum of all villainies;" and it was not true, as was subsequently asserted at the South, that "Slavery was a divine institution." It was sentiments such as these, the joint productions of fanatics and demagogues, and proceedings corresponding with the sentiments, which produced an irrepressible conflict. Not, that, in my opinion, each part of the country was equally instrumental in creating the conditions which resulted in the conflict. Granted that all the especially objectionable features of slavery at the South, which I have mentioned, really existed; the fact still remains, in my opinion, that the Abolitionists of the North were the unprovoked and inexcusable aggressors. Granted, further, that Secession was wrong in principle, and, when measured by a lower standard, worse as a matter of expediency, it still remains that, primarily, it was the words and acts of the Abolitionists of the North which created the conditions which served as an excuse, for those who wanted one, for Secession. The Abolitionists should be distinguished from the Free Soilers and the Republicans. The latter had their origin in the later conditions, and, though I did not agree with their views and purposes, they generally sought to gain their ends by means of legislation, which they claimed to be within the Constitution.

APPENDIX C.

I can mention two occurrences which illustrate the spirit which prevailed among some of the Republicans.

An acquaintance of mine, a prominent lawyer and a Democrat, of high social position, who resided, and still resides, in the interior of Pennsylvania, told me that, during the war, when he happened to be in Philadelphia, he was invited by an acquaintance to visit a Social Republican Club, and that, on his reading, placed conspicuously on one of the walls, the words: "Disloyal persons not admitted here," or something to that effect, he asked who were considered disloyal persons, and that his acquaintance answered: "Democrats." He did not tell me, nor did I ask, whether it was known that he was a Democrat, or whether, the fact being known, he was not considered so bad as "those wicked Democrats" generally.

The other occurrence was a personal experience. I had known, for many years before the war, a family with the members of which I had had very pleasant relations, and which I was sure nothing which I had said or done, or omitted to say or do, had served to mar or change. The relations were purely social; conversation had never taken the form of discussion or controversy, and the political opinions of each were known to all. Various circumstances had rendered it convenient for them and for me, that, when the season arrived for our meeting more frequently than usual, the advance, in each instance, should be made by them, and this had become the settled custom. In the course of time the war came. I continued to act with the Democratic party, but neither said nor did anything which could be reasonably deemed objectionable. True, I flatter myself that I was not a coward, and therefore did not, for dread of being "called names" such as "copperhead," make a display of my loyalty. I *know* that I was not a trimmer. About this time, after what I deemed was a sufficient consideration of the subject, continued through years, I came to the conclusion that it was my duty, and binding upon me in conscience, to submit myself openly to the Catholic Church, and that, if I should fail to do so, I would put myself in peril. When I arrived at the decision, I gave but little consideration to the point whether any and what comments might be made. The affair was *mine* and that sufficed for me. The external conditions of my relations with the family, to which I have referred, remained as I have described them, and, yet, for years after the occurrence last mentioned took place, and from before the middle of the war, though members of the family were often in my sight, and, even, hearing, and my being near at hand must have been known, I and my existence were completely ignored.

Finally, I asked an acquaintance of theirs and mine, who was aware of the change which had taken place, what was the meaning of this want of recognition, and his answer was: "The fact is, I suppose, that they do not like Democrats and Catholics." I do not doubt that his supposition was correct. That I did not regard the matter more in sorrow (for them) than in anger is due to the fact that my appreciation of its drollery nearly effaced the effects of both emotions.

As I take pride in being a Democrat and a Catholic, it would be unseemly and unreasonable for me to take the tone of *defense* upon either point of the objections which were made. I prefer the tone of *aggression*, and, fortunately, at this juncture, both points may be treated in this manner.

The Democrats of the North were the real Union Party. When war came, recognizing the fact that the disruption of the Union would be the direst of calamities, not for this country alone, but for mankind, they stood, as ever before, for the Union and the Constitution. If there were exceptions among them, they were not more numerous than were those, not Democrats, who, for years, had declared themselves ready to "shovel the Slave States out of the Union," while others said, as I heard it said: "You cannot kick the Slave States out of the Union;" thus charging the people of the South with want of sincerity in making their complaints, and with not having the courage to act according to their threats, and leading them to suppose that it was believed at the North that they would eat their words and submit to anything. When afterwards, as was the case, any of the Democrats withdrew, or lost, their sympathy in the war, it was because the Republican Party had departed from the purposes for which the war was to be conducted, as first formulated and proclaimed with the approval of all. Added to this was the fact that the Administration trampled the Constitution under foot, violated the sacred rights of liberty, interfered with elections in loyal States, and, whenever or wherever it deemed it necessary, attempted to establish military rule. Some persons, cowards or trimmers, who still called themselves Democrats, approved, or pretended to approve of all this as demanded by the "life of the nation;" others preferred to "let the Union slide," which expression, I think, had a Republican origin; but the mass of the party, of which I was one, felt and said that the restoration of the Union was paramount to everything, and that, as to all grounds of complaint, we must wait, the Union having been restored, for times to come. It looks now, as if the dreary hours of waiting were passed, and as if the times to come were to be ours.

The Democratic Party has been guilty of committing grievous errors; errors in its political course and in its candidates. Those errors, in my opinion, have been the results of cowardice; an abandonment of principle, and the substitution of measures prompted by a willingness to con-

sult a short-sighted policy, with a view to an immediate success, for those which would have better accorded with a policy far-sighted and comprehensive. The desired success never came. Among those errors were: The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which, whatever may have been its original merits, limited the extension of slavery according to its natural limits; the platform of 1864, adopted as a cowardly concession to noisy, but small, faction, and which, possibly, caused the defeat of McClellan; the proposed nomination of Chase in 1868, and the ridiculous nomination, in 1872, of Greeley, whose election was *never* a possibility. Strange that public men do not see that courage is the best quality which a party can possess, and that nine men out of every ten in a party, who may hesitate to act for themselves, will follow a courageous man, who voices the principles of the party, and will follow him, not blindly or by reason of the glamour or prestige of his name, but with hearty and intelligent good will, and as a leader for whom they have long waited.

It is not in my power, as it is not my province, to say more concerning the objection made to me as a Catholic, than to give expression to my undoubting conviction that the Catholic Church is divine in its origin, and, though necessarily working through human, and, therefore, through frail instruments, is always supernaturally, and, therefore, unerringly, guided, and is, as it has ever been, the friend, than which there can be no better, of all rulers and all nations.

In contrast with the disposition manifested by many members of parties not Democratic, to establish a system of social ostracism in regard to their opponents, I am proud to say that, though Democrats hold their political principles very tenaciously, I never knew of a case where a Democrat was guided, in his social relations, by his political opinions to the effacement of other influences and considerations. "Offensive partisanship" may be manifested in social life, but I have never known a Democrat to make any such display. On the other hand, many of the Republicans were not only "in season" but often "out of season." They frequently converted their pulpits into political platforms, and the result was that Democratic and Protestant church-goers were of the opinion that many of their churches had, indeed, become, in the language of Mrs. Partington: "places where the gospel is dispensed with." I cannot state the case better than by using the language of a friend of mine, Mr. Freeman P. Woodbury, now deceased: "The Republicans have an unfair advantage over us, Churchill; they can stump it seven days in the week."

APPENDIX D.

The query may arise: Why should I, a Democrat, have been in attendance, as an outsider, at a Whig Convention? This is the answer: The surroundings of my early life were those of the Whig Party, and I naturally adopted its sentiments, and learned to regard the Democrats, or Lo-co-fo-cos, as wanting in intelligence, sincerity, virtue and patriotism, and as persons to be avoided and tabooed. As a boy, in 1840, I participated in all the tomfoolery of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," and "Log Cabin and Hard Cider," and thought it wisdom. A change was wrought by reflection and reading, and by wider associations and experience, and the observation of the tendencies of political parties. I came to understand and approve the strict construction placed by the Democratic Party upon the powers vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution, and to reject the latitudinarian views of the Whig Party, for the reason, among others, that they led to legislation which favored classes and which made lavish expenditures for purposes purely local, no one of which could have gained favor on its own merits, but which combined for a raid upon the Federal Treasury. I did not sympathize with the spirit of ostracism and intolerance displayed by many of the Whigs and their successors in reference to persons of foreign birth, and to Catholics, whether native or foreign. I perceived that the Abolitionists were mainly to be found among the Whigs of the North. I saw that it was the logical result of the ideas and theories entertained by all parties other than the Democratic that their members should be, and were, disposed to meddle, by legislation and criticism and otherwise, with the affairs of their neighbors, the social organizations of the citizens of other States, and the private habits of their fellow-citizens of their own State. Every year of experience and all my thoughts and reading upon the subject enabled me to see more clearly, and, therefore, to condemn the fallacies and iniquities of the protective system, that system by means of which the many are taxed for the benefit of the few in this respect that but a small portion of the sums which are wrung from the many, under the protective system, goes into the National Treasury. I was convinced that any such system was not only unconstitutional, but was a fruitful source of oppression and deception and of combinations and conspiracies against the rights and interests of the people.

Though I have answered the query, I think it opportune to add some general remarks concerning the protective system. The idea and the practice of protection existed from the organization of our present Federal system, but I think that it was due to Mr. Clay, that "The American System" became the motto of a political party. In adopting the

motto the advocates of protection virtually characterized their opponents as being unpatriotic, and not *American*, but *British*. Though dictatorial and uncharitable in his political career, Mr. Clay was thoroughly patriotic, just and national in his feelings. But, in his day, the protective system had not been studied in theory and observed in its results when in operation, as has been the case in later years. In my opinion the protective system is anything but American. The American idea, if I understand it, is in the direction of the freedom and largest liberty of the individual and of the community, due regard being had for the welfare and safety of the public, and of peace among ourselves and with all nations. The same spirit leads to free intercourse with all nations, that is, to FREE TRADE.

I do not see why free trade should not prevail throughout the entire world as it exists among our States and Territories. If it should be urged, as it is often urged, that we should not *depend* upon other nations, the answer is readily found. Owing to the vast extent of the country, and its varied conditions of soil and climate, there is nothing absolutely necessary to our independence which we cannot produce without protection. Other nations depend upon *us*. We must, of course, have fortifications and ships of war, and all the appliances of war, and must not depend upon other nations for anything needed in war. This, I think, is the limit to which we should carry protection under any circumstances; but we can have all these requisites and they can be provided by the U. S. Government in its own foundries and navy yards, as resultants and consequences of the growth and existence of private industries. Only let those industries take care of themselves; let them be neither protected nor hampered. If an industry is remunerative it does not need protection; if it is not, it should not be undertaken, not, at least, so long as the existing conditions remain unchanged. In the natural order of events, the industries of a country are determined by external conditions, and any industries not so determined are artificial and should never be undertaken. The inhabitants of a new country, covered by forests, should fell trees and make slabs and shingles before they undertake to cut and polish diamonds. It would be more profitable, as well as more natural, for them to manufacture potash than perfumery. Oranges may be forced in Maine and ice manufactured in Florida, but free trade between those States prevents any such foolish enterprises being undertaken. So it should be between nations. Time was when hardly a clothes-pin was made by machinery in the Northwestern States. Now, Chicago is one of the four leading manufacturing cities of the country. All of this is the result, not of bounties and subsidies, protection of Western industries and restriction upon purchases at the East, but of free trade among the States, that is, allowing things to shape themselves. So should it be among nations. The result with us is a condition of af-

fairs which is healthful and natural. It will continue so long as external circumstances remain unchanged. Should circumstances demand a change it should be permitted to take place, and, under our system of inter-State free trade, it will take place.

Undoubtedly it sometimes happens, under this system, that one part of the country may be prosperous to the detriment of another, but this can never be without benefit to a largely increased number of people, and, therefore, the country at large. Time was when wheat was an important crop in the Valley of the Mohawk and in the Valley of the Genessee, and when the flouring mills of Oswego and Rochester were of the first rank. Now, Minneapolis is the principal flouring city in the United States, and wheat and other grain, and animal food in every form, are mainly transported 1,000 miles and more to the Eastern consumers, and with less labor on the part of the producers and at lower prices to the consumers than in former years. I have read, of late, that forest trees are appearing in the old orchards of the deserted farms of New England, and that the farming population in New England is diminishing. I know that such is the case in Northern New York. This fact merely proves that the farming industry has ceased to be profitable in certain parts of the country, and that the farmers have gone west or have sought other occupations. It strikes me that it would be the wildest insanity to attempt, by legislation, to prevent these changes. But, compensation for these losses already begins to manifest itself. People of wealth and leisure, when they go into the interior, in their summer saunterings, do not seek prairies or any regions purely agricultural; they flock to the hills and mountains, all along from the mountains in Maine to the extreme Southern limits of the Appalachians. They do not wish to see hills and mountains parched and treeless, but forest-clad when they do not present cliffs and precipices to the view; they want to find brooks running brimful and not dry gullies. The new growth of forest trees, which has been mentioned, will tend to remove the disastrous results of the reckless and wasteful felling of the forests which has heretofore prevailed, and the farmers, who remain in the hills and mountains, will be able to dispose, at high prices, to the "summer boarders," of the products of their industry directed into new channels, and devoted to the cultivation of smaller areas than when crops alone were raised. Further than this, it will be found that forest culture is more lucrative, in the lapse of years, than was any form of agriculture bestowed in the past upon sterile and stony acres. All of these natural adjustments of industries are the results of free trade among the States. Such would be the results of free trade among all nations.

The language of some advocates of the protective system indicates that they think that every nation on earth would profit by a protective tariff. Of course the statement of the proposition carries a refutation

with it. But, if they are correct, each of our States would profit by a protective tariff on importations from all other States. If such is the case the People of the United States made a sad mistake when they adopted the Constitution. Under the Articles of Confederation, the several States possessed and exercised the power to collect duties on imports from other States. This was one of the evils which made it evident that another compact was necessary, and, finally, the People of the United States, in separate State Conventions, adopted a Constitution which established free trade among the States by Article I, Section 10, Clause 2nd, which is as follows: "No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws; and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress." Any one, who should propose to return to the old system, would be considered insane, and, yet, no doubt, a fraction of the population of every State would be able, by means of a protective tariff, to till soil, now neglected, and to apply themselves to industries not now pursued. Thousands of acres of land, within the limits of the Jersey Flats, are now lying waste and useless, producing nothing of any value but muskrats, and nothing else but malaria and mosquitoes. If they were surrounded by levees and ditched and drained, and the soil properly treated, they would be made extremely fertile, and there would be rich returns in cattle and in crops of every kind. There would be markets and consumers within the limits of the State. The results could not be accomplished without large expenditures and without protection against imports from other States. The protection would encourage "home industry;" but, and this is the point in the case, the cost to consumers would be immensely advanced. The people of New Jersey, if they had the power to do so, would not consent to the necessary protection. Why? Because they would prefer free trade among the States, as a result of which they could buy at the lowest rates and sell at the highest rates. By their decision they would consult the interests of every person in the State except those who sought protection. The only danger would be that the latter would combine with others, who also sought protection, to put a load upon the backs of the people. They would say, of those who opposed them in these schemes of oppression, as, according to the Evening Post of February 10th, 1888, Senator Sherman said, at the "Home Market Club," in Boston, the evening before, "he could excuse Prof. Sumner and Prof. Perry, whose theories exclude love of country and rest upon the universal love of man." Prof. Sumner and Prof. Perry must have been amused on hearing that they were charged with an altruism so Quixotic.

If it is well for the people of New Jersey, by means of free trade among the States, to buy at the lowest rates and to sell at the highest rates, why is it not well for the people of the United States, by free trade among nations, to have the same privilege; to have the choice of the whole world in making their purchases, and the wants and demands of the whole world in finding their customers? Every country of ordinary extent and importance, by reason of local conditions, produces a surplus, beyond its wants, of some article, agricultural, mineral or manufactured, and, of course, can sell the article, to those countries which require it, at an advance on the price which prevails where it is produced. It is a converse of the same proposition that every country, of ordinary extent and importance, by reason of local conditions, needs or desires some article which it does not produce, or of which it does not produce a sufficiency, and is willing to purchase the article in order to supply its wants. It is certain that merchants will buy the article and import it if they can make a profit by the transaction. If they are permitted to seek the article throughout the world, they will make their purchases in the country where the lowest prices prevail, and that country will be the one which produces the largest surplus and in which there are no restrictions on exportation. These exchanges contribute trade.

The system of free trade allows the exchanges mentioned to be made. It does not encourage them. It simply allows things to shape themselves, as exchanges take place among the States of our Union, or as the currents of the ocean keep the water at a level. By this process every country makes a profit; it sells its surplus above the home prices, and it buys the surplus of other countries at rates which are below the same rate of prices. Each gains by the transaction, and, yet, according to the methods by which the "Balance of Trade" is determined, that is, estimating the value of exports at the ports of exportation, and the value of imports at the ports of importation, each country is a loser. In order that a country may profit by its trade, the balance of trade, thus determined, *must* be against it. All the nations of the world may and should profit by their trade, and, if they do, the balance of trade must be against them. An erroneous idea has prevailed and still prevails upon this subject. A large proportion of the restraints upon the freedom of commerce for some centuries has grown out of this notion, and the advocates of the protective policy have made the most of it. An interesting article on balance of trade can be found in the Cyclopedia which I have mentioned.

Such is the result of the application of the principle of free trade. On the other hand the protective policy prevents, or tends to prevent, a country from disposing of its surplus at the highest prices in the markets of the world, and from supplying its wants by purchasing at the lowest prices in the same markets. Why? Because a country cannot sell

unless it is willing to purchase, and it cannot purchase unless it has something to sell. Every intelligent person must admit that a tariff of any kind, whether protective or not, operates as a restriction upon trade, and the avowed object of the advocates of a protective tariff in this country is to compel our people to purchase articles produced or manufactured in the United States. It follows, therefore, that any tariff tends to check exportations and to prevent our people from selling their surplus at the highest prices in the markets of the world. The extent to which the restriction operates depends upon the rates of duties levied, and the difficulties in the nature and condition of things which the false system is obliged to overcome. But, the tendency and the restriction remain the same. It is only a question of degrees.

Another erroneous idea, which the advocates of the protective system have endeavored, and with some unfortunate degree of success, to instill into the minds of our people is: That a dollar in gold is worth more than a dollar's worth of other property. The precious metals possess merely the advantage of exchangeability. Beyond this they are nothing but commodities, and it is not necessary to encourage their importation or prevent their exportation. But, the advocates of the protective system urge against the policy of free trade that, if adopted, the result would be that the country would be *drained of its gold.* The readers of Dombey and Son will remember that one of the guests at Dr. Blimber's entertainment, Mr. Baps, the Professor of Dancing, having got hold of this fallacious idea, flew around among the other guests, and posed them by the question: "What you were to do with your raw materials when they came into your ports in return for your drain of gold?", and that, among them all, Toots was the only one who ventured an answer, which was: "Cook 'em." Now, the Professor of Dancing was not familiar with the laws of trade; otherwise he would have known that England would not import raw materials for the mere fun of the thing, but because she needed them, and that, if she needed them, it was wise to import them even at the expense of a drain of gold. On the other hand, Toots, though not a philosopher, or a master of finance, showed wisdom in his answer; for it is clear that, if it was necessary for England to import raw materials, it was equally necessary that they should be adapted to the uses for which they were needed, and that cooking might be the best means of adaptation.

Since writing of this occurrence at Dr. Blimber's entertainment I have seen, in the Congressional Record, a speech made in the H. of R. by Mr. Allen, a member from Mississippi, on the 12th day of May, in which he mentions Mr. Baps and Mr. Toots. I am pleased to learn that I am not the only one who thinks that the occurrence serves to illustrate the fallacies of the protective system.

The question is sometimes asked, what is to become of existing in-

dustries? Those who ask the question, if they are well-informed, know perfectly well that no one proposes free trade, except as an end to be kept in view; that it is a result not to be reached now, even if it were desired and sought; that the most that can be expected is a movement in that direction coupled with a proper consideration of existing interests. A vicious system has no element of sanctity, and can acquire no prescriptive rights by lapse of years. But private interests, which are the outgrowth of a vicious system, particularly if it is, itself, a measure of public policy, have rights which should always be considered. I have never failed to note, however, that when an attempt is made to relieve the people, in the least degree, from the burdens of the protective tariff, the representatives of the protected interests proceed at once to denounce "tinkering with the tariff." On the other hand, when it is proposed to increase the burden, nothing is said about tinkering, but much is said about protecting the American laborers against the "pauper labor of Europe." Tinkering is, if possible, to be avoided, but, if the relief demanded cannot be obtained systematically and gradually, and with due regard to all classes, then, I say: on with the tinkering. That the interests, which have grown up under the influences of the protective system, must prepare themselves for the establishment of free trade or be crushed by it, on its being established, there can be, in my opinion, no doubt. The movement in favor of free trade is one which is as sure to be successful as were the various reform bills, the Catholic Emancipation bill, the bill to repeal the corn laws, and all the great measures which have been proposed by the Liberal Party in England. I cannot but be struck, however, by the protracted babyhood of the "infant industries" of the country. I am an old man, and yet, such of the infant industries, the companions of my childhood, as are not still "mewling and puking in the nurse's arms," have not advanced further, in the utterance of intelligible sounds, than to "cry for more." But, the claim of infancy is one which, in most instances, is without foundation. The industries are old in years, and, with increase of years, their inclination to maintain their unjust advantages has increased. As it is with a man, so it is with a class; a vice becomes more potent the longer it continues to rule. The avarice of a man, who is but twenty-five years old, is wastefulness, when compared with the avarice of a man whose years are three score and ten. There are moments when generosity and mercy are manifested by the former; the latter is grasping and inexorable at all times. Encouraged by success and rendered over-confident by their immunity, the protected classes may be made reckless by their intoxication, and be thrown by the over-burdened people from their shoulders, as the Old Man of the Sea was thrown from the shoulders of the unfortunate Sindbad.

Another point. The advocates of protection say that, though many of the Northern industries, which have derived a benefit from the pro

tective policy, are now, in a measure, so much matured as to be able to walk alone, the policy has gained new supporters in the industries which have been established in recent years in the Southern States. If such industries differed from those long prosecuted at the North, there might be something in the statement, but, as they are the same in all respects, the statement is perfectly fallacious. A tariff on imports, which the industries of one part of the country do not need, cannot be of service to the same industries in other parts. Why? Because the former will be the rivals of the latter, undersell them and drive them out of existence, unless the latter possess some advantages in local conditions, such as lower prices for land, building materials, fuel, motive power, food, supplies and customers near at hand. The only means whereby the underselling can be prevented is a combination among all the persons interested in the protected industries to maintain high prices. But, when the people come to understand that such combinations have been made, they will throw the doors open to foreign competition, that is, they will establish *free trade*. Such combinations have been made. It only remains for the people to know the fact.

It is not to be believed that the people of the Southern States, in which the new industries have been established, will range themselves on the side of protection. Most of the people of those States are interested in agriculture, and the agriculturists in every part of the country see now, better than ever, that there are none upon whom the evils of protection press more heavily than upon themselves. They understand that, though an agriculturist may not be the consumer of an imported article unless it may be a little spice or sugar or tea or coffee, or the like, he is taxed heavily for the support of the manufacturing classes. They are not deceived by the talk of a "home market" created for them at their doors. They want the world for a market. They see, with some of the manufacturers themselves, that, by reason of a vicious protective system, the latter cannot purchase their supplies at the lowest possible prices in all parts of the world, and, consequently, being undersold in foreign markets by those who do thus procure their supplies, cannot dispose of the products of their industries. The agriculturists see that, if we do not import, we cannot export, and that the system, which is called one of protection, is one of restriction and oppression.

It is one of the advantages of free trade that the world-wide producers of an article cannot combine to maintain an artificial price. Each producer is a competitor of all others. In this connection it may be said that, when an article is produced in but one country, it must be sold at the same price to all nations. A Chinese tea merchant, for instance, cannot sell a cargo of tea, destined for the United States, admitting that he knows its destination, for a higher price than he can sell one destined for England or France. If he should succeed in doing so, our

purchases would at once be made through the favored country. The Chinese tea merchant can have but one price.

In former times the advocates of protection frankly avowed that it was primarily the manufacturers whose interests were sought. Now, in the hope of securing new allies, they prate much of wage-earners, and the laboring classes. No one will claim that it is constitutional to tax one class of laborers for the benefit of another class; but, aside from the constitutional point, it is safe to assume that no one class will be content to be so taxed, and to assume, further, that all the laboring classes will understand that, as the cost of labor is but an item in the cost of manufacturing an article, employers will be compelled, by competition among themselves, and irrespective of any tariff, to hire labor at the lowest rates, and that, consequently, the benefits to be derived from protection will be enjoyed by the employers. The exceptional advantages enjoyed by the laboring men in this country do not arise from the protective policy, and cannot be maintained by it. They rest upon local conditions, our internal free trade, the readiness by which a laboring man can go from one pursuit to another, or make a change in his residence, the skill and enterprise of the workmen, and, largely, upon the fact that there are millions of acres of land to be had at low prices and ensuring a living to all who will occupy and cultivate them.

As to the methods of taxation for the national government, the choice seems to lie between internal revenue, and a tariff upon imports. There are two reasons, at least, why the former should be preferred. One is that the amount paid by the consumer of an article upon which there is an internal revenue tax is the limit of the amount paid by him, whereas, under the protective system, for every dollar of duties paid, several and often many dollars are paid to the favored classes, and, what is still worse, many dollars are paid to them by those who consume imported articles in but small quantities, if at all. The other reason is that the internal revenues are now derived from articles which are necessaries to merely a limited extent. Practically, and except to this limited extent, no one is obliged to pay anything for the support of the current expenses of the government. I have not made a close investigation, but I venture the opinion that, aside from the payment of pensions and interest on the national debt, the current expenses of the nation could be paid by the revenue from tobacco, whiskey when used as a beverage, and other articles so used. But if, in addition to the revenue derived from these sources, it is necessary to raise a revenue by a tariff on imports, then I suggest that the policy to be kept in view and, in due time, attained, would be best expressed by the words: *A tariff for revenue only, without the purpose of protection, direct or incidental, and without that result unless unavoidable.* In order to determine the rates of duty on the imported articles, it should be first ascertained what rates will

produce the largest amount of revenue, and then, if it should appear that those rates would produce more revenue than was required, the rates should be reduced. The proposition, lately made, to reduce the amount of revenue by increasing the rates, so as to diminish or prevent importations, is simply a bald proposition to tax the mass of the people for the benefit of the few, is unconstitutional, and is a scheme of oppression.

The protective policy, based, as it is, upon the idea that each nation should make itself independent of all others by throwing around itself a barrier of exclusion, is in accord with the idea that the nations of the earth are necessarily hostile, and should shape their policy as if they were likely to become open enemies. It is in accord with the ideas which once prevailed, and were put in practice, that all strangers were enemies, that private property was subject to capture in war, that prisoners of war should be reduced to slavery or put to death, and that wrecks and the cargoes and the private property of the crews and passengers of wrecked vessels were lawful plunder. It was considered quite an amelioration when, for the violence and license of a mob, the monopoly of conducting the plundering was secured to certain powerful men of the neighborhood and a hereditary class of land pirates, similar to the Robber Barons, the Road Agents of the period, was created. When, subsequently, it was proposed to make the matter of wrecks a subject of legal procedure, the members of this hereditary aristocracy made a great outcry concerning the proposition to overthrow "existing industries;" and, so powerful and influential had they become, that it was necessary to secure their assent to the introduction of the new order of things by bribes and the other means well known to Prime Ministers.

The policy of free trade is in line with modern and enlightened ideas: the increasing exemptions from capture in war of private property, the increasing rights of neutrals, the restrictions placed upon privateering, and the submitting of differences between nations to arbitration. All of these changes are in the right direction. They lead to peace, free intercourse and free trade, and to the solidarity of nations. It may seem idle to entertain a view so hopeful when Europe is shaken by the tramping of armies and millions of soldiers are maintained on account of the jealousies and suspicions of rival nations, largely growing out of the question which of them, when the time comes, shall administer upon the effects of the sick man of Europe. The force of all this I acknowledge, but my faith in the advent of a condition of things in the near future to which the circumstances above mentioned point, is not shaken. An optimist by nature, I am still more an optimist by conviction and by the contemplation of past events and present tendencies.

APPENDIX E.

I call attention, here, to several points worthy of careful consideration. My father was a Northern man, and, more than that, a Vermonter. Gen. Macomb died in June, and, as soon as it had been decided that Gens. Scott and Wool should be promoted, as was but right and might have been expected, and the decision became known, interest in the Army centered upon the question who would succeed Gen. Wool. The position of Inspector General (with the rank of Colonel) was one of the most important and responsible in the service. It stood next to the position of Adjutant General and those of the Chiefs of Corps. It cannot be doubted that applications were made for the promotion which the vacancy would make necessary, and that all customary influences were used in favor of every applicant. My father had never had the inclination or the capacity to play the courtier. He had been but little in Washington, and for years his duties had been discharged at a distance, and, mostly, in obscurity, and there were but few who were aware of their nature and importance, and of the manner in which he had discharged them. In the face of all these facts, and in his absence and without his knowledge, his name was sent by Gen. Jesup, a Virginian, to the President, John Tyler, also a Virginian, for the appointment of Inspector General. Gen. Towson, of Maryland, supported the recommendation of Gen. Jesup. John Bell, of Tennessee (a candidate for the Presidency in 1860), was Secretary of War, and President Tyler nominated him to the Senate, and thus, through influences entirely Southern, and by the action of Southerners, two grades were conferred upon my father, and, apparently, to the satisfaction of the entire Army. I think that my father had never met Mr. Tyler. He told me afterwards that, when they first met, the President laughingly said to him, in substance: "Colonel, if I had desired to nominate any one else I could not have done so; your friends advocated you with such warmth."

I mention these facts for the reason that, in a recent publication, to which I have already referred, "Fifty Years Observation of Men and Events" of which Gen. Keyes, a native of Massachusetts, is the author, the statement is made again and again, and in every form of words, that officers of the Army of Northern birth were at a great disadvantage in comparison with those of Southern birth; their exploits and merits overlooked and ignored; praise, commendation, and recognition by brevets and promotion not rendered and bestowed according to their deserts, and they, individually, regarded as inferior. In order to use extreme care let it be understood that I do not assert that Gen. Keyes states that Northern officers were absolutely ignored, &c., but were ignored in comparison

with Southern officers. That I may speak "by the book," and this book, in particular, I quote several passages, among many, as follows: "All the glory of its victories [those of the war with Mexico] and the lion's share of its promotions and rewards inured to the profit of Southern officers" (p. 203); "In those days, however, when Mr. Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War, the exploits of Northern officers were not much regarded" (pp. 260 and 261); "but considering him [Gen. Harney, who had done Gen. (then Capt.) Keyes a favor which the latter duly acknowledges] as a prominent member of the sectional party to which I was so strongly opposed, I would not relinquish my vicarious resentment, which I cherished as a sacred duty" (p. 289); "They [Southern people] claimed all the chief officers and commands in the Federal Government, the Army and Navy, by right of innate superiority" (p. 338); "Almost invariably, when a Northern officer was named for any kind of distinction, he [Gen. Robert Anderson, of Sumter fame] would shake his head and make a disparaging remark" (p. 370); "I can say, if hatred and contempt for the people of the North and East, and, especially, the latter, and of a boundless partiality for the South, are qualifications for a successor in command [of Fort Sumter] to Colonel Gardner [an officer, a native of Mass., grossly assailed and misrepresented, and without cause, by Northern fanatics, as was Col. Dimick, a native of Vermont, who was in command of Fort Monroe] few better than Major Anderson can be found among my acquaintances in the Army" (p. 370, and copied from an entry made, Oct. 16th, '60, by Gen. Keyes, in his journal); "At the outbreak of the rebellion Northern officers enjoyed about the same standing in the Federal Army as the Sepoys enjoy in the English East Indian Military Service" (p. 429); "During forty years before the rebellion it was an axiom with the War Department that no officer was fit to command an Army who was not of Southern birth" (p. 439).

I first saw this book in Newport, where it was lent to me by the late Admiral Werden (retired), and I may say that he ridiculed these ideas so far as his experience in the navy enabled him to express an opinion concerning them. He was of Northern birth—a Pennsylvanian, I think—and I was informed that his political views were in accord with those of the Republican party.

My opinions differ radically, and in their entire scope, from those of Gen. Keyes, and I do not hesitate to claim as much knowledge and as having had as many opportunities for observation as he can rightly claim. I claim to be his superior in impartiality and coolness of judgment. There are no issues of fact. The issue is as to the inferences to be drawn from observation and the knowledge and study of facts. From my earliest recollection till 1835 my father was in the 1st Art. He was then, till 1841, in the 3rd Art., and thereafter, and until his retire-

ment, in the Staff. From 1840 till 1862, with a brief interval, one of my two brothers was in the 3rd Art., and from the latter date until the present time one has been on the retired list. Including his cadetship, my nephew was in the army for nine years. These circumstances brought me into a close association with the army, and created an interest in it which remains till the present day. This interest led me to keep the run of legislation and administrative proceedings affecting the army. I have met officers singly, and in small and large numbers, of all grades and ages, from all parts of the country, and of every branch of the service, those whose position in the army was strictly military, and those who belonged to the Medical and Pay Departments, graduates of the Academy and officers appointed from civil life. As my years increased, intimacies became closer, and conversation with those with whom I was intimate became free and without reserve. During all those years I never saw the least manifestation of the idea that an officer gained or lost anything merely on account of the place of his birth. Among themselves each officer stood upon his merits. When there was an opportunity for advancement or recognition or promotion, individual officers exerted themselves and brought influence to bear in their behalf. There were schemers among them, and some gained the reputation of always falling into "soft places:" but there was nothing sectional in all this. Similar schemers are found everywhere. Sectional topics were not the subject of discussion, or, even, conversation, in the army; not that those topics were avoided as painful by a tacit understanding, but for the same reason that, in social clubs and in well-ordered society, political and religious controversy is not considered to be in good taste. I do not hesitate to say that, if an officer had been constantly talking on *any* topic, he would have been considered a monumental nuisance. I have heard officers talk *pipe-clay* till all the hearers were wearied. Of course, when sectional matters became political issues, army officers could not fail to form and express opinions, but I venture to say that there were much less discussion and acrimony in army circles than elsewhere. To the last moment, at almost every post, the officers, there assembled, dwelt together in harmony, and, with exceptions so few that they can be counted on the fingers of one hand, officers who resigned and entered the Confederate service, were true to the service and the flag. I have heard officers make good-natured comments on the local peculiarities of the communities in which they had been stationed, or of the persons whom they had met, and no one, though the shot struck near the place of his birth, took exception. It could not have been a cadet from the North who, when called up in the section room, uttered the words: "You take this here (rather this-heah or this-yah) equation," and, yet, I have heard Southern graduates laugh when the well-worn story was told. It could not have been a cadet from the North who,

when he accidentally kicked the heels of another cadet in the ranks, asked, abbreviating the name of the person addressed, and which I will not disclose: "S——, is dem your (rather, you) heels?" The cadet addressed afterwards commanded an Army Corps in the Federal service. I do not know the name or subsequent history of the questioner, but the gentleman who told me the story, with great glee, was a cadet at the time, is a Virginian, and had been a Brigadier General in the Confederate army.

It may be objected that what I have written refers, solely, to the relations which existed among the officers of the army, and does not prove that it was not the settled policy and practice at Washington, and, particularly in the War Department, to honor, favor and advance Southern officers in preference to those who were born at the North. This objection can be readily answered. Had there been any such policy and practice, the fact would certainly have come to the knowledge of the army, and the relations among the officers could not have been as I have described them, and as they certainly were. Further than this, it is impossible that, in my many years of intimacy with the army, the subject would never have been mentioned in my presence. No word, indicating that any one knew or suspected that the alleged policy and practice existed, was ever uttered in my hearing. My father and mother were warmly attached to their native State, and the fact that an officer, or any one, was a native of Vermont, or, I may add, of New England, made him (other things being equal) a specially welcome visitor or guest. In all the confidences of conversation in the family, or with any such visitor, never, when a boy or in my mature years, did I hear a word of comment upon this alleged policy and practice. Further: I criticise no one. It is fair and just to assume that Gen. Keyes had good reasons for remaining in a service in which he considered his position one of inferiority; but I am sure that my father would not have retained his commission for an hour had he known or suspected that, at Washington, or in the army, the fact that he was a native of Vermont was to his disadvantage. I do not believe that either one of the gentlemen, whom I have mentioned, Wilkinson, Hampton, Izard, Towson, Scott, Jesup, Taylor, and others, in his relations with my father, ever gave the subject a thought.

I will make the concession that I think that I can name two or three officers of the army who agree with Gen. Keyes in the substance, if not the details, of his opinions. I do not believe that any one of them, or of others holding the same views, could stand a cross examination, and I believe that their views would be condemned, almost unanimously, by such of the officers as had any experience of ante-war times.

Now, for some specific facts. I have no means for making any computation, but I am inclined to think that, in the early days of the Republic, under the Constitution, that is, from 1789 till 1812–14, the proportion of officers of the Army from the Southern and Southwestern States was larger than the proportionate population of those States as compared with that of the Middle, Northern, and Northeastern States. It is easy to account for this fact. It should be borne in mind that Kentucky became a State in 1792, Tennessee in 1796, and Ohio not till 1802 or 3. The military operations of the United States were against the Indian tribes which resided north of the Ohio River. The troops who served under Gens. Harmer, St. Clair, Wayne and Harrison were mainly volunteers and militia, and came from the neighboring States and Territories, largely from Kentucky, and few, if any, from States north of New Jersey. The latter States were far from the seat of the hostilities, and their inhabitants were not affected by the results of the warfare. Naturally, individuals, among all these troops, acquired some taste for military life, and, as commissions were obtained by appointment and not otherwise, some of them went into the Army. Moreover, many of the Northern and Northeastern States were politically opposed to the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison, and it followed that, when appointments were to be conferred, they were bestowed upon the friends of the Administration and in the States which gave it a sure and solid support. It is a curious circumstance, on the other hand, that an examination of the list of graduates of the Military Academy discloses an entirely different condition of affairs, and makes it clear that the ambitious young men of the North and Northeast preferred a systematic military education to that acquired by the experiences of the service. According to Gen. Cullom's Dictionary, of the first one hundred graduates of the Academy seventy-seven were natives of the Northern States, or, having been born abroad (very few in number) were appointed from them; and twenty-three only were born in or appointed from the Southern States. In the computation I credit the latter States with *either* birth or appointment. Strange to tell, eighteen were natives of the little State of Vermont and also appointed from it. The list includes the graduates of 1802 and a portion of the graduates of 1814. The Presidents, during this period, were Jefferson and Madison, Southerners and Democrats. Clearly, appointments to the Academy were not coveted and sought in those days, or youths of Southern birth were not favored to the disadvantage of those who were born in a higher latitude. Did those seventy-seven young men disappoint the hopes of their friends, or had they ever occasion to know, or, even, suspect, that their Northern birth was an obstacle in their way? In order to answer the question in the negative I will not dwell upon such honored names as George Bomford and René E. De Russy, of N. Y., and others, but I call attention, particular

ly, to the first graduate, Gen. Joseph G. Swift, of Mass., who resigned in 1818 and died in 1865, aged 82; to the tenth, Gen. Joseph G. Totten, of Conn., who died in 1864, aged 75, and being then Chief of Engineers, and the thirty-third, Gen. Sylvanus Thayer, of Mass., who was retired in 1863, and died in 1872, aged 83. I do not believe that, among the 3173 graduates, including the class of 1886, any other *three* can be named whose reputation for solid and real worth, and the fame gained in warfare being omitted from consideration, would surpass that of the three whom I have mentioned. I do not doubt that, if any other graduate, all being living, should state that his birth-place was ever, in the slightest degree, an element in his favor, against either one of the three, the whole Army would proclaim him a howling idiot. The contemporaries of those three gentlemen, in early life, have answered to the last roll-call, but many still remain who knew them personally or by reputation in the later years of their lives, and I do not doubt that all of them, Southerners and "Sepoys" alike, will agree with me. In order to anticipate a point I will add that I am aware that, owing to a difference between Gen. Jackson and Gen. Thayer, the latter resigned the superintendency of the Academy, but there is nothing to indicate that the difference was of a sectional character.

Further as to the Military Academy. There are few positions in the service more important and more highly prized, or appointments to which more signally show the high esteem in which the officers are held upon whom the positions are bestowed, than those of the Superintendent and Commandant of Cadets at West Point. Moreover, there are, probably, no persons who do so much in moulding the Cadets, irrespective of their class-standing, for their future career of soldiers and gentlemen, as do the incumbents of those two positions. As intimated, officers are *selected* for those positions, and do not receive them by seniority or promotion. It might be inferred that, if the opinions entertained by Gen. Keyes are well founded, Southerners "claimed" those positions, and partial or truckling Administrations conferred them upon officers of Southern birth. Far different was the case. Of the eight officers who held the position of Superintendent from April 15th, 1802, to March 1st, 1861, but one was from the South. He was Robert E. Lee, who was Superintendent from September 1st, 1852, till March 30th, 1855. Of the thirteen Commandants who served from September 15th, 1817, when the Department of Tactics was established, to June 25th, 1861, but five were from the South, and their united terms of service covered but twelve years. Among the Northern men may be mentioned William J. Worth (not a graduate), who served for nearly nine years; Ethan A. Hitchcock, who served for four years; and Charles F. Smith, who also served for four years. Every one knows that neither of the three, during his term of service, could teach or tolerate a sectional feeling, and that with

neither would any one have dared to assume an air of superiority by reason of the place of his birth.

In order to show that the opinions of Gen. Keyes are without an adequate foundation, I now give a wider scope to the inquiry. By the Act of March 3rd, 1815, determining the Peace Establishment, it was provided that there should be two Major Generals and four Brigadier Generals. Jacob Brown, of New York, and Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, were retained as Major Generals, and Alexander Macomb, of New York, Edmund P. Gaines, of Tennessee, Winfield Scott, of Virginia, and Eleazer W. Ripley, of Massachusetts, as Brigadier Generals. I mention them in the order of rank. It is not to be supposed that there was any balancing of sections here. Those were retained who had most distinguished themselves, and, possibly, because they desired, more than others, to remain in the Army. By the Act of March 2nd, 1821, there was a further reduction. In the meantime Ripley and Jackson had resigned. The result of the Act was that Gen. Brown became General-in-Chief and Gen. Macomb Principal Engineer. On the death of Gen. Brown in 1828, Gen. Macomb was *selected*, as I understand it, to succeed him, but, as Mr. Adams was President at the time, this fact has no significance. Gen. Macomb died in 1841, and Gen. Scott was selected as his successor. He was a Virginian as was the President, but I do not believe that there was an officer in the Army who did not think that it was, in some sense, Gen. Scott's right to succeed to the command of the Army. His subsequent achievements, showing, as they did, that he was one of the ablest soldiers of the age, proved, also, that the opinion of the Army was well founded.

It is interesting to note, now, who was selected to succeed Gen. Scott. Gen. Keyes says: "During forty years before the rebellion it was an axiom with the War Department that no officer was fit to command an army who was not of Southern birth." In 1841, the officers who, it was most probable, would command armies, were the one Major General and the two Brigadier Generals, and it became necessary to fill a vacancy in the grade of Brigadier General. There were several Colonels of Southern birth in the service, and, indeed, the President had the right to make the appointment from any grade, or, as I understand, even from civil life. Yet President Tyler (John Bell, of Tennessee, being Secretary of War, as I have stated) ignored the axiom, and conferred the appointment upon Col. and Bvt. Brig. Gen. John E. Wool, Inspector General, of New York. He took a fearful risk thus to ignore a self-evident truth, and one having the character of a truth of mathematics, and the results might have been disastrous. Fortunately, Gen. Wool's subsequent career showed the wisdom of the appointment which the President made.

The recognition of the high character and distinguished services of officers of the army is manifested by the mention of their names in reports and orders, their assignment to special duties (as at West Point) by the conferring of brevet rank and by promotions outside of the regular course of promotion by seniority. Of all these methods of recognition that of promotion is, ordinarily, the most marked and the most prized. Such promotion can rarely take place; only when there is a vacancy in one of a very limited number of positions, and when there is a permanent increase of the army. Such increase has rarely taken place. I will refer to the most recent before the civil war, mentioning, at times, brevets conferred, and I will prove, so far as the printed matter within my reach will permit, that Gen. Keyes's opinion, that Northern men were at a disadvantage, is not justified by facts.

I regret that I have not a complete set of the Army Registers. For this reason I am obliged to omit the First Dragoons organized under the Act of March 2nd, 1833 (U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 4, p. 652, ch. LXII), and to begin with the Second Regiment of Dragoons, now the Second Regiment of Cavalry, which was organized by an Act of Congress of May 22d, 1836 (U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 5, p. 32, ch. LXXX), during the second term of Andrew Jackson, and when Lewis Cass, of Michigan, was Secretary of War. The three Field Officers were of Southern birth. I have no Army Register of the time, and, therefore, cannot write as to the Company Officers. It should ever be borne in mind that commissions in the mounted regiments have always been particularly sought by Southern and Western men, and, therefore, obtained by them. Gen. Jackson's personal feelings, whether of like or dislike, were very strong, but no one ever justly charged him with being influenced by sectional considerations to the prejudice of the good of the whole country. He dealt sternly with nullification. The Colonel of the Regiment was David E. Twiggs, of Georgia, who was advanced one grade. Whatever may be thought or said of his conduct in 1861, and which, if it was as reported, no one can condemn more than I, it cannot be said that the appointment and promotion were not eminently proper. Col. T. had served in the war of 1812–14, and, subsequently, had shown that he possessed great energy and activity. He was so much distinguished in the Mexican war as to receive two brevets, and the presentation of a sword by resolution of Congress. He certainly made his mark in *profane* history. The Lieut. Col. was apparently (the record in the Register is obscure to me) William S. Harney, of Louisiana, who was also advanced one grade. He distinguished himself subsequently in Florida and Mexico. Gen. Keyes gives his own opinion and impressions concerning him on pages 287–9 of his book. I never saw Gen. Harney but once. In the early part of 1848 (my father being at the time in Washington as a member of a court-martial), I was in Carlisle, Pa., and hearing that Col. Harney was at

Carlisle Barracks, then used as a depot and place of instruction for recruits for the mounted regiments, I called upon him. Except that his large stature and stalwart frame were imposing, there was nothing exceptional in his appearance and manners. There was no coldness in his salutation. He received me as a gentleman, past the meridian of life, should receive a gentleman not twenty five years old. Conversation naturally turned upon the prospects for brevets on account of Mexican war services. He said, very decidedly, that my father would receive a brevet, but disclaimed any expectation of one for himself. If this was mock modesty the role was well played. Certainly, there was nothing to indicate that he thought that he, as a Southerner, was entitled to participate in the "lion's share." Gen. Harney remained in the service, was retired in 1863, and still lives in honorable retirement. The Major of the Regiment was Thomas T. Fauntleroy, of Virginia, who was appointed from civil life. I know nothing about him except that he resigned in 1861.

The next increase of the Army was under the Act of July 5th, 1838 (U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 5, p. 257, ch. CLXII), and its most important feature was the organization of the Eighth Infantry. Martin Van Buren, of New York, was President, and Joel R. Poinsett, of South Carolina, Secretary of War. The Administration was thoroughly Democratic. I am able to write of the Field Officers only. William J. Worth, of New York, then a Major in the Ordnance Corps, was advanced two grades, and appointed Colonel. He was afterwards brevetted for his services in Florida, and again for his services in the Mexican war under Southern Presidents. Newman S. Clarke, of Vermont, was advanced one grade, and appointed Lt. Colonel. He is one of the officers named by Gen. Keyes (p. 158) whose merits he thinks were overlooked and ignored because they were of Northern birth. In addition to this acknowledgment of his merits he received the Brevet of Brigadier General for his services in the Mexican War. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, also of Vermont, was advanced a grade, and appointed Major of the new regiment. In 1842 he became Lt. Colonel in the order of promotion, was Acting Ins. Gen. in the army commanded by Gen. Scott in Mexico, in '47 and '48, and received two brevets for his services in the Mexican War.

The next important increase took place under the Act of May 19th, 1846 (U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 9, p. 13, ch. XXII), which provided for raising a Regiment of Mounted Riflemen. I have not the data at hand or within my reach to enable me to write with confidence concerning this regiment further than to say that its Colonel was Persifor F. Smith, who was born in Pennsylvania and appointed from Louisiana and from civil life. He had previously served in Florida and under Gen. Taylor on the Rio Grande, as an office of volunteers, was subsequently greatly distinguished in the Mexican war, was selected for promotion to the grade of

Brigadier General in 1856, and died at Fort Leavenworth in 1858. He was probably a soldier by nature, and whether he is to be regarded as a Northern or Southern man, it is clear that it was a wise selection which brought him into the army.

During the war with Mexico there was some legislation which affected the army and increased it temporarily, but the next permanent increase took place under the Act of Congress of March 3d, 1855 (U. S. Stat. at Large, vol. 10, p. 635, ch. CLXIX), which provided for four additional regiments, two of Cavalry and two of Infantry. Gen. Keyes thinks that his merits and those of Col. George Wright and Col. Silas Casey were overlooked for the reason that they were Northern men. Let us see. It should, of course, be understood that not every act of gallantry or merit can be rewarded, or, even, publicly acknowledged. All that an officer can expect is that his merits in his life-long career, shall be fairly and properly appreciated and rewarded, as compared with the equal merits of others. As I write I have before me Gardner's Dictionary, Gen. Cullom's and the Army Registers of 1855 and 1856, and they enable me, as I think, to controvert successfully Gen. Keyes's statements concerning the ignoring of the three officers (himself excepted) to whom he refers, and his statements generally concerning the relative position of Northern and Southern men in the matter of the acknowledgment of their merits. The new regiments of Infantry were the Ninth and Tenth. The register of 1856 show that the Colonel of the 9th was George Wright, of Vermont, one of the three neglected officers. In that of 1855 he appears as Major of the Fourth Infantry. Feb. 3d, 1855, he was promoted, in due order, to the grade of Lt. Colonel. He was then, by selection, advanced one grade, and, no doubt, gained from eight to ten years of time. He was lost at sea off the Pacific Coast in 1865. The Lt. Colonel of the Regiment was Silas Casey, of Rhode Island, a second of the three neglected officers, who appears in the Register of 1855 as a Captain in the Second Infantry, and was advanced two grades. If it should be asked why these two officers were thus signally honored, the answer is found in the fact that, though Col. Wright had received one brevet for his distinguished services in Florida and two for such services in the Mexican war, and Col. Casey had received two brevets for similar service in the later war, and all these marks of the high esteem in which they were held were conferred upon them during the administrations of Southern and Democratic Presidents, such recognition was not deemed sufficient when there was an opportunity to advance them by promotion. The two Majors of the Regiment were Virginians, one of whom resigned early in the war and took no part on either side, and the other was killed in battle in the Confederate Army. Of the ten Captains, all of whom were advanced, by selection, from a lower grade, six were appointed from Northern States, one of whom, however, was born in Maryland and one

in Virginia. The former was Pinkney Lugenbeel, was a class-mate of my elder brother, had received two brevets for Mexican war services, and served on the Union side during the Civil War. In Dec. 1855, my father inspected the 9th Regt. at Fort Monroe. It was then on the eve of its departure for California by way of the Isthmus. The Colonel of the Tenth Infantry, advanced one grade, was Edmund B. Alexander, born in Virginia, and appointed from Kentucky. He had won two brevets in the Mexican war, was on the Union side during the Civil War, and is now in the Army retired from active service. The Lt. Col. of the Regiment, advanced one grade, was Charles F. Smith, of Pennsylvania, already mentioned, than whom there have been but few in the service in whom the Army generally, and especially the graduates of West Point, take more pride. He gained three brevets in the Mexican war, contributed, largely, to the capture of Fort Donelson, and died all too soon at Savannah, Tennessee, April 25th, 1862. I do not hesitate to express the belief that, had he been at Shiloh, even in a subordinate capacity, the result of the conflict at that place, instead of being nearly a disaster to the Union Army, would have been a signal victory. Of the two Majors of the regiment, one, William H. T. Walker, advanced one grade, had been thrice wounded and once brevetted in Florida, and once wounded and twice brevetted in the Mexican war, was a Georgian, and was killed in battle on the Confederate side; and the other, Edward R. S. Canby, advanced two grades, had been twice brevetted in the Mexican war, was a native of Kentucky, but appointed from Indiana, was greatly distinguished in the Civil war, and was killed by Modoc Indians in 1873. Of the ten Captains, all advanced in grade, seven were appointed from Northern States, one of whom, however, was born in Kentucky.

As already noted, Gen. Keyes, on pages 260 and 261 of his book, says: "In those days, however, when Mr. Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War, the exploits of Northern officers were not much regarded." These regiments were organized by Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1855. Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War from March 8th, 1853, till March 4th, 1857. I have shown what the Register of 1856 discloses as to the Field Officers and Captains of the regiments. Is Gen. Keyes mistaken or was Jefferson Davis powerless?

As to the two regiments of Cavalry, organized under the same Act, it is true that a preponderance of the officers appointed to them were of Southern birth, but I have already stated that Southern and Western men very often preferred and even sought commissions in mounted regiments. In addition to this, other circumstances may be mentioned which tend to deprive this preponderance of the significance which any one may think or claim attaches to it, and to show that the appointments were not based upon sectional considerations. Of the twenty-eight Field Officers and Captains, whose names appear in the Register of 1856,

at least fourteen served in the Federal Army during the civil war. I think it well to name them, as follows: Edwin V. Sumner, William H. Emory, John Sedgwick, Delos B. Sacket, Thomas J. Wood, George B. McClellan, Samuel D. Sturgis, Edward W. B. Newby, George H. Thomas, James Oakes, Innis N. Palmer, George Stoneman, Junr., Albert G. Brackett and Charles J. Whiting. Of the other fourteen, some, I know, were in the Confederate Army, but others had left the service before 1861, and the residue (all originally appointed from civil life) I cannot trace.

It certainly does appear, as I have already intimated, that the services of Gen. Keyes in the operations against the Indians in 1855, 1856, and 1858, were not duly acknowledged and rewarded. His detailed narrative of those operations, and of his own participation in them, prove that, though he was not in command, the successful result was largely due to his skill, activity, and efforts. It is the more strange that he should have been overlooked when it is considered that Gen. Scott was in command of the Army, he, of whom Gen. Keyes so often speaks as his "hero." Gen Scott was a good judge of an officer's merits.

On pages 430 and 431 of his book Gen. Keyes touches upon a point in a letter written by him to Mr. Lincoln, when President elect, which is worthy of attention when the comparative advancement of officers of Northern and Southern birth is the subject of consideration. He says: "But as soon as the cadets are put in commission, it is found that all the Southern officers coalesce to assist one another, and that all their civil functionaries are on the watch to advance their friends. On the other hand, Northern officers, being wholly overlooked by Northern functionaries, are divided among themselves, and of those who have spirit and capacity some turn doughfaces, and others, the victims of disgust and blasted hopes, die early or fall into premature decay of body and mind." While I am satisfied that Gen. Keyes, though, of course, unintentionally, grossly mistakes the condition of affairs (witness what I have already written upon this subject, and the language of Gen. Keyes on page 3 concerning himself, and the influence, on his behalf, of Lt. Mercer, who, by the way, was a grandson, and not a son of Gen. Mercer, and on page 407, where he says: "Nearly every benefit I ever enjoyed in the service I owed to a Southern man") there is, I think, some support for the opinions expressed by him; and, such being the case, Northern men had good reason for being ashamed of themselves, and all grounds for complaint were pretty much taken from under their feet. A narrative which I had from my father, sustains Gen. Keyes's views. It should be said, by way of premise, that it is far from being the case that brevet rank, or promotion outside of the due order, is conferred in every case by the administration of its own accord. Very often political and personal influences are

potent, and frequently work through devious channels. My father's narrative referred to a case where personal influences could have been properly employed, but were not exerted when they were sought by him, and this, too, on account of party spirit. Gen. Keyes complains that Col. Wright's exploits in 1858 were overlooked, I do not know to what extent my father and Col. Wright were intimate, but the latter was a native of Vermont, and this fact, all other things being as they should be, was sure to gain for him special consideration on my father's part. My father told me that, when he heard of Col. Wright's successful campaign, it at once occurred to him that his friends should suggest to the administration the propriety and rightfulness of conferring a brevet upon him. He thought that the suggestion should proceed from the Vermont Delegation, and that he, himself, should not act in the matter unless his opinion should be asked. Accordingly, he called upon the Senior Senator from Vermont, long since dead, and broached the topic to him. He was met by a prompt refusal. The Senator closed by saying: "No, General, we have decided not to ask anything from this administration." My father went no further; it would have been useless to do so, and, at the same time, inconsistent with his self respect. He was not offended, for no offense was intended, but he was equally surprised, disgusted, and angered, and it pained him keenly that he should be thwarted by Vermonters in his plan, adopted, largely, because he, himself, was a Vermonter, to obtain a merited honor for a gallant brother officer, then on the distant Pacific Coast, who was also a native of Vermont. I soften his language when I state that he closed the narrative by saying: "Frank, you can march a platoon of such Congressmen through a knot-hole without their touching." Gen. Keyes, on page 287, says that John B. Floyd's treatment of Col. Wright was contemptuous. He does not state any facts to sustain the proposition. I, on the contrary, do state facts which show how Col. Wright was treated by Vermont Congressmen.

The facts which I have just mentioned are an illustration of the fanatical intolerance, which, in my opinion, as I have already expressed it, characterized many of the members of certain political parties in this country. My father had no sympathy with this spirit. His long army life served to efface any trace of it, if he was ever influenced in any degree by such feelings. I say "if he was ever" for the reason that, in his early years, he was a member of the Democratic Party, a party whose members were, generally, big-hearted, generous, charitable and tolerant, and largely imbued with the homely but admirable virtue of attending to their own affairs, and not meddling with those of others, and, particularly, those of the citizens of other States. They did not claim that they composed a "party of high moral ideas," and did not think that matters had been so arranged in this world that it was their "mission" on earth,

and, correspondingly, that it was the *duty* of the rest of mankind, to be regarded by it as a priceless privilege, "where duty is pleasure," that the latter should "fall in" before them for inspection and review. Such persons have abounded everywhere, and their relative number in any community or part of the country depends largely upon the antecedents, traditions and history of the inhabitants, their political training and preferences, and, I venture to add, their religious belief. Whether the Democratic Party, by its characteristics, attracted persons of the other class such as I have attempted to describe, or whether it developed and cultivated those habits among its members, it is not necessary to discuss and decide. Probably, there was a reciprocal action between the party and its members. The *party* remains with the *same characteristics*. Its *members* still possess the *same characteristics*, except such as are members by reason of the influence exerted upon them by former associations, or are members "for revenue only."

APPENDIX F.

It would be difficult for a young member of the present generation to understand that any place existed east of the Mississippi in 1828 so isolated, so distant in point of time, and so inaccessible as was Smithville in that year. I think, therefore, that a detailed account of the condition of affairs may be interesting.

The only means of communication by sea were sailing vessels. We went from New York to Wilmington on a brig which carried passengers as well as cargo; and, no doubt, there were packets which plied between the two ports. But the voyages, which were sometimes made in a few days, might have lasted for two weeks or more. In addition, the packets were occasionally detained in the ports for wind, or a fair wind, or the cessation of a storm. The steamtugs of the present day were unknown. If we were suddenly deprived of them now, commerce would be paralyzed, as travel is paralyzed when our railways are blockaded. Vessels were slowly and laboriously worked into and out of their berths by the crew, and the passage to and from the sea, and over a bar, through a long, narrow, and tortuous channel, could only be made under favorable conditions of wind and tide. A flaw in the wind, or a few minutes of calm occurring when the tide was running rapidly, might result in the vessel's being driven upon the shoals, and then, if near the bar, being knocked to pieces by the waves. The donkey engine, now so useful in loading and unloading and in hoisting sails, was unknown. With the ports south of us there was no regular communication by sea, and those, who wished to go in that direction, were obliged to avail themselves of the arrival from Wilmington of any schooner bound for the Southern ports. They, too, were subject to the chances of wind and tide. I remember that a gentleman from New York, a Mr. Bayard, who had spent some days in Smithville, and had been a frequent visitor at my father's quarters, twice bade us good by, and as often presented himself in the evening, not having been able to "get over the bar." He had been much in Europe in the early part of the century, had known Napoleon, and he made a present to my mother of two large damask napkins which had belonged to the Emperor and been used at his table, and in which were inwoven the letter N and various emblems.

To the North, our inland communication was by steamboat to and from Wilmington. The same steamboat carried the mail. I do not remember whether she made daily trips, though it is highly probable that such was the case, but it is my impression that the mail came but thrice a week. The sole public means of travel to the South by land was a two-horse stage, which left an hour or two after the arrival of the steam-

boat, and which sufficed for all the land travel in a southerly direction in that part of the country. The road was sandy, where it did not pass through swamp-land, and the journeying was slow and monotonous. The fare at the various roadside inns must have been unsatisfactory. My father, who was hospitably inclined, and who was always pleased to become acquainted with strangers from a distance, often brought a traveler to our house for a meal, and, among them, Rt. Rev. John England, the first Catholic Bishop of Charleston, 1820–1842, sat at the table at various times. I remember that, on one occasion, after tea, when he was about to leave the house in order to take the stage for his wearisome journey, my father humorously handed him a large loaf of bread, and that it was humorously but thankfully accepted. The point was this: In those days the people of the vicinity used hot bread almost exclusively, and there were many who never saw loaf bread. The materials used were wheat flour and corn-meal, which were prepared in numerous forms and with excellent results, but the food was not always acceptable to those who had been accustomed to a different diet. The Bishop, who was from "the old country," preferred the loaf bread for his journey, and, when I add that my father handed to him, at the same time, a bottle of Sherry or Madeira, it will be understood that he made his start under favorable circumstances so far as bread and wine were concerned. At one time, at my father's instance, the Methodist Church, the only church edifice in the village, was opened to the Bishop, who spoke from the pulpit. I was present, but, though hearing, I did not understand. The Bishop wore some ecclesiastical vestment, and my boyish attention was given to the purple fabric which formed a portion of its sleeves.

When a line of steamers was established between Charleston and Norfolk, and another between Charleston and New York, a change was wrought, and we were put in easy and certain communication with the outside world. The Cape Fear River had two mouths: one, the natural mouth, was in sight in front of us, and was South of Cape Fear and the Frying Pan Shoals, which extended from the Cape into the ocean from ten to twenty miles. I had a view of those shoals once from the lantern of the light-house, and have seen them since from the deck of a passing steamer. The "New Inlet," opened by storms and currents, was from eight to ten miles distant, and was North of Cape Fear and the Shoals. It was on the North side of this inlet that Fort Fisher was constructed. The steamers of the new lines entered the harbor by one inlet and left by the other. They thus gained two or three hours of smooth water, replenished their fuel, and found a place of refuge in stormy or threatening weather. They were frail affairs compared with the poorest coasting steamers of the present day. The passengers left the steamers as soon as they were made fast, and, mostly, directed their steps to the enclosure

which constituted Fort Johnson. My father formed the acquaintance of a gentleman from New York, named Churchill, and, as the steamer was storm-staid, we saw much of him and his family. Rev. Dr. Tyng was on the same steamer. In the summer of 1835, when in New York, we were at the City Hotel, standing on the site now occupied by the Boreel Building, and Mr. Churchill, having ascertained the fact, called upon my parents, and, with his family, was very attentive to us. His residence was in the vicinity. I think that it was on Cedar street, west of Broadway. I remember that, in order to enable my mother to see the growth of the city, and its more marked architectural features, he took her and others in a carriage to the upper part of the city, and, among other things, pointed out the building erected by the University of the City of New York, now standing on the east side of Washington Square.

The amusements and social gatherings of the people of Smithville were simple and inexpensive, and, generally, informal. As for the boys, of whom I write with knowledge, I think that, with the exception of tops and marbles, we made everything which we used in our sports; traps with "figure-four" adjustments, whistles, kites, bats and balls and bows and arrows. For arrows we used small shoots of cane, the same which is used for fishing-rods, and which, I understand, is not found near the Atlantic north of the bottom-lands of the Cape Fear River.

For some months, during the warm and hot seasons, the population of Smithville was largely increased by families from Wilmington. That place was above the salt water, and near it were many rice plantations, on which it was considered almost dangerous for a white person to pass a night in summer. Wilmington was considered unhealthy between the months of spring and the frosts of autumn, and the ladies and children of many families went to the seacoast and elsewhere. Some who came to Smithville found board, but most, bringing their slaves and some furniture with them, occupied their own houses, which were closed during their absence.

There were but few visitors at Smithville. Occasionally, a family would have, as a guest during the cold weather, a relative or friend from the North, but, ordinarily, at that season, there were none but the permanent residents in the place. As a matter of course, there were military visitors. I remember Gens. Gaines, Scott and Wool, Col. House, commanding the 1st Art., and Bvt. Brig. Gen. Eustis, who was promoted to fill the vacancy caused by his death. Courts-martial brought a number of officers to the post at different times. I remember several, and among them I can mention Sec. Lt. Joseph E. Johnston, who, in order to engage me in conversation, affected to take great interest in learning what I had been able to accomplish with my bows and arrows. He was distinguished in the Mexican war. He entered the Confederate Army, and his career is well known.

I recall, among the persons whom I saw at my father's quarters, a son of Prince Murat, Napoleon Achille Murat, who was a resident of Florida for some years.

Smithville was the County Seat, and the Sessions of the Courts gave life to the little village. I do not think that any lawyer resided permanently in the County. The lawyers who attended the courts were from Wilmington, which is in New Hanover County, and, possibly, other places. My father often invited the judge and members of the bar to spend an evening at his quarters, and the dish which was invariably most acceptable to those dwellers on fresh water was oysters, which were found in abundance near us, and were the property of the public. I do not think that they were ever gathered to be taken elsewhere, as merchandise. They were native oysters, and small in size. It may be a remnant of a youthful taste, or, more probably, a youthful *appetite*, but I think that their flavor surpassed that of any oysters I have eaten since.

Near the Court House stood the *Stocks*, which were used occasionally in punishing persons convicted of minor crimes.

During the excitement caused by Nullification in South Carolina, a Union Meeting was held in the Court House. It was in the evening. My father attended as a spectator, but took no part in the proceedings. On his invitation I accompanied him. On that occasion I first heard the words Union and Nullification. From that evening I was for the Union. The soldiers used to tease me by stating that they were all Nullifiers. I understood, afterwards, that a copy of the resolutions, adopted at the meeting, was sent to Gen. Jackson, and that he was much pleased with them, for the reason, in part, that they came from a border county.

I remember the substitution, on the French vessels, of the Tri-color for the White flag. The soldiers used to tell me that the latter flag was merely the table cloth, hung up by the steward, by order of the captain, to shake the crumbs out of it.

The most important event, in my mind, of all that occurred at Smithville, was the visit of Gov. David L. Swain, Governor of North Carolina in 1832–5. He arrived from Wilmington on the steamboat Clarendon, which was crowded by the gentlemen who accompanied him. My father met him at the wharf, and, on learning that Bvt. Maj. Blaney, who was one of the passengers, had arranged that the Governor should visit Fort Caswell at once, he went on board and proceeded with the party. When the landing was made at Fort Caswell a salute was fired at Fort Johnson. After the visit the steamboat was headed to the mouth of the river, and soon began to plunge her bow into the long swells, as, heaving and sinking, they moved up the channel. It was not long before "the country members" began to think that "there was no place like"—*terra firma*, and the course was changed to Smithville, where all disembarked and

scattered through the village. So anxious was I that everything which had been arranged as the ceremonies of the occasion should produce the desired effect, that, as soon as I met my elder brother, who had gone upon the steamboat, I asked him whether the salute had been heard at Fort Caswell, and was disappointed on his saying that he hardly heard it. When the Governor arrived at Fort Johnson another salute was fired. He proceeded to my father's quarters for a brief visit, and I, among others, was presented to him. He was the first high official, in civil life, I had ever seen. I was struck by his gentle manners, and particularly noticed his soft hands. In the evening there was a large gathering in some part of the village. I was not within hearing, but I understood that there were toasts and speeches. I have reason to believe that all were patriotic and happy, and that some were fuddled. I understand that Gov. Swain was afterwards President of the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill. I heard much of Chapel Hill in my childhood, and, on passing through it in 1853, looked around me with interest.

I have witnessed the reception of Gen. Scott, on his return from Mexico, those of Kossuth, the Prince of Wales, and the Japanese Ambassadors, two Inaugurations, and processions not to be numbered, but all have not served to efface the impression made upon my mind and memory by the reception of Gov. Swain.

We came from Smithville, as we went to the Cape Fear River, by sea, and, as I had never gone beyond Wilmington, in our seven years residence at Fort Johnson, my personal knowledge of North Carolina was very limited. In the spring of 1853 it was my good fortune to have occasion to visit Concord in Cabarrus County, which place I reached by rail to Raleigh, and thence in a stage coach, by a lengthened route through Chapel Hill, Guilford, Salisbury and other places which I cannot now name, to Concord. Returning, I hired a conveyance to Charlotte, whence I went by rail to Charleston. I was not prepared to see a country so beautiful and so unlike the pine lands of Brunswick County. Its rolling surface, its hardwood forests and oak openings, and its rapid streams were pleasing to the eye. There were evidences that the country was well populated, and, though the fields were far below what I had seen in Pennsylvania, in neatness and thorough culture, they and the dwellings furnished sufficient indications of industry and thrift. It was clearly an *old* but not a dilapidated country. The towns and villages, too, presented the same appearance of being old but not decayed. I remembered, in passing through one or two places, that I had seen their names in reading accounts of the War of Independence.

When, on one occasion, the driver happened to state that we were

approaching the Cape Fear River, or, rather, the most important of the several streams, having different names, which, when united, form that river, I alighted from the stage, though it was night time, in order to walk over the bridge and view the river more easily. It was a bright, starlight night, and I looked with interest on the narrow and shallow stream, and my thoughts went back to former years, when I had so often bathed in its waters, well salted, 200 or 300 miles below, and fished and waded and "trod clams" (wading bare-footed near the line of the low-water mark until, to my joy, one of my feet would come in contact with a hard clam, or, more frequently, and to my grief, would be badly cut by the razor-like edge of a broken oyster shell which lay embedded in the mud) or sailed my toy boats on its surface or moved about in every thing which could float, from a "dug-out" to the largest steamboat or sailing vessel which was known in that region.

It was during the night travel of this journey that I heard, for the first time, I think, as it was certainly the last, the notes of the post-horn, by which sounds the driver made known the approach of the stage to the points where the mail was opened, or the horses changed. I do not know the compass of the post-horn, but the driver was certainly a master of the instrument, and fond of exhibiting his skill. I shall always remember that music with pleasure, and I do not doubt that it was pleasing to the ears of the road-side residents who were awakened by it, or by the rattling of the stage.

At one place, and near the commencement of the journey, two Episcopalian Clergymen entered the stage on their way to their respective homes from a church assembly or convention. I was a hearer of their conversation, and was interested in much of it. They spoke of some persons the mentioning of whose names brought up *old times* to me. They spoke of what had been said by Dr. Hill, a layman of high position, but why styled Doctor I do not know, whose plantation, having the name, I think, of Orton, was but a few miles from Smithville. One, who was from the extreme west of the State, said that Mr. Curtis had been there on some of his botanical tours. When I was a boy Mr. Curtis was a teacher in Wilmington, and, in summer, in Smithville, of boys more advanced in years than I. He was devoted to botany, and added much to botanical knowledge. He became an Episcopal Clergyman, and received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The plants of North Carolina have received much attention from as early as 1776 to the present time. It is supposed that a greater variety of trees and shrubs exists in North Carolina than in any other State in the Union. Within its limits is the transition line between the Northern and Southern Botanical Districts. Many Northern plants have their Southern limits within the State, and here, also, some which form a peculiar feature of Southern vegetation are first seen. One

reason of this is that many of the mountains in the Western part of the State rise several hundred feet higher than any others east of the Mississippi, and, consequently, upon their higher summits, are found species which are not found elsewhere south of the Adirondacks and White Mountains. Rev. Mr. Curtis refers to this in detail in a report made as long ago as 1860.

So much for Smithville and the Old North State.