



*JAMES A. GARFIELD.*

THE  
REPUBLICAN MANUAL.

History, Principles, Early Leaders, Achievements,

OF THE

REPUBLICAN PARTY,

WITH BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF

JAMES A. GARFIELD

AND

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

---

BY E. V. SMALLEY.

---

NEW YORK:  
AMERICAN BOOK EXCHANGE,  
TRIBUNE BUILDING,  
1880.

## INTRODUCTION.

---

THE purpose of this work is to describe very briefly the origin, rise, and growth of the Republican Party, its great achievements in moulding public opinion, and its important work of administration and legislation. Since the party was formed, a new generation of voters has come upon the stage of political action, to whom its early history is little more than a tradition. A brief résumé of that history must be interesting and instructive to these young Republicans who have taken up its work and are to carry it on after all its founders have passed away, and the older members of the party can hardly fail to find some pleasure and profit in reviewing the story of its organization and victories. No party ever had such a record. It has freed four millions of slaves; it has suppressed the most formidable rebellion the world ever saw; it has preserved and strengthened the credit of the nation; it has conferred equal rights of suffrage and citizenship upon all the inhabitants of this Republic, and it has administered the Government for twenty years with signal fidelity, honor, and intelligence. Within the compass of a work so limited as this, it is not possible to go into many interesting details concerning the career of this great historic party. Very little can be said about its action in State campaigns and its position upon State issues. Its history as a national organization alone is dealt with in the following pages, and that, too, in as condensed a form as is consistent with the presentation of all important facts.

gain strength and individuality, however, until more than half a century after the adoption of the Federal Constitution. A brief examination of the history of the parties preceding it is essential to an understanding of the changes in public sentiment which at last developed this most important, most powerful, and most moral of all the political organizations that have thus far arisen in the United States.

During the Revolution there were but two parties in the country; the Patriot Party, supporting the effort for separate national life; and the Tory Party, which opposed the severing of the Colonies from the mother country. After the recognition of American Independence parties soon divided on the question of forming a closer union between the States. One, known as the Federalist Party, favored the adoption of a Constitution creating a strong, enduring National Government, and the other, called the Anti-Federalist Party, desired to uphold the rights of the States as separate and sovereign, and to continue the mere league between them formed by the Articles of Confederation. The feebleness of the old system became more and more apparent, and a convention, called in 1787, for the purpose of amending and strengthening the Articles of Confederation, adopted a Constitution, after a four months' session, and thus created a new government, with independent and sovereign powers within its own prescribed functions. The new government had no model in history. The Swiss Republic was, at that time, a league of cantons, closely resembling our own form of government prior to the adoption of the Constitution. No model was found in antiquity for the experiment. It was, therefore, only natural that the scheme of resting a central authority upon thirteen independent State Governments should awaken scepticism and resistance. The Anti-Federalist Party opposed the ratification of the Constitution, and were successful in several States in delaying, for a time, their assent to it. The position of the Anti-Federalists was that a single executive head

was dangerous. They feared above all things, that the country would lapse back into a monarchical condition and lose its liberties. The value and necessity of a National Government was, however, so clear, that the Federalists were in a large majority in the country and held the administration for twelve years. In 1788 they elected George Washington, President, and John Adams, Vice-President. At that time the Constitution required the electors to vote for two candidates for President. The one having the highest number of votes became President, and the one next highest, became Vice-President. This system continued until 1804, when the present plan was adopted. During Washington's first administration, a fresh cause for division of parties was found in the French question. The Anti-Federalists, led by Jefferson, were warm sympathizers with France, and desired that the new American Republic should, in some form, give assistance to its recent ally. The Federalists favored a strict neutrality between Republican France and her enemies. Party feeling ran high at the second Presidential election in 1792, but Washington again received the unanimous vote of the Electoral College. Adams was again chosen Vice-President, receiving 77 votes, against 55, of which 50 were cast for George Clinton, the candidate of the Anti-Federalists.

About this time the Anti-Federalists began to drop their party name and to take the name of Democrats. Thomas Jefferson, their great leader, objected, however, to the use of the word Democrat and sought to secure the adoption of the name Republican. Backed by his influence, this name struggled for a time for recognition and was used to some extent in a few States, but was not generally adopted. Most of the old Anti-Federalists preferred the term Democrat as implying more fully hostility to the assumption of governmental powers threatening the individual rights of citizens. In 1796 the Federalists elected John Adams, President. He received 71 electoral votes and Jefferson, his opponent, receiving 68, became Vice-Presi-



dent. Troubles with France arose and nearly resulted in war. During these troubles Congress passed two acts, known as the Alien and Sedition Laws; one empowering the President to order aliens who were conspiring against the peace of the United States to quit the country, and the other providing for the punishment of seditious libels upon the Government. These laws created much party feeling and were denounced by the Democrats as tyrannical and unconstitutional. They contributed very largely to the overthrow of the Federal Party at the Presidential election of 1800, when Mr. Adams was a candidate for re-election. The Democrats voted for Jefferson and Burr, and gave them 73 votes each in the Electoral College, while Adams received 65, Pinckney 64, and John Jay 1. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives by a tie between Jefferson and Burr. Jefferson was chosen President and Burr Vice-President. When Jefferson entered the Executive office, his old views about diminishing the powers of the General Government were considerably modified. He gave the country a vigorous and successful administration and was re-elected in 1804, by 162 electoral votes. The Federalists voted for Pinckney of South Carolina, and Rufus King of New York, and were able to control only 16 electoral votes. Jefferson declined to be a candidate for a third term, and the Democrats selected as their nominee his friend, James Madison, whose home near Charlottesville, Va., was almost in sight from Jefferson's house at Monticello. During the last year of Jefferson's administration, the Federalists gained considerable fresh vitality through the popular opposition to what was known as the Embargo, an act of Congress prohibiting American vessels from trading with foreign ports. It was adopted out of revenge for the insolent actions of Great Britain and France, which arbitrarily searched American ships on the high seas and often seized them and confiscated their cargoes. The embargo was fatal for a time to the commercial interests of the United States,

and was repealed in 1809. At the election of 1808, the name Democrat was almost universally adopted by the party supporting Madison. Madison received 122 votes and George Clinton 113, while the Federal candidates, C. C. Pinckney, and Rufus King, received 47 each. The war of 1812 which practically began in 1811, by British emissaries inciting the Indian tribes of the Northwest to hostile acts, nearly obliterated party lines for a time. Both of the parties supported the war when it was fairly begun. The Federalists continued their organization, however, and at the election of 1812, gave 80 votes for De Witt Clinton, against 128 for Madison. The Democrats nominated for President, James Monroe. Mr. Madison's Secretary of State, Madison himself declining a third term. It is difficult at this distance to understand what were the issues of the contest, but it is plain that the old political parties had nearly exhausted their motives of controversy and that the issues were rather the traditions of old struggles than anything fresh and vital. Monroe received 183 votes, against 24 given to Rufus King by the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware. Now began what is known in our political history as the era of good feeling. No one was disposed to longer question the utility of the Federal Government, and on the other hand, no one was disposed to assert for it any dangerous or monarchical powers. Both the Democrats and the Federalists supported Monroe, and he was re-elected in 1820, by all of the electoral votes save one.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE BEGINNING OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT.

Up to 1820, the existence of slavery in the United States had been regarded as a misfortune by the people of all sections of the country. Indeed, among the causes of grievances brought

against Great Britain, was her action in forcing the slave trade upon the colonies against their will. With scarcely an exception, the early statesmen of the Republic regarded the institution of slavery as an evil which would gradually be got rid of by wise emancipation measures. Looking to that end, the slave trade was prohibited and ranked with piracy, as a crime, as early as 1808. Mr. Jefferson, the head of the Democratic party, was one of the most enlightened opponents of slavery, and was far from foreseeing that the party which he had founded would in after-years, become its chief defender. The first anti-slavery society in the country was formed by the Quakers of Pennsylvania, but there were, at an early period, organizations of emancipationists in the South who kept up some agitation in behalf of measures for getting rid of the institution by the action of the State Governments. One after another of the Northern States where slavery existed provided for its gradual abolition, and the sentiment in the North was so nearly unanimous in opposition to fastening slavery permanently upon the country that it insisted that for every new Southern State which came in, a Northern free State should be admitted. Thus, Vermont, Ohio, and Indiana compensated for Kentucky, Tennessee, and Louisiana; and later, Maine counterbalanced Alabama. Thus far, the number of free and slave States was equal. Then the question arose in 1820 about admitting Missouri with a slave Constitution. It gave rise to a vehement public discussion which was rather sectional than political. The people of the Northern States insisted that a clause, prohibiting slavery, should be inserted in the Missouri Constitution as a condition of the admission of the State. The struggle went on in Congress for over two years. While it aroused the anti-slavery sentiment of the North, which had been almost dormant, it had the effect of inciting the South to a united and earnest defence of an institution which had before been regretted, even in that section, as undesirable and temporary in its nature.



A compromise settled the struggle for the time being, in which the South gained a victory. Missouri was admitted with slavery, but an act was passed prohibiting slavery in all the new territory lying north of latitude 36 degrees and 30 minutes, known as "Mason and Dixon's Line." This settlement became known as the "Missouri Compromise." The North gained nothing that did not belong to it before and the South secured the admission of a new slave State, north of the old line separating freedom from slavery. The "Missouri Compromise" laid the foundation of the future Republican Party, by creating in the mind of the North, a distrust of the South and by developing a political force in the country which received the significant designation of the Slave Power. This force, in the course of time, suppressed all opposition to slavery in the South and asserted the right to convert the whole unoccupied territory of the United States into slave States, and to carry its human chattels into the Northern States under the protection of the Federal Government, in defiance of the laws of those States. Resistance to the slave power and its demands formulated itself in the course of time into the Republican Party.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES.

MONROE'S administration is chiefly famous in history for its recognition of the Spanish-American Republics and its declaration of what is known as the "Monroe Doctrine," an assertion that any attempt on the part of European Governments to extend their system to any portion of the American Continent would be considered to be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States. The destruction of party lines under Monroe's administration went so far that in the election of 1824,

no reorganization on the basis of old ideas was practicable. There were four candidates for the Presidency. Andrew Jackson received 99 votes, John Quincy Adams 84, William H. Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 37. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives, and Mr. Adams was chosen President. The administration of the new President, who was a son of the great Federalist, John Adams, might have been expected to restore the Federal Party, but that party had outlived its usefulness. It had witnessed a complete success of its ideas respecting the National Government and there was no occasion for its revival. The supporters of Mr. Adams called themselves National Republicans, but the name did not long survive. Mr. Adams's policy did not differ much from that of Mr. Monroe. The distinguishing event of his administration was the adoption of the protective tariff system. It was favored by the North and opposed by the South. Parties degenerated into factions and the personal popularity of the political leaders had more to do with their success than any principles they professed. In 1828, Mr. Adams was a candidate for re-election, but was defeated by Andrew Jackson, who had 178 votes, to Adams's 83. Jackson was a narrow-minded man of limited education, strong prejudices, violent temper, and little schooling in statesmanship. His popularity grew out of his success as a military commander. He introduced personal government at Washington to a far greater extent than any of his predecessors or successors. Fealty to him, personally, was the chief test of merit in his eyes. For a time the country was divided into a Jackson party and an anti-Jackson party, all other names being lost sight of. Jackson introduced into American politics the theory that "to the victors belong the spoils;" he was the first President who removed from office all persons not favorable to him politically. John Quincy Adams had made a few removals of officials in high position, but there was a great public clamor against him for this act. Jackson swept the entire public service of every-

body who had not favored his election, and filled the offices with his personal partisans. The corruption of American politics in more recent times is largely due to this high-tempered, bigoted, and egotistical man; but his glaring faults almost merit complete forgiveness, in view of his great service to the country in suppressing the nullification movement in South Carolina.

Up to this time, the South, and particularly the Democratic Party in the South, had asserted the doctrine, that the Constitution is a federal compact between sovereign States, and that in such compacts between sovereigns who are equal there is no arbiter, each State being the rightful judge, as a party to the compact, of the constitutionality of any measure of the General Government. This view was asserted by the Legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky, in what are generally called the resolutions of 1798. The doctrine that each State can judge for itself whether the laws or the action of the Government is constitutional or not became in time a part of the platform of principles of the Democratic Party, and was held to with particular zeal by the people of the South. In 1832, South Carolina, under the lead of John C. Calhoun, endeavored to resist the enforcement of the new tariff law, by a process called nullification. Less from statesmanship and patriotism, probably, than from motives of personal hostility to Mr. Calhoun, President Jackson threw himself with all the force of his resolute nature upon the other side, and declared his intention to treat nullification as treason, and to hang the men who resisted the authority of the United States. He ordered a large armed force to Charleston and thus put an end to the incipient movement for dissolving the Union. His vigorous conduct caused the total abandonment of the theory that a State can set aside the laws of the United States at its pleasure. The South shifted its policy, and soon began to rally on a new position, namely, that when a State does not like the conduct of the

General Government, it has a right to secede from the Union.

The nullification question was not taken up as a party issue, and, indeed, Jackson gave it very little time to ferment in the public mind. He furnished the country with an issue, however, by assailing the Bank of the United States, an institution modelled somewhat after the Bank of England and having close relations to the Government. It is said that Jackson's hostility to the bank arose from the refusal of one of its branches in the South to cash his checks when he was carrying on the Florida War. In 1832, the President recommended the removal of the public funds from the bank. Congress refused to authorize the removal. Then Jackson, on his own responsibility, ordered the Secretary to withdraw the deposits and place them in certain State banks. That officer refusing, he was removed and Mr. Taney appointed to his place. The bank was broken down, a great financial panic followed, and serious commercial distress afflicted the country. The opponents of Jackson's policy toward the bank organized themselves under the name of the Whig Party, taking this name because the Whig Party in England had resisted the arbitrary measures of the king. Thus, by a curious change of the political situation, the leader of the Democrats, the party formed to resist strong government in this country, became the type and exemplar of the strong government idea, and the Whigs, the successors of the Federalists, became, as they imagined, the defenders of the people against the encroachments of Executive power. In 1832, just before the bank question came up, Jackson was re-elected by 219 electoral votes, against a divided opposition, casting 49 votes for Henry Clay, 11 for John Floyd, and 7 for William Wirt. A short-lived popular excitement against secret societies, and especially against the Masons, sprang up, and Wirt was the candidate of a new party called the Anti-Masonic Party. He got the electoral vote of Vermont. Martin Van Buren was chosen



Vice-President. In 1836, General Jackson put forward Mr. Van Buren as his successor. The bank question, the tariff question, and opposition to the personal government of Jackson were the chief issues. Jackson had made a powerful impression on the rather unorganized public sentiment of the country by his boldness and independence, and his influence was sufficient to secure the election of Van Buren. He received 170 electoral votes. The Whig vote was divided between William Henry Harrison, 73; Hugh L. White, 26; Daniel Webster, 14; and Willie P. Mangum, 11. Up to 1832 national nominating conventions were unknown. A party caucus of members of Congress selected the candidates for President and Vice-President, and not unfrequently State Legislatures put candidates in the field. Van Buren's administration was exceedingly unpopular. The commercial crisis of 1837 and the hard times which followed reacted powerfully against the dominant party. The administration was charged with the dullness of trade, the stagnation of industry, the scarcity of good money, and the alarming number of business failures. More to the hard times than to any other cause was due the overwhelming success of the Whigs in 1840. The Whigs held a national convention at Harrisburg, in December, 1839, and nominated General Harrison for President, and John Tyler for Vice-President. The Democrats held their convention at Baltimore, in May, 1840, and unanimously nominated Van Buren for re-election. The campaign was the most exciting, demonstrative, and dramatic that had ever taken place in this country, and the result was that Harrison and Tyler received 234 electoral votes, and Van Buren 60. The Democratic vote for Vice-President was divided. Harrison's popular vote was 1,275,011, and that of Van Buren 1,128,702. Although Harrison's majority of the popular vote was a very small one, his electoral majority was enormous, a discrepancy which strikingly illustrates the peculiarity of our electoral system.

Harrison died a month after his inauguration—worried to death by office-seekers, it is said. His successor, John Tyler, proved treacherous to the Whig Party, espoused the views of the Democrats, changed his Cabinet, and finally went over to the Democratic side.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### REVIVAL OF THE SLAVERY AGITATION—THE LIBERTY PARTY.

In 1844, the Democrats nominated James K. Polk for President, and the Whigs nominated Henry Clay. The question of the extension of slave territory entered largely into the canvass. A treaty had been negotiated for the annexation of Texas, then an independent Republic, but still claimed by Mexico as a part of her dominions. The treaty was rejected by the Senate and the Democratic Party throughout the country took it up and declared in their conventions that it was a great American measure. The Whigs were nearly unanimous in their opposition to the Texan scheme; in the North, because of their unwillingness to give the slave power another State; in the South, on various grounds of expediency. The opposition of the Whigs was not sufficiently clear and earnest, however, to draw to their support all the voters hostile to the annexation project. A party was organized which took broad grounds against the extension of slavery and assumed for itself the name of the Liberty Party. It was, in fact, an offshoot from the anti-slavery organizations throughout the North. A struggle arose in the American Anti-slavery Society as to the duty of its members. One faction, headed by William Lloyd Garrison, abstained wholly from voting, on the ground that the Constitution was a covenant with the slave power to protect slavery. The other faction insisted that the way to fight slavery was to use the weapon of the ballot. This faction became the Liberty

Party, and nominated James G. Birney for President. It was a very small party, but an exceedingly earnest one, and although it never had a majority in any State, and probably not in any county, it frequently held the balance of power, and exerted considerable influence on the two great parties. Just before the election of 1844, Mr. Clay wrote a letter which dissatisfied the Liberty Party and also the anti-slavery Whigs in the State of New York. About 16,600 votes were cast in New York for Birney and were mostly withdrawn from the Whig ticket. This defection caused the loss of the State to Clay, defeated him for the Presidency, and changed the whole subsequent history of the country. The result of the election was 174 votes for Polk and Dallas, and 105 for Clay and Prelinghuysen, the vote of New York turning the scale. Under Polk's administration, Texas was admitted and war was waged with Mexico. The war was opposed by most of the Northern Whigs who had begun to be considerably tinctured with anti-slavery sentiments and still more strongly opposed by the Liberty Party men and the Garrisonians, now called by the name of Abolitionists, who thought that the purpose of the conflict was to secure more territory to be made into slave States.

The decline of the Whig Party dates from this period. As a national organization it was obliged to cater to the South, where a large part of its strength lay, and no positive declaration against the extension of slavery could be got from its conventions. At the same time a feeling of hatred to the slave power had obtained a firm lodgment in the mind of a large portion of its Northern members. The Whig Party embraced in its membership a much larger portion of the intelligent and educated classes of the country than its rival, the Democratic Party. In the South, these classes contented themselves with opposition to extreme pro-slavery measures threatening the perpetuity of the Union, but in the North they began more and more to demand such action as should stop the growth of the slave power and secure to freedom all the unoccupied territory of the United States.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE WILMOT PROVISIO—THE FREE SOIL PARTY—THE CAMPAIGN OF 1848.

It became apparent before the end of the war, that the defeat of Mexico would be followed by the cession of a large part of her territory to the United States, and the question began to be agitated in Congress as early as 1847, of what should be the condition of the territory in reference to slavery. At a consultation of members of the House from the free States, who felt that the extreme limit of justifiable concession to slavery had already been reached, David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, presented the following proviso, to be offered to any bill for the organization of new Territories: "That as an express and fundamental condition to the acquisition of new territory from the Republic of Mexico, by the United States by virtue of any treaty that may be negotiated between them, and to the use by the Executive of any moneys herein appropriated, neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of said territory, except for crime whereof the party shall first be duly convicted." This was the famous Wilmot Proviso which played a large part in the political history of the succeeding years. It served to bring together many members of both the Whig and Democratic organizations who were opposed to the extension of slavery. Its advocates were called in the political nomenclature of the day, "Wilmot Proviso Men," although they adhered for a time to their old party connections. The proviso was offered to the bill for negotiating a treaty with Mexico, but it was defeated in the House.

In 1848 the Democrats nominated for President, General Lewis Cass, of Michigan. His principal competitors in the convention were James Buchanan and Levi Woodbury. The nominee for Vice-President was General William O. Butler, of



Kentucky. The New York Democrats divided into two factions, one, called "Barn-burners," opposed the extension of slavery, and the other, styled "Hunkers," sympathized fully with the South. The "Barn-burners" bolted from the Democratic convention, and sent delegates to a national convention held at Buffalo, which organized a new party, called the Free Soil Party. The Free Soil Party was the legitimate successor of the Liberty Party of 1848. The Buffalo Convention nominated Martin Van Buren for President, and Charles Francis Adams for Vice-President. Van Buren's nomination weakened the moral force of the new movement, for while President he had been a tool of the slave power, and only since his retirement to private life had he expressed himself against the extension of slavery to the Territories. The motive of his nomination was to secure the votes of "Barn-burners" of New York and to defeat Cass.

The Whig National Convention met in Philadelphia and nominated General Zachary Taylor, of Louisiana, for President. His chief competitors for the nomination were Henry Clay, General Scott, and Daniel Webster. Taylor's nomination was exceedingly popular in the country on account of his brilliant service in the Mexican War and his lack of any political record with which fault could be found. The Democrats, in their convention, refused to endorse the extreme Southern view, that slaves were property and could be carried into the Territories under the protection of the Government. The Whigs dodged the slavery question altogether. The Free Soilers claimed that the Constitution was hostile to slavery and intended to limit it to the States where it existed by virtue of local laws, and further, that the Federal Government should relieve itself from all responsibility for the existence of the institution. At the election, General Taylor carried 15 States, with 163 electoral votes; and General Cass 15 States, with 137 electoral votes. Van Buren carried no State, but had a large vote

throughout the North. The entire popular vote stood, Taylor and Fillmore, 1,360,752; Cass and Butler, 1,219,962; Van Buren and Adams, 291,342. The general effect of the canvass was to show that the Democrats were pretty thoroughly committed to the slave power and that the Whigs did not dare to antagonize it. The agitation produced by Van Buren's candidacy served a good purpose in further arousing public sentiment in the North to the encroachments of slavery.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE COMPROMISE OF 1850 AND THE FUGITIVE-SLAVE LAW.

Soon after the peace with Mexico, which secured to the United States all the territory comprised in the present States of California and Nevada, and the Territories of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, gold was discovered in California, and an immense rush of emigration occurred. In a short time there were people enough there to form a State Government. They adopted a Constitution prohibiting slavery, and applied for admission to the Union. At that time there were 15 slave States and 15 free States, and the admission of California would place the free States in the majority of one. It was therefore vehemently opposed by the representatives of the slave power. Many slave States threatened secession if the new State should be admitted without some concessions to secure the equality of the South in the future. They demanded a recognition of their claim that slavery could not be prohibited in the Territories or its existence be made an objection to the admission of a new State. They also demanded a guarantee against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and a stringent fugitive-slave law. The contest in Congress lasted nearly two years, and was finally settled by what is known as the Compromise of 1850.

Zachary Taylor, who though a slaveholder did not sympathize with the extreme Southern view, had died before the controversy culminated, and Millard Fillmore, his successor, openly espoused the side of the pro-slavery leaders. The compromise was advocated by Henry Clay, and received, also, the support of the great Northern Whig leader, Daniel Webster, who abandoned his anti-slavery position and went over, with his great intellect and influence, to the slave power. His action divided the Whig Party in the North and practically gave it a death-blow. Wm. H. Seward became the leader of the anti-slavery Whigs. The compromise of 1850 admitted California with its free Constitution, and left for future settlement the status of the rest of the conquered territory in respect to slavery; rejected the Wilmot Proviso, and paid Texas \$10,000,000 for a visionary claim to the Territory of New Mexico; prohibited slave auctions in the District of Columbia, and enacted the odious fugitive-slave law. This law shocked the sense of justice of the more intelligent portion of the Northern people and exerted a powerful influence in preparing men's minds for the advent of the Republican Party. It provided for the return of alleged fugitives without trial by jury, allowing their captors to take them before a United States Commissioner, who was empowered to remand them on the *ex-parte* depositions of the slave-catchers. The Commissioners were paid ten dollars in case they directed the return of the alleged fugitive, and five dollars if, for any cause, they decided against the claimant. In effect, therefore, they were offered a bribe to decide against the person claimed as a slave. Slave-catchers were authorized to summon bystanders to their aid, and all good citizens were commanded to assist in the arrest of alleged fugitive slaves. The law, in effect, ordered the people of the North to turn slave-catchers and threatened them with heavy penalties in case they harbored or assisted any fugitive. Numerous cases of extreme brutality arose from the execution of this law. Professional slave-

hunters invaded the North and captured colored persons without much regard to whether they had run away from slavery or not. In some cases there was resistance on the part of the people, and trials occurred which served to increase the irritation in the public mind. The law was vehemently denounced by the anti-slavery Whigs, the anti-slavery Democrats, and the Free Soilers, and the Abolitionists found in it a new text for the crusade they preached with so much earnestness and self-denial against the "sum of all villainies." Some of the Northern States passed what were known as "Personal Liberty Bills," practically nullifying the fugitive-slave law and punishing as kidnappers persons who sought to carry off alleged slaves without trial by jury. These personal liberty bills furnished a notable illustration of the powerlessness of theories of government, when human rights are involved. Hitherto the slave States had alone maintained extreme State rights doctrines, but now the free States practically asserted such doctrines in their legislation hostile to the Federal authority. The personal liberty bills set at naught the authority of the United States so far as it was sought to be exercised in the enforcement of the fugitive-slave law. They asserted the right of the State to protect the people within her borders from arrest and imprisonment without trial and from being carried off as slaves. They fell back upon the clause in the Constitution which says, "In any suits at common law, whereof the value of the controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved." Fugitives were claimed to be property exceeding that value, and it was asserted that they could not be deprived of their liberty without a jury trial. Public agitation against the fugitive-slave law increased from year to year, and it finally became impracticable in most parts of the North, save in the great cities, to reclaim fugitives. Not only was this the case, but associations were formed in many parts of the North for the purpose of aiding slaves to escape to Canada. The lines over which the



fugitives were forwarded by day and by night, by the anti-slavery people, were known as the "Underground Railroad." Many thousands of negroes escaped from the border States to Canada by the aid of this institution, and became industrious and valuable citizens of the British dominions.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### CAMPAIGN OF 1852—DEFEAT OF THE WHIG PARTY.

THE Whig and Democratic Parties had been fully committed by the action of their representatives in Congress to the endorsement of the compromise measures of 1850, and it was evident before their national conventions met in 1852 that they would rival each other in professions of fidelity to those measures. Indeed, a public pledge had been signed by Henry Clay, Howell Cobb, and about fifty other members of Congress, of both parties, agreeing to abide by the compromise as a final adjustment of the controversy between the free and the slave States. The Democratic Convention surprised the country by dropping General Cass, James Buchanan, and Stephen A. Douglas, who were the leading candidates for the nomination, and taking up Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, a man almost unknown outside of his own State. On the 50th ballot Pierce was nominated. Wm. R. King of Alabama, was nominated for Vice-President on the second ballot. The convention declared that the compromise of 1850 was a finality and that the Democratic Party would resist all attempts at renewing the agitation of the slavery question. The Whig National Convention nominated General Winfield Scott for President. The other candidates were Millard Fillmore and Daniel Webster. Scott was nominated on the 52d ballot, and Wm. O. Graham of North Carolina was put on the ticket for Vice-President. The plat-

form endorsed the compromise of 1850, including the fugitive-slave law, and declared that the system it established was essential to the nationality of the Whig Party and the integrity of the Union. The Whigs went into the canvass with a good deal of apparent vitality, but before the close it was evident that the poison of slavery had sapped the vitality of the party.

The Free Soilers met at Pittsburg, in August, and nominated John P. Hale of New Hampshire, for President, and Geo. W. Julian of Indiana, for Vice-President. Their platform was opposition to the extension of slavery and their battle-cry was "Free soil, free speech, free States, and free men." In some States the supporters of Hale and Julian took the name of Free Democrats, in others they called themselves, Free Soil Democrats, and in still others, simply Free Soilers. They did not poll as large a vote as in 1848. Numbers of New York Democrats who then voted for Van Buren, returned to their old allegiance. They had, however, a pretty effective organization in all of the Northern States, sustained a number of influential newspapers, and placed in the field many able stump-speakers. Most of their vote was drawn from the Whigs. The result of the election was that the Democrats carried all the States in the Union except Massachusetts, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, choosing 254 electors. General Scott received only 42 electoral votes. The popular vote was, Pierce, 1,601,474; Scott, 1,386,578; Hale, 156,149. The disaster to the Whigs was so overwhelming that it killed their party. They kept up some form of an organization for four years longer, but it was merely a shadow. The party had no longer an excuse for living. Its former principles of a protective tariff and a wise system of internal improvements had very little hold upon the public mind. The country was rapidly dividing on the slavery question, and as the Democratic party was generally recognized to be the principal ally of the slave power, there was no room for another organization not definitely opposed to that power.

The dead party was sincerely mourned, particularly by a class of its adherents in the North, represented by Seward and Greeley, who had hoped to lead it over to anti-slavery ground. It was also regretted by a considerable element of educated and conservative people in the South, sincerely attached to the Union, and apprehensive of grave dangers to the peace of the country from the extreme ground taken on the slavery question by the Democrats. The disappearance of the Whigs as an organization from the field of politics opened the way for the formation of the Republican Party, by a new and formidable agency, which will be described in the next chapter, coming in to complete the work.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### RISE AND FALL OF THE KNOW NOTHING OR AMERICAN PARTY.

BETWEEN the years 1853 and 1855 there suddenly arose a party of phenomenal growth and extraordinary ideas. It took for itself the name of the American Party, but its members were generally known by the popular slang term of "Know-Nothings," which they did not themselves object to. They were organized into secret lodges, with pass words and grips, and were sworn to vote for no one for a public office who was not a native. They proposed that citizenship should not be conferred, so far as the right of voting was concerned, until after twenty-one years' residence. They were peculiarly hostile to the Catholics, and claimed that the priests of that Church controlled the votes of their parishioners. The growth of this new organization was marvellous. It spread like wild-fire over the country and before it was two years old managed to carry many important local and State elections. It must not be supposed, however, that it was absolutely without roots in the past. Native Americanism as a sentiment had existed since about

the year 1830, and had in several localities in the East assumed at different periods the form of political organizations. It rested on a not unreasonable apprehension of the growing power of the foreign element in the large cities of the country. This element, in large part ignorant of our system of government, frequently banded together to carry municipal elections, and elected objectionable persons to office. When the idea of nativism spread to the whole country and became the basis of a national party it was illogical and unpatriotic, because the growth of the United States had been largely the result of foreign immigration and a great part of its wealth had been produced by the labors of its foreign-born citizens. Many of these citizens were men of marked intellectual and moral worth, who had studied thoroughly the American system of free government, and had come to this country to escape the despotic limitations of life in the Old World. In seeking to exclude such men from voting and holding office in the land of their adoption the Know-Nothing movement was evidently unjust.

The rapid spread of the secret Know-Nothing lodges cannot be accounted for by the principles of ordinary political action. A study of the laws of mind which govern the propagation of intellectual delusions and produce phenomenal movements in the world of religion as well as of politics would be necessary for a philosophical treatment of the matter. Undoubtedly, the decay of the Whig party had much to do with the rise of this new movement. Men were suddenly cut adrift from their old party politics. In this situation they easily became a prey to a movement which had the fascination of secrecy and laid claims to lofty motives of patriotism. The Know-Nothing party culminated in 1855. It nominated Millard Fillmore for President in 1856, but it was already on the wane at that time, and shortly after the slavery question had so completely absorbed the public mind that Know-Nothingism subsided as rapidly as it had risen, and in a single year disappeared from the field of politics. It



played a part of some importance in the work of forming the Republican Party, by making a sort of bridge upon which many old Whigs crossed over to that organization.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETIES AND THEIR WORK.

BEFORE proceeding with the chronological order of our narrative, it is time that we should pause for a moment to consider the work of the anti-slavery societies in the North. Their members were few in number and were usually despised by the masses of people as impractical theorists and negro-worshippers, who threatened the tranquillity of the country and the permanence of the Union, but they were men of earnest convictions and lofty moral purpose, who, by their tireless exertions, gradually wore into the Northern mind a conception of the atrocity of slavery. These societies were strongest in New England, on the Western Reserve of Ohio, and in the Quaker communities of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. They supported a number of eloquent public lecturers, who traversed the country and addressed meetings in school-houses, churches, and in the open air. Often these orators were received with opprobrium and insult; sometimes they were brutally treated by angry mobs; but they kept on heroically with their noble task. The condition of public sentiment in the North on the slavery question, prior to 1850, can scarcely be understood by the present generation. Even the church organizations were, as a rule, bitterly hostile to all forms of anti-slavery agitation. The Abolitionists, as the anti-slavery men were generally called, were looked upon as no better than criminals. A bigoted, unreasoning, and often brutal devoteeism to the slavery system had taken possession of the public mind, and whoever questioned the constitutionality or

perpetuity of that system ran the risk of ostracism in his social and business relations, and if he publicly advocated his ideas, actually took his life in his own hands. This sentiment caused the anti-slavery men to draw closely together for mutual encouragement and assistance. They believed in the sacred humanity of their work. Their lecturers were entertained like brethren at the homes of the members of the society wherever they went, and every anti-slavery man regarded every other anti-slavery man in the light of a near personal friend. In some parts of the country, they held annual conventions under tents or in groves. A number of newspapers advocated their ideas, chief among which was the *Liberator*, published in Boston by William Lloyd Garrison, who was generally recognized as the head of the movement. Horace Greeley, in his "American Conflict," divided the opponents of slavery in the period preceding the formation of the Republican Party into four classes :

1. The Garrisonians, who regarded the Federal Constitution as a covenant with death and an agreement with hell. They pledged themselves to wage against slavery an unrelenting war, to regard and proclaim the equal and inalienable rights of every innocent human being as inferior or subordinate to no other, and to repudiate all creeds, rituals, constitutions, governments, and parties that rejected these fundamental truths. They generally declined to vote, believing the Government and all political parties so corrupted by slavery that no one could take any part in politics without moral defilement.

2. The members of the Liberty Party who, regarding the Federal Constitution as essentially anti-slavery, swore with good conscience to uphold it and to support only candidates who were distinctly, determinedly, and permanently champions of liberty for all.

3. Various small sects and parties which occupied a middle ground between the above positions, agreeing with the latter

in interpreting and revering the Constitution as consistently anti-slavery, while refusing with the former to vote.

4. A large and steadily increasing class who, though decidedly anti-slavery, refused either to withhold their votes or to throw them away on candidates whose election was impossible, but persisted in voting at nearly every election so as to effect good and prevent evil to the extent of their power.

The influence of all the various forms of anti-slavery agitation in opening the way for the advent of the Republican Party, and laying the foundation for that great organization, can scarcely be overstated.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA STRUGGLE.

THE result of the election of 1852 was to place the Democrats in complete control of the National Government. They had the President and a large majority in both houses of Congress. Their party was now completely dominated by the pro-slavery element. Franklin Pierce had been nominated by Southern votes and was wholly subservient to the slave power. In spite of the professions of the Democrats in their platform of 1852, in which they declared the compromise measures of 1850 to be a finality, settling forever the contest between the free and the slave States, Congress had scarcely met in 1853 before the South began to agitate for the repeal of the prohibition of slavery north of the line of 33 degrees 30 minutes. The vast plains lying beyond the States of Ohio and Missouri were known to be fertile and adapted for settlement. To remove the Indian tribes occupying them and make out of the region two new slave States, thus flanking the free States on the west and securing for slavery all of the vast region beyond the Missouri River, was the ambitious scheme of the Southern leaders. It

mattered not that the faith of the South had been pledged, first by the compromise of 1820 and then by that of 1850, adopted as a final settlement of the slave agitation. The pro-slavery leaders felt their power and determined to exercise it. After a tremendous struggle in both houses of Congress, they passed a bill repealing the prohibition of 1820, and opening all of the new Northwest to slavery. The extreme pro-slavery Democrats asserted that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the territory of the United States. They further asserted that the people of the new Territory had no power themselves, by their own territorial statutes, to interfere with the holding of slave property. A more moderate wing of the party, headed by Stephen A. Douglas, broached what was known as the popular sovereignty doctrine, which was that the people of the Territories should themselves decide whether they would have free or slave States, and that Congress had no authority to interfere with them. Abraham Lincoln once characterized this doctrine as, in effect, that one man had the right to enslave another, but a third man had no right to interfere. Mr. Douglas's position prevailed, and the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, passed in 1854, permitted the introduction of slaves into those Territories and left the people free to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way.

The passage of this act created intense public excitement in the North. It was regarded as a breach of faith on the part of the South and as the forerunner of measures designed to extend slavery over the whole country. In every Northern State large numbers of men of influence broke loose from the old political organizations, and were styled "Anti-Nebraska Men." Public meetings were held denouncing the measure, and a great popular movement, hostile to the encroachment of slavery, arose spontaneously on a wave of excitement which swept over the entire North. The Territory of Nebraska was too far away from the



slave States to be occupied to any great extent by emigrants from the South, but a fierce struggle arose for the possession of the Territory of Kansas. Armed men from Missouri moved over the border at once to occupy the region and keep out Northern immigrants. The Indian titles were quickly extinguished by the Democratic administration and the public lands thrown open for settlement. The first party of emigrants from the free States were visited by an armed mob and ordered to leave the Territory. The spirit of the North was fully aroused, however, and thousands of brave, intelligent men went to Kansas, determined to make it a free State. A contest ensued which lasted for several years, and was generally called at the time "The Border Ruffian War." Reckless and lawless men from the Missouri border harassed the Northern settlers. Many free State men were brutally murdered. The town of Lawrence was sacked and burned in part by an armed force of pro-slavery men. A regiment of wild young men from the South was recruited in Alabama by Colonel Buford, and invaded the Territory for the avowed purpose of subjugating the Northern settlers. The North supported her emigrants with fresh re-enforcements and with assignments of rifles and ammunition. Numerous encounters occurred with more or less loss of life. At the village of Ossawatimie, a pitched battle was fought, wherein 28 free State men led by John Brown defeated, on the open prairie, 56 border ruffians led by Captain Pate of Virginia.

In the struggle for Kansas, the South fought against the laws of nature. Very little of the Territory was adapted for the raising of cotton, and slavery had been found profitable only in the cotton regions. Few emigrants from the South went with their negroes to the new Territory, while resolute Northern farmers and mechanics poured in year after year in large numbers. The slave power then undertook to secure possession of Kansas by fraud. At the first election for a Territorial Legislature, thousands of Missourians crossed the Kansas border and

voted. The free State men disregarded this election, held another, and organized a legislature of their own, so that for a time there were two legislatures in session. In the same manner, two State Constitutions were formed, one at Lecompton, by a convention composed of members chosen in great part by fraudulent Missouri votes, and one at Lawrence, by a convention representing the anti-slavery settlers of the Territory. The administration at Washington endeavored to force the pro-slavery Constitution upon the people. Great efforts were made to this end through the agency of the Federal office-holders in the Territory, supported by detachments of Federal troops, and these efforts were abandoned only when it became evident that the free State men were in an overwhelming majority and were determined to have their rights. The Kansas War finally degenerated into a series of plundering raids by parties of Missourians, but these in time became too hazardous to be continued. Some Democrats in Congress opposed the course of the administration toward Kansas and were called Anti-Lecompton Democrats, but the bulk of the party stood steadily on the side of the South as long as the Democrats held power in Congress. Kansas, with its free State Constitution, was refused admission to the Union.

Every incident of the long struggle in Kansas was promptly reported in the Northern papers, and the anti-slavery element in the North followed the conflict with intense interest, and looked upon the men who took their lives in their hands and went to the new Territory to secure it for freedom as heroes of a just and patriotic cause. It was the Kansas and Nebraska Bill and the struggle between freedom and slavery beyond the Missouri which finally crystallized the anti-slavery sentiment of the North into the organization known as the Republican Party.

CHAPTER XI.

THE OSTEND MANIFESTO, THE DRED SCOTT DECISION, AND THE  
ATTACK ON CHARLES SUMNER.

Three events occurring in the period we are now describing contributed powerfully towards increasing the alarm in the North at the purposes and spirit of the slave power. In August 1854, Secretary of State William L. Marcy secretly directed James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Pierre Soule, our ministers at London, Paris, and Madrid, respectively, to meet in some European city and confer about the best method of getting possession of Cuba. The conference took place at Ostend, and resulted in a dispatch to our Government, known as the "Ostend Manifesto," which recommended the immediate purchase of Cuba, and threatened Spain with a forcible seizure of the island in case she should refuse to sell it. The purpose of the Cuban annexation scheme thus developed was to prevent the island from ever becoming a free republic like San Domingo, and to make out of it one or more slave States to re-enforce the slave power in Congress. Nothing came of the manifesto, save the resulting anger of European nations and the increased determination created in the North to oppose the schemes of the pro-slavery leaders.

The Supreme Court of the United States at this time was thoroughly in sympathy with the projects of the pro-slavery Democracy. The leaders of that party determined by a bold stroke to cut the Gordian knot of controversy as to the power of the Government over slavery in the Territories, and for this purpose they procured from the court what was known as the Dred Scott decision. Dred Scott was a negro belonging to an army officer who had taken him into a free State. This act entitled the slave to his liberty, and when he was afterward taken back to Missouri he sued for his freedom. The case was carried

up to the Supreme Court. A majority of the judges decided that persons of African blood were never thought of or spoken of except as property when the Constitution was formed, and were not referred to by the Declaration of Independence, which says that all men are created free and equal and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Such persons, the court declared, had no status as citizens, and could not sue in any court, and were so far inferior that they had no rights that a white man was bound to respect. Proceeding then to the question of slavery in the Territories, the court, through its Chief-Justice, Roger B. Taney, held that the clause of the Constitution which says that "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," applied only to territory that belonged to the United States when the Constitution was framed, and that in all other territory the slaveholder had the right to take his slaves, and Congress had no right to prevent him. This partisan decision was practically agreed to in 1855, but was held back until after the campaign of 1856, and made public early in 1857. It was designed to prohibit Congress from making any laws respecting slavery in the Territories, and to exclude all of the inhabitants of the United States of African blood, or mixed blood, from all of the privileges of citizenship, so far as such privileges were guaranteed and protected by the Federal Government. The decision shocked the humanity of the North, but was received in the South with great satisfaction. The slaveholders thought that they had at last secured from an authority that could not be disputed an absolute endorsement of their most extreme theories and had thrown over the institution of slavery the protecting shield of the highest tribunal in the land. They little dreamed of what the future had in store for them.

In May, 1856, a brutal and wanton attack was made upon Charles Sumner, a Senator from Massachusetts, by Preston



Brooks, a Representative from South Carolina. Mr. Sumner had made a speech upon the Kansas question, in which he had sharply criticised the State of South Carolina and had reflected somewhat severely upon Butler, one of her Senators. After the Senate had adjourned he was sitting at his desk engaged in writing, when Brooks approached him from behind, felled him to the floor with a blow from a heavy cane, and continued to beat him about the head till he was unconscious. A South Carolina member named Keitt and a Virginia member named Edmonson stood by at the time to prevent interference with the dastardly outrage. Mr. Sumner was severely injured and never fully recovered his former health. A disease of the spine ensued, and he was obliged to resort to a painful form of treatment which kept him for two years out of his seat in the Senate. The outrage produced great indignation throughout the North, which was intensified by the ovations paid to the ruffian Brooks when he returned home to South Carolina.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### ORGANIZATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY--CAMPAIGN OF 1856.

THE necessity for the organization of a national party to resist the encroachments of slavery was felt throughout the North immediately after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. Events had already shaped the platform for such a party. It was in all men's minds, and might have been formulated in a single sentence, "The freedom of the Territories from the curse of slavery." Interference with slavery in the States where it existed by virtue of State law had not been thought of, save by the Abolitionists, who did not count as a political force. The men who were prepared to join a new party organization deter-

mined that slavery should be wedged in within the region where it already existed, and that no protection should be given by Federal law to property in slaves in the States whose laws declared that no such property should exist. The elements prepared for crystallization into a new party were the late Free Soilers, the anti-slavery Whigs, and a small number of Democrats calling themselves anti-Nebraska men. The question of when the Republican Party first originated, and who gave it its name, has been much disputed, but within the past three years it has come to be pretty generally acknowledged that the Michigan State Convention, held at Jackson, early in June, 1854, was the first State representative body to take the name of Republican. The title was suggested in a letter from Horace Greeley to a delegate to that convention. This letter was shown to the late Senator Howard and several other influential men. The suggestion was deemed a good one, and the name was formally adopted in the resolutions of the convention. A few weeks later it was adopted by State conventions in Maine, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa. In most of the New England States, in Pennsylvania, and in the entire South, the Whig Party still kept alive and ran tickets that year. The success of the Republicans in all the States where they ran straight tickets of their own gave a great impetus to the further extension of the party. It won its first national triumph in the House of Representatives elected in 1854, which convened in December, 1855, when the Republican candidate for Speaker, N. P. Banks of Massachusetts, was elected.

In a single year, the Republican Party had carried most of the Northern States and had secured a controlling influence in the lower house of Congress. Its leaders were mostly men of anti-slavery convictions from the old Whig Party, like Fessenden, Sumner, Greeley, Seward, Chase, Wade, and Chandler, but there were among them several former Democrats. No account was made of old political affiliations, however, and the only test of membership was opposition to the encroachments of the

slave power. In 1855, the Republicans strengthened their State organizations and were successful in most of the Northern States. The Whig Party gave some last feeble signs of life in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Ohio. At the South, the Whigs almost in a mass merged themselves into the Know-Nothing or American organization. Conservative men in that section, opposed to reopening the slavery controversy, did not venture to ally themselves with the Republicans of the North, but took refuge in the American Party, where they were able for a brief time to combat the ultra pro-slavery element.

Thus far the Republicans had no national organization. On the 22d of February, 1856, the first Republican National Convention was held in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. Its purpose was to better organize the party and to prepare the way for the Presidential campaign. A second convention, to nominate a President and Vice-President, met in Philadelphia on the 17th of June, and was presided over by Henry S. Lane, of Indiana. John C. Fremont, the intrepid Western explorer, was nominated for President on the first ballot, receiving 359 votes, to 196 for John McLean. William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, received 259 votes for Vice-President on an informal ballot, to 110 for Abraham Lincoln, and 180 scattering. Mr. Dayton was then unanimously nominated. The platform welcomed to the party all who were opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the extension of slavery in the Territories, and who favored the admission of Kansas as a free State. It demanded the prohibition of slavery in all of the Territories of the United States, and denied the authority of Congress or a Territorial Legislature to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory, freedom being the public law of the national domain under the Constitution. It asserted the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in all Territories those twin relics of barbarism, slavery and polygamy.

The Democratic Convention met in Cincinnati on the 2d of June, and nominated James Buchanan for President on the

17th ballot. The voting at first was close between Buchanan and Pierce, Douglas having a small following. Toward the end, all the opposition to Buchanan centred on Douglas. The nominee for Vice-President was John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky. The platform denounced all attempts to prevent slavery in the Territories or the District of Columbia by legislation, and all objection to the admission of a new State on the ground that it established slavery. It revived the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1797 and 1798, which contained an assertion of extreme State rights doctrines. It also recognized the right to maintain slavery in any part of the public domain, and promised the faithful execution of the fugitive-slave law.

The Know-Nothings, now calling themselves Americans, met in Philadelphia, on the 22d of February, and nominated for President Millard Fillmore of New York, and for Vice-President, Andrew Jackson Donelson of Tennessee. Their platform demanded that none but natives should hold office and that foreigners should not vote until they had lived twenty-one years in the country. On the 17th of September an insignificant remnant of the once powerful Whig Party convened in Baltimore and ratified the nomination of Mr. Fillmore. Their meeting attracted very little public attention.

The Presidential contest of 1856 was exceedingly animated in all of the Northern States. Colonel Fremont, although without any record as a politician, proved an exceedingly popular candidate. The Republicans carried every Northern State except Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California, and gave to their ticket 114 electoral votes. The Americans carried but one State, Maryland. Buchanan's electoral vote was 174. Of the popular vote, Buchanan received 1,828,169; Fremont, 1,341,264; Fillmore 874,534. Buchanan had therefore a decided plurality but he lacked 377,629 votes of a majority over both of his competitors.



CHAPTER XIII.

JOHN BROWN'S RAID--HELPER'S "IMPENDING CRISIS."

AN event that had a powerful effect in exciting the South, and in aggravating the growing sectional feeling in the North, took place in 1859. John Brown, who had distinguished himself as a brave free State leader in the Kansas war, invaded Harper's Ferry, Virginia, on the 17th of October, with an armed force consisting of 17 white men and 5 negroes. The invaders tore up the railroad track, cut the telegraph wires, and took possession of the United States Armory; doing this by the authority of God Almighty, they said. Brown issued a proclamation calling upon the slaves of the South to rise and demand their liberty. The frightened inhabitants of the place appealed to the State authorities to come to their aid, and the State called upon the General Government. A force of United States marines was promptly despatched to Harper's Ferry, and a large body of Virginia militia was soon on the ground. Brown and his followers defended themselves in the armory building. A sharp conflict ensued. Hemmed in on all sides, Brown sent out a flag of truce, but the bearer, Stephens, was instantly shot down by the Virginians. One of Brown's men was captured by the Virginia militia, dragged out upon the railroad bridge, and shot in cold blood. Four of Brown's party attempted to escape by crossing the river, but three were mortally wounded. Brown made his last stand in an engine house, where he repulsed his assailants, who lost two killed and six wounded. The fight went on all day; at night Brown's forces were reduced to three unwounded whites besides himself. Eight of his men, including two of his sons, were already dead, another lay dying, and two were captives, mortally wounded. Next morning the marines charged the engine house, battered down the door, and captured Brown with his surviving followers. The pur-

pose of the raid upon Harper's Ferry was to stimulate an insurrectionary movement throughout the South. Brown had drawn up a sketch for a provisional government, and had nominated several of his followers to the principal executive offices. He was held a prisoner for about six weeks, tried at Charlestown, Virginia, and hanged on the 2d day of December, exhibiting to the last a heroic fortitude and an exalted frame of mind which won for him the admiration of even his bitter enemies, the Virginians, and excited deep sympathy throughout the North. The South was profoundly stirred by this invasion, insignificant as it was in its dimensions and its results. The Southern people, in their excited frame of mind undoubtedly believed that the John Brown raid had the indorsement of the Republican Party of the North, and was the beginning of an effort to destroy slavery by inciting the slaves to a general insurrection. The horrible history of the San Domingo massacre had always been a terror to the Southern people, and a rumor of a negro rising had, on several occasions in the past, sufficed to throw them into a convulsive state of anger and apprehension. It was not strange, therefore, that an effort to organize an insurrection, led by courageous white men from the North, should provoke their fiercest animosity.

John Brown had few apologists though a great many sympathizers in the North. His movement was his own secret and was not abetted by any body of anti-slavery men. Just how great an influence it exercised on the subsequent history of the country it would, of course, be impossible to measure, but the feelings it produced and the memories it left in the South were a principal agency in inclining the Southern people to separate from the North and set up a Government of their own.

A book published about this time on the slavery question added to the irritation in the South. It was called "The Impending Crisis," and its author was Hinton R. Helper, a North Carolinian, who had migrated to California. The book was

addressed to the slaveholding whites of the South, and was a powerful argument, re-enforced by statistics drawn from United States census reports, to prove that slavery cursed the industries of the Southern States. The poverty of those States in respect to accumulated wealth and agricultural products in comparison with the States of the North, was forcibly set forth and the non-slaveholding Southern whites were urged to throw off the control of the small minority of slaveholders and take the affairs of their States into their own hands. The circulation of this book was everywhere prohibited in the South. It was regarded as an incendiary document, although it contained nothing but calm reasoning and indisputable statistics. Several Republican members of the House signed a letter endorsing the volume, and their conduct was made the subject of an acrimonious discussion. At one time a resolution came near passing, affirming that no man who recommended the book was fit to be Speaker of the House. "The Impending Crisis" had an immense sale and though its effect in the South was only to aggravate the pro-slavery feeling, it opened the eyes of many people in the North to the blighting effect of slavery upon industry, manufactures, and trade.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860.

THE Republicans were not discouraged by their defeat in 1856. They saw that if they had carried the States of Pennsylvania and Indiana they would have succeeded, and felt that they had formed what was destined to be the great party of the future, and that their principles would prevail in time. The promulgation of the Dred Scott decision immediately after the inauguration of Mr. Buchanan gave new vigor to the Republican cause, showing as it did that the pro-slavery party intended to

fully subjugate the whole country and make of it a vast slave empire. The conduct of Buchanan in continuing the efforts of Pierce to force slavery upon the Territory of Kansas kept alive the discussion of the question of the freedom of the Territories until the next Presidential election. Buchanan was as fully subservient to the South as Pierce had been. His administration was controlled by ultra pro-slavery men, and directed its energies to carrying out the schemes of the slave power.

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas contested the State of Illinois for the United States Senatorship, and made a memorable canvass which attracted great attention throughout the country. Douglas advocated what was known as his squatter sovereignty policy, which was that Congress should abstain from all legislation as to slavery in the Territories and allow the people to settle the question for themselves. Mr. Lincoln advocated the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories. Although Lincoln had a majority of the popular vote, Douglas had a majority in the Legislature and was elected. The South was not satisfied with the Douglas squatter sovereignty plan, the theory of the pro-slavery leaders being that slavery could not be prohibited in the Territories by any power whatever. This theory was repugnant to a great majority of the Democrats of the North, and the conflict between it and the Douglas theory led to a disruption of the Democratic party. The Democratic national convention met at Charleston, on the 23d of April, 1860, and immediately got into a heated controversy upon the subject of slavery. Finally, by a close vote, it was resolved that as differences had existed in the party as to the nature and extent of the powers of the Territorial Legislatures and as to the powers and duties of Congress under the Constitution, over the institution of slavery within the Territories, the Democratic party would abide by the decision of the Supreme Court on the question of constitutional law. This exceedingly guarded and neutral declaration angered the



Southern delegates, and most of them withdrew from the convention. An adjournment was carried until the 18th of June, when the convention reassembled in Baltimore. The seceding delegates met and adopted an extreme pro-slavery platform, and adjourned to assemble in Richmond June 11th. The regular convention reassembled in Baltimore and nominated Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, for President, and Benjamin Fitzpatrick, of Alabama, for Vice-President. Fitzpatrick subsequently declined, and Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia, was substituted by the National Committee. The Baltimore Convention affirmed Douglas' squatter sovereignty theory. The Bolting Convention met in Richmond and adjourned to meet again in Baltimore, June 23d, when it adopted the Charleston platform and nominated John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for President, and Joseph Lane, of Oregon, for Vice-President.

A new party, composed mainly of former members of the now dead American party in the South and a few stubborn old Whigs in the North, was formed at Baltimore May 9th. It took the name of the Constitutional Union party, and nominated for President John Bell, of Tennessee, and for Vice-President Edward Everett, of Massachusetts. This party declared that it recognized no political principles other than the Constitution of the country, the union of the States, and the enforcement of the laws. This last phrase was intended to refer to the Fugitive Slave law. The Republican National Convention met in Chicago May 16th, 1860. It was generally supposed, prior to the meeting of the convention, that William H. Seward would be nominated for President. He was recognized as the chief leader of the new party, and its greatest teacher on the political bearings of slavery. His principal competitor was Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois. The other candidates were Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, Edward Bates, of Missouri, William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, John McLean, of Ohio, and Jacob Collamer, of Vermont. Mr. Seward led on

the first and second ballot, but the argument that he would not be a popular candidate in the States of Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois—the States lost by the Republicans in 1856—led to the nomination of Lincoln on the third ballot. Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was nominated for Vice-President. The platform was substantially that adopted in 1856. Its chief planks were those referring to slavery in the Territories. It declared freedom to be the normal condition of the Territories, and denounced the new dogma that the Constitution, with its own force, carried slavery there.

In the campaign of 1860 the Republicans were united and confident, while the Democrats were divided into two factions, which fought each other about as vigorously as they did their common enemy. These factions were known by the name of their leaders, one being called Douglas Democrats, and the other Breckinridge Democrats. There were few Douglas men in the South and few Breckinridge men in the North. The strength of the new Constitutional Union party was almost wholly confined to the South. Every free State but New Jersey was carried by the Republicans, and in New Jersey the refusal of a part of the Douglas men to support the fusion ticket allowed four of the Lincoln electors to slip in. The electoral vote was divided as follows: Lincoln, 180, all from the North; Breckinridge, 72, all from the South; Bell, 39, from Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee; and Douglas, 12, from Missouri and New Jersey. The popular vote was, Lincoln, 1,857,919; Douglas, 1,291,574; Breckinridge, 850,082; Bell, 646,124.

The very large vote given to Mr. Douglas was due, in some part, to his personal popularity. He was the idol of the Democratic party of the North, and had the South chosen to give him its support, instead of seceding from the convention and nominating Breckinridge, he would probably have been elected President. With his comparatively moderate views on the subject of slavery, which were becoming more and more

modified in the right direction as he saw the tendency of the pro-slavery leaders, it is not unlikely that he would have averted or at least postponed the war.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### SECESSION—REBELLION—WAR.

As soon as the election of Lincoln and Hamlin was known to be beyond dispute, movements for seceding from the Union began in the South. The Southern leaders did not wait to learn what the policy of the new administration would be, but made haste to break the relations of their States with the Union and to form a separate government, under the title of the Confederate States of America. As early as December South Carolina seceded; other States followed during the winter, and in February a complete Rebel government was organized at Montgomery and a Rebel army put into the field. A considerable party in the Southern States, composed mostly of old Whigs, opposed secession, but were overpowered by the more active, unscrupulous, and determined supporters of the movement. During the session of Congress just prior to Mr. Lincoln's inauguration great efforts were made in the way of conciliatory propositions to induce the Southern States not to renounce their allegiance to the Union. The Republicans were willing to go to the farthest extent possible not involving the vital principle of their party that the Territories of the United States were free soil by virtue of the Constitution. The plan known as the Crittenden Compromise received a large vote in both Houses, although opposed by most Republicans. Its principal provision was that all of the territory north of latitude 36 degrees and 30 minutes should forever be free, and that all of the territory south of that line should be given up to slavery.

Senator Anthony, a Republican, was willing to admit New Mexico as a slave State, because slavery already existed there, but this was as far as he or any other Republican proposed to go concerning the disputed question of the condition of the Territories. A series of resolutions, accompanied by a constitutional amendment, passed both Houses, however, guaranteeing slavery in the States where it existed against any interference on the part of the Federal Government, and recommending the Northern States which had passed laws obstructing the recovery of fugitives to repeal them. A Peace Conference, invited by the Legislature of Virginia, sat in Washington in February. Thirteen Northern States and seven Southern States were represented. Its propositions had no effect in staying the rising tide of rebellion. The Southern leaders had fully made up their minds to dissolve the Union, and although many of them remained in Congress up to the time of Lincoln's inauguration, they did so avowedly for the purpose of resisting legislation which might be hostile to their section.

It is not the purpose of this work to trace the history of the war for the preservation of the Union further than is necessary to show the action of the political parties concerning its prosecution. The Republican party was the war party from the beginning to the end of the struggle, holding the Union to be a perpetual bond, and not a league which could be dissolved at the pleasure of any of its members. It also held that the Republic was indestructible, and that the duty of the United States Government was to enforce obedience to its authority.

The Democratic party in the North was in an extremely awkward predicament when the storm of war burst upon the country. For a whole generation it had maintained the theory of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, that the States were sovereign and were themselves the judges of the constitutionality of the Federal laws and acts. Out of this theory grew logically another, that the Government had no right to coerce



sovereign States. This was the theory upon which Mr. Buchanan's administration proceeded during the three months in which the Rebellion organized itself throughout the South. It continued to be held by a considerable portion of the Northern Democracy, but the patriotic feeling which followed the attack upon Fort Sumter caused it to be exceedingly unpopular for a while, and it was rarely avowed in public during the first year of the war. For a time there was but one political party in the North, and that was the party of the Union. As the war went on, however, and it became evident that it was going to be a long struggle and no holiday parade, as many had imagined, the Democrats took courage and reorganized their party as an anti-administration party. They did not avowedly oppose the prosecution of the war at that time; some of them, indeed, insisted that if they were in power they would push it more vigorously, but the spirit of their movement was one of dissatisfaction with the contest. In 1862, after the disaster to our armies on the Peninsula and at the second battle of Bull Run, a feeling of discontent arose throughout the North which took the form of hostility to the Republican party in the fall elections of that year. The Democrats carried the great central belt of States, beginning with New York and ending at the Mississippi River. Fortunately, in only one State was there a Governor to be elected. That was in the State of New York, where the Democrats chose Horatio Seymour, by the aid of enormous election frauds committed in the City of New York. The Republicans were barely able to secure a majority in the new House, and were for a time greatly discouraged by their reverses and apprehensive that the Democratic triumphs might lead to the ultimate success of the Rebellion. In 1863, however, the capture of Vicksburg by General Grant and the decisive victory at Gettysburg completely turned the current of public sentiment. The Republicans recovered that year every State they had lost in 1862.

Wherever the contest was the hottest there their victory was the greatest. The great political battle of the year occurred in Ohio, where the Democrats nominated Clement L. Vallandigham for Governor. He was an avowed opponent of the war and an open sympathizer with the South. The majority against him was the largest ever given at any election in the State, running up to nearly 100,000.

In 1863, the Democratic party in most of the Northern States threw off all pretension of sympathy with the Union cause. On this account they were given by the Republicans the name of "copperheads." In some parts of the West they wore pins made of the butternut, to typify their sympathy with the South, the Southern soldiers being frequently clad in homespun dyed with the juice of that nut.

A long and bloody riot occurred in the City of New York in 1863, in which thousands of Democrats resisted the draft and held possession of many parts of the city for several days, murdering a number of people. The Democratic Governor of the State, Horatio Seymour, addressed the mob in front of City Hall, at the height of the riot, and styled the lawless persons composing it "my friends." The riot was finally suppressed by United States troops, after considerable slaughter. In the State of Indiana a formidable conspiracy under the title of the "Sons of Liberty," was organized by the Democratic sympathizers with the South, but was suppressed by the vigilance and courage of Oliver P. Morton, the Republican Governor of the State.

In several of the States the Republicans in 1863 dropped their party name and took that of the Union party, in order to save the feelings of the war Democrats who desired to co-operate with them. The voting force of these war Democrats was comparatively small, but among them were a number of men of undoubted patriotism and high position in the country. Most of them continued to co-operate with the Republican party during and after the war.

## CHAPTER XVI.

## THE EMANCIPATION OF SLAVERY.

THE Republican party did not enter the war with the purpose of abolishing slavery. A few far-sighted men saw that the struggle must end either in the separation of the South or the freedom of the slaves, but the masses of the party did not look beyond the suppression of the Rebellion and the preservation of the Union. President Lincoln said that if he could save the Union with slavery he would save it, and that if he could save it without slavery he would save it. As the war went on, the folly of recognizing and protecting an institution which gave the rebels a large force of laboring men to stay at home and raise food for their armies became plainly apparent, and there was a general demand for the abolition of slavery as a war measure. It was not, however, till April, 1862, that slavery was abolished in the District of Columbia, nor till June, 1864, that the Fugitive Slave laws were repealed. In the early military operations against the Rebellion great care was taken not to excite insurrections among the slaves, and the negroes who came into our lines were treated as contraband property, so as not to be restored to their masters. On September 22d, 1862, President Lincoln issued his first proclamation of emancipation, which was, in effect, a threat to the States then in rebellion that they would lose their slaves unless they returned to the Union. He declared that on January 1st following all persons held as slaves in any State which should be then in rebellion should be then and forever after free. On January 1st, 1863, no rebel State having returned to the Union, he issued his second proclamation, designating the States and parts of States in rebellion, and ordering and declaring that all persons held as slaves in such regions "are and shall be free," and pledging the Government to maintain their freedom. "On this measure," said Lincoln, "I in-

voke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of God." This celebrated proclamation professed to be a war measure, adopted by authority of the President as the commander-in-chief of the army and navy.

The Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution prohibiting slavery in the United States passed the Senate in April, 1864, and the House in January, 1865, but was not ratified by a sufficient number of States to make it valid until nearly a year after the end of the war. It was essentially a Republican measure, all of the Republicans in Congress voting for it, and nearly all of the Democrats voting against it. It will stand for all time as the noblest of the many monuments which mark the brilliant history of the Republican party. Public sentiment was slow to take shape in favor of the total abolition of the curse of slavery, but its progress was certain, and when the amendment was ratified it was approved by the entire Republican party. For some time afterward the Democratic party continued to denounce the Thirteenth Amendment, declaring it void and of no effect, but long ago even the most bigoted and stubborn Democrats came to acquiesce not only to its validity but in its justice and wisdom.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1864.

ANXIOUS to secure the co-operation of all men who favored the prosecution of the war, the Republicans, in 1864, called a Union National Convention to meet in Baltimore. The convention renominated Abraham Lincoln for President, and nominated Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, for Vice-President. The nomination of Lincoln was by acclamation, but there were a number of candidates for the Vice-Presidency, prominent among whom were Hannibal Hamlin and Daniel S. Dickinson. Prior to the



Baltimore Convention a small number of Republicans, dissatisfied with the administration, and especially with its leniency toward rebels, met at Cleveland and nominated John C. Fremont for President, and John Cochrane for Vice-President. Their convention demanded the suppression of the rebellion without compromise, and the confiscation of the lands of the rebels, and their distribution among soldiers and actual settlers. General Fremont accepted the nomination but repudiated the confiscation plank of the platform. Subsequently both the candidates withdrew from the field, and the whole movement collapsed. The Democrats held their convention in Chicago, and manifested open hostility to the continuance of the war. Bitter speeches were made, denouncing the administration. A platform was adopted declaring the war a failure, and attacking those who carried it on for disregarding the Constitution, treading upon public liberty, perverting right, and impairing justice, humanity, and material prosperity. The convention nominated for President General George B. McClellan, whose half-hearted, dilatory course while in command of the army of the Potomac was largely responsible for whatever failure had characterized the war up to that time. George H. Pendleton, of Ohio, was nominated for Vice-President. The platform crippled the Democratic party in the canvass, for scarcely had it been published when news came that Sherman had taken Atlanta, and that Farragut had carried the defences of Mobile. In the face of such victories as these the declaration that the war was a failure sounded absurd and treasonable.

In the canvass of 1864 the Democrats attacked the administration for exceeding its constitutional powers in suspending the habeas corpus and imprisoning rebel sympathizers and agents in the North without trial. They did not openly avow their old theory, that the States could not be coerced; but they had a great deal to say about the "bloody and endless war, brought on by the anti-slavery agitators in the North." They denounced

the emancipation proclamation and appealed to the prejudice against the negroes, still very strong in the North, by asserting that the war was an abolition war, carried on not to restore the Union but to free the slaves. The Republicans had practically but one argument to make, and that was, that it was the duty of every patriot to sustain the Government in its efforts to crush the Rebellion and save the Union. The result of the election was the success of the Republicans by very large majorities. Mr. Lincoln had the electoral vote of every State not in the rebellion, except Kentucky, Delaware, and New Jersey. He received 212 electoral votes against 21 cast for McClellan. His popular vote was 2,213,665 against 1,802,237. The success of the Republicans in this critical campaign assured the ultimate triumph of the Union arms in the field, confirmed the emancipation of the slaves, and opened the way to the termination of the war. Had the Democrats prevailed, there is little reason to doubt that the war would have ended by a recognition of the independence of the rebel States.

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### SECURING THE FRUITS OF THE WAR—THE STRUGGLE WITH ANDREW JOHNSON.

AFTER the Republican party had carried the war through to a successful issue, destroying upon the battle-field the doctrine of secession, and forcing the surrender of the rebel armies, it was called upon to meet a new and very grave issue, involving the security of the results of its past efforts.

Lincoln was assassinated in April, 1865, very soon after his second inauguration. The Vice-President, Andrew Johnson, became President. At first he was so radical and violent in his treatment of the conquered rebels that it was feared that