

Notes and Documents

Senator Beveridge, J. Franklin Jameson, and Abraham Lincoln

EDITED by ELIZABETH DONNAN AND LEO F. STOCK

With the publication of the final volumes of Albert J. Beveridge's *The Life of John Marshall* in the autumn of 1919, the correspondence between the author and J. Franklin Jameson lapsed and was not renewed until the former began his work on Abraham Lincoln. The first letter in the revived intercourse is a note from Jameson, accompanying two small pamphlets dealing with Lincoln.¹ From that time until death brought an abrupt end to Beveridge's activities the interchanges between the two were frequent. The letters which follow tell the story of his growing absorption in his study and his despair over the tangles which he was called upon to unravel.

Of his two biographies Jameson wrote briefly after Beveridge's death: "Unwearied diligence and an eloquent style made that book (*Life of John Marshall*) one of the most successful and valued of America's biographies. His later years were devoted, with the same assiduity and concentration, to the preparation of a *Life of Lincoln*, to which he brought besides the diligence and uprightness of the historian, an exceptional experience of political life in the Middle West."²

The letters in the correspondence which are here omitted deal for the most part with his services to the American Historical Association. In 1925 he became a member of its executive council and was made chairman of its committee on endowment on which he had

¹ J. Franklin Jameson to Albert J. Beveridge, February 17, 1923, J. Franklin Jameson Papers. All the correspondence here quoted comes from those papers, which are in the hands of Dr. Leo F. Stock. The letters of Senator Beveridge are printed by the generous permission of Mrs. Beveridge.

² *American Historical Review* (New York), XXXII (July, 1927), 949.

served in 1924. To accept such an office in the midst of his arduous labors upon his Lincoln material must have been a sore sacrifice, and his willingness to do so is a measure of his appreciation of the services which historians had rendered to him. Into the work of raising money for the Association he threw himself with the same fervor which characterized all his activities. His disappointments were frequent. He was often discouraged but he always rallied. On November 13, 1926, after an attempt to interest his friends in Indianapolis, he wrote: "I found the same state of mind that I found among the men in New York who have money. Our businessmen are more than generous in giving to anything that they can see — anything that is tangible. They will give money to build an armory, to build a hospital, even to an art institute since these things can be seen and felt. But, when it comes to giving money to something as intangible and imponderable as scholarship, they do not seem to get the idea."³ To this letter he added a postscript saying that he and Mrs. Beveridge, in order to aid the Indianapolis quota, were doubling their subscription.

A month later, his health and spirits both restored, he wrote: "We have prepared the field for the harvest. Never in my experience or observation has anything of the kind received such good publicity, widespread, continuous, and, on the part of the press, very generous. We shall begin to get results from this in the ordinary course of events; and I am expecting that, in the early part of next year, we shall make up the fund."⁴ A Chicago speech for the endowment fund was to have been his final appearance in public until the second volume of his Lincoln was completed. The brief telegram which went to Indianapolis when the news of his death reached Washington stated but the simple truth when it said: "American Historical Association suffers great loss in death of Senator Beveridge." And this loss was far from being to the endowment fund alone. As Jameson later wrote: "His affection for the society, his obvious enjoyment of its meetings, his *bonhomie*, and the vigor and interest of his conversation drew many members to him with warm feelings of friendship, and cause his loss to be keenly felt."⁵

³ Beveridge to Jameson, November 13, 1926, Jameson Papers.

⁴ Beveridge to Jameson, December 17, 1926, *ibid.*

⁵ *American Historical Review*, XXXII (July, 1927), 949.

February 28, 1923.

DEAR JAMESON:

On my return to this place I have your courteous letter of February 17. This will explain my seeming impoliteness in not having answered you promptly.

Mr. [William E.] Barton had already sent me his brochure (he has written three or four, by the way); but I have not seen that of Mr. [Percy C.] Eggleston. Both are interesting and valuable, and it was kind and thoughtful of you to send them to me.⁶

By the way, this is the same Barton who wrote the books, "The Parentage of Lincoln," and "The Soul of Lincoln."⁷ He is a preacher, living in or near Chicago. His work suggests one of the serious difficulties encountered by anybody who attempts to write on Lincoln by scholarly methods. Dr. Barton starts out with a theory, and strives with all his might to discover facts which will support that theory. The same is true of Mrs. [Caroline Hanks] Hitchcock's little book on the ancestry of Nancy Hanks.⁸ In fact, it seems to have come to the point where a good many well-meaning people are trying to fit Lincoln into their idea of what they want him to be. The result is a noisome growth of prepossessions and prejudices with which it will be hard to deal, I fear.

In my work on the Lincoln I am going to lean on you even more heavily than I did when preparing the Marshall.

I thought I had told you about my Lincoln plan; indeed, I am certain that I did, but, of course, in the heavy and pressing work which burdens you, you have forgotten it for the moment.⁹

While finishing the last two volumes of my Marshall, the idea came to me to write a companion piece to that biography, continuing the institutional interpretation of America, weaving it about the life of Abraham Lincoln as I tried to weave the first part of the institutional interpretation of America about the life of John Marshall. This idea grew until it controlled me almost as much as the Marshall did.¹⁰

So determined was I to do the Lincoln that in January of last year I positively told several gentlemen who came up to my house to urge me to become a candidate for the senatorial nomination, that I would not go into politics again because I intended to write the Lincoln. Later on the situation

⁶ With the letter of February 17, 1923, Jameson forwarded a copy of William E. Barton, *The Influence of Chicago upon Abraham Lincoln* (Chicago, 1923), an address delivered before the Chicago Historical Society on February 10, 1922; and Percy C. Eggleston, *Lincoln in New England* (New York, 1922).

⁷ William E. Barton, *The Paternity of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1920); William E. Barton, *The Soul of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1920).

⁸ Caroline Hanks Hitchcock, *Nancy Hanks; the Story of Abraham Lincoln's Mother* (New York, 1899).

⁹ Jameson seemed to imply in his letter of February 17, 1923, that he had just heard, by indirection, of Beveridge's contemplated life of Lincoln.

¹⁰ Before Beveridge finally determined that the life of Lincoln was to be his next work, he considered a study of William Pitt the younger. See Claude G. Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era* (Cambridge, 1932), 560-61.

compelled. But when the election was over, and I was beaten, I at once began work upon what I wanted, and want to do.¹¹

During the latter part of March I hope to be able to be in Washington on this very matter; and if I am, I am going to ask you to give me an hour or two of your time, invaluable as that time is. I wish to lay before you the theory of my Lincoln; and also to get your judgment on some perplexing Lincoln problems.

Of course, the Lincoln is a much bigger, and far harder job than the Marshall was. Indeed, the magnitude and complexity of it are such that I am well-nigh appalled at the task I have undertaken. It all but discourages me. However, it has one good reaction: I have entered upon, and shall pursue the project, with humility, which is the best corrective I know of for over-confidence.

March 21, 1923.¹²

MY DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

Stephenson's address is "Professor Nathaniel W. Stephenson, Yale University Press, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York." Miss Mary Scrugham's is "Todd's Road, Route 9, Lexington, Kentucky." Her little book is called *Peaceful Americans of 1861*. It was published by Longmans, a little more than a year ago, in the series of Columbia University Studies in History, etc. I think you will find some good thinking and data in it.

President E[dwin] E. Sparks's edition of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates is volume III. of the Illinois Historical Collection, published by the State Historical Commission; you can get it through [Theodore C.] Pease.¹³

[William A.] Schaper's monograph on "Sectionalism in South Carolina" is embedded in the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1900, volume I., pages 237 to 463.¹⁴

In the *American Historical Review*, volume I., pages 313-314, there is a letter respecting Lincoln's nomination to Congress that you might miss, though I suppose it is of no great importance. In volume VIII., pages 53 to 69, Professor [Carl Russell] Fish of Wisconsin has an article on "Lincoln and The Patronage." The striking passage in which the traveller in the Kentucky mountains in 1796 describes the instinctive swarming of Americans toward the West is in the *American Historical Review*, V., 525-526, the traveller being Moses Austin, afterward the founder of Texas. The article about [Edouard de] Stoeckl is in the same "esteemed contemporary," volume XXVI., and I send you a "separate" of it herewith.¹⁵

¹¹ In the campaign of 1922 Beveridge had won the Republican nomination for the United States Senate in a bitter struggle with Senator Harry S. New. In the election he was defeated by the Democratic candidate, Samuel M. Ralston.

¹² The letter which asked the questions here answered has not come to light.

¹³ Edwin E. Sparks was the president of Pennsylvania State College; Theodore C. Pease was associate professor of history in the University of Illinois.

¹⁴ The author of this monograph, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina," was awarded the Justin Winsor Prize of the American Historical Association in 1900.

¹⁵ Frank A. Golder, "The American Civil War through the Eyes of a Russian

With most pleasant remembrance of our talk, very profitable to me, and with best wishes for the work,

April 21, 1923.

DEAR DR. JAMESON :—

I wrote Mr. and Mrs. [John D., Jr.] Rockefeller that you and I had had a fairly full talk about the [Nelson W.] Aldrich biography; that we agreed that Stephenson is the man to do it, if he can be had; and that you would see him personally about it when you are in New York about two weeks hence.¹⁶

I am writing Stephenson about another matter and am merely mentioning to him that you are going to see him on an important subject which I hope he will take up. I did not think it wise to go into the matter further since you will talk it over with him personally.

The more I think about this project the more I am impressed with it. If it is done well and in comprehensive fashion and by the right man, it will be a worthwhile contribution to history. If it is not written in this manner or is produced by the wrong man, it would not interest me at all.

So for Heavens sake "go down the line" with Stephenson and get him to undertake the book. If I had not been so deeply impressed by the sincerity and bigness of yourself, of Aldrich's daughter and of her husband, perhaps I would not be so much in earnest about it.

It was a joy to see you again, dear Dr. Jameson. Somehow or other personal contact with you has the effect of strengthening and encouraging me.

May 28, 1923.

DEAR DR. JAMESON :—

What was the outcome of your conference with Stephenson on the Aldrich biography? I learned that he is to do the "Davis" and "Civil War"¹⁷ which, of course, are vitally important and will take up his entire time. I suppose, therefore, that he can't do the Aldrich.

Did Mrs. Rockefeller see you? In short, what can I do to push the matter along? I am tending to reconsider my judgment as to [Burton J.] Hendrick.¹⁸ At any rate, do let me hear from you.

I have been working my eyes out (almost literally that) trying to get Diplomat," *American Historical Review*, XXVI (April, 1921), 454-63. In a letter of April 24, 1923, Jameson added to these items a list of books on the antislavery movement before the Civil War and on slave insurrections.

¹⁶ Mrs. Rockefeller is the daughter of Senator Nelson W. Aldrich. Professor Nathaniel W. Stephenson was well known at this time for his work in American history but in a period earlier than the days of Aldrich's activity. That Beveridge should be helping to select a biographer for the Rhode Island Senator is a matter of some interest. The two served contemporaneously in the Senate, but Beveridge was never admitted to the inner circle of senators dominated by Aldrich, and the struggle between them over the Payne-Aldrich Tariff was prolonged and bitter. See Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 215, 341-66.

¹⁷ This is doubtless a reference to part of the work which Professor Stephenson was doing as editor of the *Yale Chronicles of America* photoplays.

¹⁸ Probably Burton J. Hendrick, author of *The Age of Big Business* in the *Chronicles of America*, may also have been considered as a possible biographer of Aldrich.

through with the Herndon-Weik-Lincoln mss.,¹⁹ and also the Illinois University card indexed newspaper data of which I told you, in order to return this invaluable material to the owners of it. While I have it under very heavy insurance, nevertheless I am in constant terror lest something might happen to destroy it and, therefore, want to get it out of my hands.

I have made my first trip to Springfield and also a hasty survey of the "Lincoln country" and "Douglas country"; but I shall have to go over it many times of course.

While in Springfield I made some investigations concerning the credibility of Herndon. There is no doubt at all about his veracity. Moreover, this is confirmed by the Herndon letters to Weik and others. It is perfectly obvious that in spite of his philosophizing analysis of motives and general Emersonism, in statements of fact he strives to tell the absolute truth. I have come to the conclusion — well nigh definitive — that the Mid-Victorians, the preachers and a few emotional women have been most unjust to Herndon.²⁰

Also, the newspaper data has revealed many things of first importance, some of them surprising — at least to me. When we get together which, pray God, will be soon, I will tell you all about it.

June 5, 1923.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

Thank you for your interesting letter of May 28. Mrs. Rockefeller asked me to come to see her, when I was in New York a month ago, and we talked over the matter of the proposed biography. It appeared to me that she was expecting to have a talk with Mr. Stephenson, but was going to read some of his writings first, and I do not know whether she has yet seen him or not, but it did not seem appropriate for me to talk with him beforehand about the matter, as I had rather planned to do. I have not meanwhile thought of anyone who would be better for her purposes. I do not suppose that Stephenson would profess to have an expert knowledge of the finances of Senator Aldrich's time,²¹ but that could be procured for him from experts, in a way, while biographical talent could not be pumped in from the outside, into one who did not possess it, though he had all possible knowledge of financial history.

¹⁹ William J. Herndon and Jesse W. Weik, authors of *Herndon's Lincoln; The True Story of a Great Life*, 3 vols. (New York, 1889), republished as *Abraham Lincoln*, 2 vols. (New York, 1892); Jesse W. Weik, *The Real Lincoln* (New York, 1922).

²⁰ The most recent book on Herndon, David Donald, *Lincoln's Herndon* (New York, 1948), tends to support this judgment though it points out that Herndon was sometimes too positive in his statements and that he was guilty of occasional exaggerations and errors of memory.

²¹ It will be remembered that Senator Aldrich was chairman of the National Monetary Commission created by the Emergency Aldrich-Vreeland Act, passed as a result of the panic of 1907. The work of this commission contributed to the later creation of the Federal Reserve System.

June 17, 1923.

DEAR JAMESON :—

I dined and spent the evening with the Rockefellers to talk over the Aldrich biography.

I told them that you and I agreed that the very best man that can be found who will accept, must be given a perfectly free hand and dealt by with the utmost generosity. To this they heartily agreed. I also said that you and I feel that the biography must be a history of the period, woven around Aldrich as the leading political figure who continued in his dominant political place throughout those two and one-half decades. They thought so too.

Last Friday Stephenson breakfasted with me and we went over the whole thing. To my surprise and delight I found he was very much interested and also that his arrangements are such that after he has finished his Davis — it is practically done now — he can make arrangements to do the Aldrich biography.

Thereupon I telephoned — and wrote — Mrs. Rockefeller who, seemingly, was delighted. I particularly urged upon her that it is indispensable — a first condition — that Stephenson be given a free hand *absolutely*; that they must be extremely generous — no bargaining, etc., etc.; and that they ought to place the whole matter entirely in his hands, even including the publisher.

To all of this she seemed to heartily concur. I also told her that I would write you at once. May I suggest that, if you are sufficiently interested, you drop her a line to the effect that she ought not miss the chance to get Stephenson while he is in the mood; and also back me up in my statement to her that she should give him utmost liberty of action and be more than generous in all financial arrangements?

You now know me well enough to understand that I am either interested or not interested in any given matter; and I am very much interested in having this period treated thoroughly and truthfully. Since both of us think that Stephenson is just the man for the job, I feel strongly that he should be set to work with entire freedom of mind and with unlimited resources.

After my annual address to the New Hampshire State Bar Association at Dartmouth next Wednesday, I am coming back here [Beverly Farms?] until July 12 when Mrs. Beveridge, the children and myself sail from Boston for a short and badly needed rest. I shall stay in London only two or three days and then run up to Scotland, the land of my ancestors, for a few days, and after that make a bee line for Switzerland where it is cool and there is sanity, if such a thing remains in Europe. I do not intend to “study” or “investigate” anything whatever, but just loaf and nothing but loaf.

I shall return here with my little son on September 15 in order to have him in school, St. Marks, when it opens, but shall leave Mrs. Beveridge and my daughter with their aunt in Europe for a while longer.

June 22, 1923.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

I was absent when your letter of June 17 came, or I should have replied

more promptly. I am very glad to know that Mr. Stephenson feels as he does. I believe that Mrs. Rockefeller will be well aware that such is my state of mind. I doubt however whether it would be expedient for me to write to her in order to say anything more about the mode in which he should be handled or the degree of freedom that he ought to have, for I spoke of all that so frankly when talking with her that I believe it might seem superfluous to try to give it further emphasis.²²

I sincerely hope that he will start upon the work and be given every opportunity to pursue it successfully. I think he will, as the needs of the undertaking manifest themselves more clearly.

I hope you will have a good voyage and good journeys. I envy you your summer in Switzerland. To me such a summer would be the height of Heaven. I would rather be there than anywhere else, but North Edgecomb [Maine] will do very well for July.²³ I go there for that month, but from August first on shall be here.

April 21, 1924.

DEAR JAMESON :—

I am up to my neck in the Lincoln morass and hope that I won't sink much deeper; but it looks to me as if it is endless or probably leads to the open sea where I shall have a long, hard swim before I reach port.

Is there any one complete edition of Lincoln's works containing all his speeches and letters? If not, what edition is most complete and also most trustworthy?

Do you know what became of Lincoln's letters to his wife, if he wrote any? They would be invaluable.

To my great surprise I have uncovered some new material in Illinois. I will tell you all about it when I see you.

I shall be in Washington on May 8 to go over the Chandler mss.²⁴ and other collections which are waiting for me; and, of course, the first thing I shall do when I get there will be to look you up, at which time I will tell you all about what I have found as well as unburden my troubles upon you.

May 2, 1924.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

The best I can say, in answer to your letter of April 21 (I have been out of town somewhat), is that *The Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1906-1907, 12 vols.) enlarged from the two-volume edition of 1894 prepared by Nicolay and Hay, purports from its title to be complete, and is no doubt trustworthy, but I should not be able to certify that it contains all

²² "I think you are quite right about writing Mrs. Rockefeller further—you are always prudent, always wise." Beveridge to Jameson, June 26, 1923, Jameson Papers.

²³ "How I wish you were sailing with me and could spend with me, those few weeks of blessed relief in Switzerland! Be very sure, dear friend, that while I am there I shall think of you often and have you always in my heart." Beveridge to Jameson, June 26, 1923, *ibid.*

²⁴ Probably the Zachariah Chandler Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

his speeches and letters. I do not believe, however, that there is anything else that is more complete. As for Lincoln's letters to his wife, I should suppose that, if any survive, they are in the possession of Mr. Robert Lincoln, in the collection turned over by him to the Library of Congress, but I do not know.²⁵

I shall certainly be very glad to see you when you come to Washington. If you are going to be here long enough, I should like to secure an opportunity for a talk with you for Professor George H. Haynes of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, who has been spending the winter here in Washington, preparing what I think will be a good historical work on the U. S. Senate.²⁶

May 5, 1924.

DEAR JAMESON:—

Thanks for your good letter of May 2. All right, I'll get and use as a basis of my work, those twelve volumes. However I am sure that it is not complete and that no one edition or all put together, are complete — unpublished Lincoln letters are turning up all the time.

I shall be in Washington Wednesday afternoon and all day Thursday, May 7 and 8; and the first thing Thursday morning I shall call upon you. I am coming down there almost exclusively for the purpose of going over the Chandler mss. about which I will tell you when I see you.

Professor [Arthur C.] Cole tells me that the Bates Diary is in the possession of Miss Helen Nicolay. I should like very much to see that while I am there, and hope you will put in a good word for me in advance. I think Miss Nicolay generously allowed Cole to take that Diary to Urbana while he was preparing the third volume of the Centennial History of Illinois.²⁷

I am just back from Kentucky where I went over a part of the "Lincoln country" in that State and also attended the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which was interesting and important. Some of those young fellows are doing notable work along lines that will be helpful to me.

I will tell you about Hodgenville, Sinking Spring farm, Knobbe Creek farm, etc., when we are together.

Certainly, dear friend, I will block out an hour for your friend Haynes sometime Thursday. I am afraid, however, that I shall be on the jump every moment of the time while I am there since I leave at 9:20 Friday morning.

P. s. Do be ready to tell me what is the best, most up-to-date, scholarly and trustworthy account of the Mexican War.²⁸

I have an impression rather strong, albeit somewhat vague, that the "slave

²⁵ With the opening of the Lincoln Papers in the Library of Congress in the summer of 1947 it was found that there were no family papers in the collection.

²⁶ George H. Haynes, *The Senate of the United States, Its History and Practice*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1938). Numerous letters in the Jameson Papers, written a decade later, relate to the financing of these volumes.

²⁷ Howard K. Beale (ed.), *The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1930, IV (Washington, 1933).

²⁸ On May 19, 1924, Jameson recommended Justin H. Smith, *The War With Mexico*, 2 vols. (New York, 1919), and an early work by the same author, *The Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1911).

power" had a good deal less to do with that conflict than we have been told. However you will set me right upon that, as you will upon everything.

I will tell you in advance that I am going to annoy you to distraction while I am on this Lincoln job which, as I wrote you, is going to take me a long time to do.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,

October 8, 1924.

DEAR JAMESON :—

I have got no rest this summer but did get a start on the Lincoln — no more than a start, however. Still, by toiling night and day, I have finished the first rough, crude draft of chapters one to three inclusive. So won't you please do me the very great favor of glancing through them for me? If so, I will send the mss. to you the end of next week.

You can take your time about it because I am compelled to get into this annoying campaign; and won't return here until about the middle of November.²⁹

You really must do this for me, dear Jameson, because you are partly — *very largely* — responsible for my keeping at this job. But for your encouragement and the bucking up which [Edward] C[h]anning and [Worthington C.] Ford gave me, I really believe I should have thrown up the sponge. It is an awful task. So you have brought this on yourself, best of friends.

I know how very busy you are and hesitate to ask you; but I simply feel I must. I have not the courage to go on without your approval. So do write me that you will do this for me, and believe me, with confidence and admiration, always,

October 10, 1924.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

I have your letter of October 8. Yes, I will do what you ask, though I warn you beforehand, without a trace of exaggeration or false modesty, that I know singularly little about Lincoln, and least of all about his early days.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,

October 21, 1924.

DEAR JAMESON :—

Here are the first three chapters. I have purposely over annotated them for two reasons: first, this is the controverted period which the remnants of the Mid-Victorians have tried and are still trying to Tarbellize³⁰ and, second, I wish to inspire in the readers a feeling of confidence right at the start so that

²⁹ For an account of Beveridge's part in the campaign of 1924, see Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 538-41.

³⁰ To this time Ida M. Tarbell had published *The Early Life of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1896); *The Life of Abraham Lincoln*, 2 vols. (New York, 1900); *He Knew Lincoln* (New York, 1907); *Father Abraham* (New York, 1909); *In Lincoln's Chair* (New York, 1920); and *Boy Scouts' Life of Lincoln* (New York, 1921). Subsequently she published *In the Footsteps of the Lincolns* (New York, 1924), and *A Reporter for Lincoln* (New York, 1927).

they will be inclined to believe what I say in the more important parts that follow.

Also my idea is to mass a large number of small facts so that the meaning of the big truth back of them will be apparent without preaching; and also to let these facts themselves present character.

It is awfully good of you to do this for me, dear Jameson, and I want you to know that I appreciate it.

I have got to run and jump on the train to get into this campaign. So farewell for a month.

December 13, 1924.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

This is in reply to your letter of December 8.³¹ I shall be at the Jefferson, in Richmond, from December 27 to December 30, and shall be very glad to see you.

A great press of work, and some illness in the family, has delayed me in reading the chapters you sent. Now however I have finished reading them, and I send them back to you herewith, by express, with many thanks for the opportunity of reading them.

I have never been able to persuade you to take literally my protestations that I know extremely little about Lincoln. The fact will in the end become apparent to you. Anyhow, I have not found myself competent to make, as perhaps you expected, a lot of suggestions of detail. The general observation that I should most like to make is that the narrative improves greatly as it goes on, the third chapter making a good advance on the second and the second being considerably more attractive than the first. As to the first, I think I see your dilemma, alluded to in your letter. Foot-notes are more distinctly called for than they will be in later chapters, and you have, in your remarkable scent for materials, brought together a multitude of evidences that illuminate your story. I get from it, ultimately, a more vivid sense than I have ever had before of the nature of the life that Lincoln led in his early days, but if it were possible for this to be achieved with less of reference and quotation and more of the air of a freerunning narrative than has seemed to be possible in the first writing of this chapter I., it would be a gain.

As these three chapters stand, however, they will be highly and deservedly admired. They give us the real Lincoln, of his young days, photographed again and again in his natural scenery.

At a few places, I have made little marks of correction, but I presume that this is superfluous, the errors being ordinary errors of stenographers, sure to be corrected in any final revision. I have however ventured to make three other suggestions:

1. In chapter I., page 2, note 1, I think I should omit the last paragraph. What is said is not more true of 1809 than of 1808 or 1810 or other years, and

³¹ On December 8, 1924, Beveridge had written to ask at what hotel Jameson was to stay for the December meeting of the American Historical Association in Richmond, as he wished to be in the same one.

1809 has no special significance in the long and productive lives of Goethe and Scott.

2. In Chapter II., page 63, line 4, it is not strictly correct to speak of John Quincy Adams as the Whig candidate. His supporters called themselves the National Republicans. The Whig name did not come into vogue, as a name of a political party, till some years later, and was not composed of just the same materials as the National Republicans.

3. In chapter III., page 40, lines 5 to 7, I should choose some other scriptural quotation in place of the one that you have used. What is abhorrent to the mind of 1924 in the theology of 1834 is not the thought of resignation to the Divine will, which is approved now, as much as then, as a part of Christian doctrine, and indeed is widely approved far outside of Christianity. What is most strongly disapproved in the theology of ninety years ago is, I should say, the confident belief in a God of vengeance, an ancient tribal god, the vertebrate Jehovah, a jealous martinet that delighted in the inflicting of punishment. Would it not accord better with the rest of what you are saying to write "Among preachers and their flocks it was the period of a jealous God, delighting in the inflicting of punishment"?

With many thanks for the pleasure I have had in the "private view,"

December 22, 1924.

DEAR JAMESON:—

Thank you very much indeed, for your kindness in having taken the time to go over the mss. of my first three Lincoln chapters. I appreciate this very keenly because I realize how hard pressed you are for time. Indeed, I would not have troubled you with the matter but for the fact that I could not go on without your approval and suggestion.

Your suggestions are valuable and all will be adopted. Of course the use of the word "Whig" at the point mentioned, was a hasty error which I already had made note of. You are "right as rain" about the scriptural quotation. I felt that that did not express the religiosity of those times. What you say hits if off exactly and I shall adopt it — in fact I am going to steal from you the sentence in quotation and adopt it as my own.

It will be nothing short of joy to me to see you at Richmond; and, as I wrote you, I am going to ask that you let me have a little of your time to talk over with you some of my problems.

I do not want to bore you by repetition or otherwise, but I must again say that the task grows harder all the time. I have just returned from Springfield, Illinois, where I told you I was going to examine the newspapers from 1834 to 1849 inclusive. I am slowly coming to the conclusion that the Lincoln job has never really been done — I mean thoroughly and systematically done without prejudice one way or the other.

January 17, 1925.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

Those classical books of Frederic[k] Law Olmsted of which I spoke to you at Richmond, are three: "A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States, with Re-

marks on their Economy" (1856); "A Journey through Texas or a Saddle Trip on the Southwestern Frontier" (1857); "A Journey in the Back Country" (1860). They were consolidated in a book called "A Cotton Kingdom" (1861), but that is a condensation, and it is much better to read the originals, which have to the period of the Civil War and the subsequent upturning of southern society the same relation which Arthur Young's *Travels in France* bear to the French Revolution and its rural and social consequences. There has lately been published an excellent monograph on Olmsted, which may well be read in connection with his books. It is entitled *Frederic[k] Law Olmsted: a Critic of the Old South* (Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore).

Perhaps I mentioned to you, apropos of plantation accounts, that Professor John S. Bassett, of Smith College, has lately been specializing in that field, industriously collecting what records of the sort he could, and printing some of them in the series of *Smith College Studies*,³² which he and [Sidney B.] Fay edit. . . .

January 31, 1925.

DEAR JAMESON:

Thank you for your good letter of January 17. I shall go after the books of which you give me the titles. I am accumulating a lot of data, much of it source stuff, on the subject, and I hope to be able to write something at least tinged with truth about Southern society in the decade before the war.

I am just getting out from under the thousands of pages of the eight volumes of Journals of the House of Representatives while Lincoln was a member of the Legislature, and the vague feeling of which I told you at Richmond is now becoming stronger, that this part of his life — and a vital part it is — has never been done thoroughly, or even done at all.

When I finish the first rough draft of chapter 4, I am going to send it to you, and I will tell you now, dear Jameson, that you have just simply got to read it for me. If this wilderness don't become thinner pretty soon, and my way clearer, you may expect to find me in an institution for the demented before I am half way through. So give me absent treatment.

I was awfully sorry not to be able to see you at Washington, for I wanted so much to tell you my troubles and get the benefit of your calm and unerring judgment.

March 30, 1925.

DEAR JAMESON:—

I am sending you under separate cover, chapters four and five which take Lincoln through the Legislature and about which I told you at Richmond and have written you two or three times. As you will observe, these vital years never have been treated at all — a fact which, when I discovered it, well-nigh paralyzed me with astonishment.

³² John S. Bassett (ed.), *The Westover Journal of John A. Selden, Esqr., 1858-1862*, *Smith College Studies in History* (Northampton), VI, No. 4 (July, 1921). John S. Bassett, *The Southern Plantation Overseer as Revealed in His Letters* (Northampton, 1925), appeared as a volume in the *Smith College Fiftieth Anniversary Publications*.

The chapters are very long, but I cannot find how I can condense them more and wish your suggestions on that point. I have written them over and over again and struck out at least five times as much as remains. At least give me your judgement.

Chapter six, which deals with the period when Lincoln flunked the wedding, went crazy, wanted to fight the Shields duel, etc., etc., is nearly finished, and I hope to get it ready to mimeograph and in shape to send to you within four or five weeks.

Tomorrow I go to Chicago where there is a large collection of letters written from and in the South during the four or five years preceding the outbreak of the Civil War. Then, after I get through with that, I go to Springfield to inspect the newspaper files from 1848 to 1860, inclusive. By keeping at it all of each day and a large part of each night, I hope to be able to do this job by the middle or end of April. Indeed, I am planning to be back here [Indianapolis?] April 15.

So if you have the time and patience, won't you please go through these chapters and return them to me with your suggestions and criticisms. I am enclosing stamps for the return of the mss.

P. s. Please don't let this mss. out of your own hands; and, of course, say nothing about any statement made since all are subject to change.

May 4, 1925.

DEAR JAMESON :—

Under separate cover, registered mail, I am sending you chapter six.

You will observe that a good deal of it has not been done heretofore and that much of it that has been done, has not been truthfully told.

There is plenty of movement, "human interest," color and all that sort of thing in it—almost too much in fact; but the pigments are chiefly yellow and green with a faint dash of crimson and, alas, as yet, no purple or gold.

I have had from one or two of our friends cheering and helpful comment about chapters four and five; but I am waiting with suspense the receipt of your opinion.

P. s. Please keep in mind my suggestion that you do not let this mss. get out of your own hands.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.

December 5, 1925.

DEAR JAMESON :

I am wondering whether you have had time to look over the mss. of chapters Four and Five of my Lincoln? ³³

I have finished the other six chapters of Volume One and am particularly anxious for you to examine them. I have also completed the first chapter of Volume Two, which chapter I entitled "Foundations of Conflict—the

³³ The brief notes exchanged in 1925 relate to the shipping of chapters to and from Jameson. On December 7, 1925, Jameson responded to this letter: "Not guilty! I sent back your fourth and fifth chapters June 23, by express, with such few comments as I found it possible to make." No letter of June 23 has been located.

Southern Point of View"; and I positively must have your judgment on it. I shall not burden you now by sending this mss., but I hope to see you at the meeting of the Association and talk with you about the whole matter.

At any rate, do let me hear from you.

P. S. Oh yes, I suppose, of course, that you will be at Mr. [Clarence W.] Bowen's dinner to the officers of the Association in New York, December 16.³⁴ If so, I shall lay hold of you on that occasion; for be very sure, dear friend, you cannot escape me — no, not if I have to call out the Police Department, the Army and Navy and supplement all their futile efforts by the gallant, brave and "sleuthful" host that is so effectively enforcing the prohibition law.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.
December 18, 1925.

DEAR JAMESON:

Under separate cover, I am sending you the last four chapters of Volume One. I know very well how busy you are; but though the Heavens fall and the universe crashes into little bits, you must find time to glance through these pages.

Next Monday or Tuesday I shall send you Chapter One of Volume Two. I particularly want your judgment on that and will write you a separate letter when I send it. Also I wish you would give a little extra attention to Chapter Seven of Volume One, especially as it has to do with the Mexican War. As you will observe, I have depended upon [Justin H.] Smith, [George L.] Rives, Channing, and, to a lesser extent, on Stephenson;³⁵ but I find only one or two of our people who still cling to the ancient Whig myth about that conflict. The remainder accept the modern point of view; and Bassett made me very happy the other night when he said that he did not know anybody now who adheres to the ancient legend.

It was a joy to see you the other night and my only regret was that I did not have a chance to have a talk with you. However, I can repair that on our way to Ann Arbor or after we get there.³⁶

December 23, 1925.

MY DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE: . . .

I have duly received your Christmas present (or loan) of chapters of manuscript but, as children are instructed to do, I have felt obliged to leave it unopened until Christmas day — at the earliest. You will not suppose that in my business the Christmas trade is very active, but it is a fact that the last days of December are days of much pressure each year. When however I can get at the chapters, I am sure to have much enjoyment in them.

³⁴ Clarence W. Bowen served as treasurer of the American Historical Association from 1884 to 1917.

³⁵ George L. Rives was the author of *The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848* (New York, 1913); Nathaniel W. Stephenson, of *Texas and the Mexican War* (New Haven, 1921); Edward Channing's *A History of the United States*, V (New York, 1921), contained his treatment of the Mexican War.

³⁶ The annual meeting of the Association was to be held in Ann Arbor, December 28-30, 1926.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.

January 15, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON :

At last I have finished the first two chapters of Volume Two; and under separate cover am sending them to you. As I told you, I regard these two chapters as the heart of the whole biography of four or five volumes — without them everything that follows is meaningless — just a series of unexplained and unrelated, albeit dramatic events with no sense in them.

But it seems to me that the facts given in these two chapters makes clear the significance of the remainder of the drama.

Although these particular chapters have been rewritten many times and although I have spent several weeks cutting to the bone Chapter One, it is still at least twenty pages too long. So in addition to your critical judgment on both chapters, won't you do me the kindness of noting on the margin such parts, if any, as you think can be omitted — & *write* me.

With reference to the abolition charge of misceg[e]nation: I have been greatly troubled as to how much of that to put in; but after thinking it over again and again and after consulting Channing and Ford and others up here, I have made up my mind to follow their counsel and "face the music," even to the abolition charge of the impurity of the Southern homes.

I know, dear Jameson, how pressed for time you are and I appreciate the sacrifice you are making to do me the great favor of reading my mss; but so much do I depend upon your opinion that I would be under additional obligation if you would give particular attention to these two chapters — there is, of course, no hurry, and when you are through with the mss., send it to me at 4164 Washington Boulevard, Indianapolis. I shall reach there not later than January 24. I am starting for home Saturday, but have to stop in New York for three or four days. . . .³⁷

February 23, 1926.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

Herewith I send, by express, your chapters VII., VIII., IX., and X. With this I enclose a few sheets of small comments. Very small, I call them distinctly small beer, and I am rather ashamed to send them along, most of them being things that you or your secretary or your proof-reader might readily catch before these mimeographed sheets are put into a text for the printer. However, if I am asked to find fault, and have no large faults to find, I must e'en find small ones.

I have had great pleasure in reading the chapters and great admiration for their combination of solid construction with effective presentation. You show the man, in a multitude of phases, and you show him along with the background and environment that are necessary for explaining him, though they

³⁷ The final paragraph of the letter, here omitted, indicates that Beveridge had begun his labors for the endowment fund of the Association by interviews with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Charles M. Schwab. He had become a member of the Council and chairman of the Committee on Endowment in the preceding December. He was also a member of the Finance Committee of the Council.

alone can not explain him. If I did anything to encourage you to go forward with your plan of a Life of Lincoln, as you say I did, I am distinctly unrepentant up to the present time. . . .

p. s. — I have told Bassett what you said about Henry Ford.³⁸

Small Comments on Chapter VII.

P. 25, ll. 5-7. There was no Department of Justice at that time, nor till 1870. I suppose the office of the Attorney General is meant. By the front of the present Treasury building most people would perhaps understand the north end, where, as I suppose you are right in saying, the State Department building then stood.

P. 26, note 8, last line. I suppose this is J[ohn] W. Forney, not S. W.

P. 27, line 1. Royall, not Royal. An old lady whom I used to know, Miss Sarah Porter,³⁹ a person of some eccentricities, some of them not unlike those of Mrs. [Anne] Royall, wrote an entertaining book about her, but I do not know that you would find in it anything respecting Lincoln, though much respecting Washington in those days.

Line 18. J. A. Dix, not A. J. If you have not seen the *Life and Letters of Senator John Fairchild*, recently but rather obscurely published, you might find something useful in it.

Line 22. [Roger B.] Taney, not Tawny; and George Bancroft was Secretary of the Navy, not of War.⁴⁰ Commodore [Stephen] Decatur having died a generation before, to mention his house may mislead the unwary.

P. 32, line 21. Robert M. T. Hunter, not Robert T. M.

Pp. 35 to 46. Could in my judgment be profitably reduced. At any rate I should think foot-notes could be retrenched or dispensed with when the substance of the text has rather the nature of a background than of narrative respecting Lincoln and requiring to be buttressed by others.

P. 35, line 8. Zachary, not Zachariah.

P. 36, line 13. On the contrary, John Quincy Adams, in the Senate of 1803-1804, warmly approved the acquisition of Louisiana.

P. 36, note 4. I doubt if it can be said that Spanish and Mexican archives were carefully explored by Rives, although they certainly were by Smith.

P. 38, line 9. Zacatecas, not Zaceteas.

P. 39, line 25. The same. Also, the use of "avow" in this place and in many subsequent passages, appears to me incorrect. Unless I am mistaken, "avow" is properly used only in cases where the speaker declares, generally in a defensive spirit, his own sentiments or motives. Declarations as to others are not avowals.

P. 50, line 23. The same remark.

Line 29. 1819 not 1816.

³⁸ Probably a reference to talk of enlisting Henry Ford's interest in the endowment.

³⁹ Sarah H. Porter, *The Life and Times of Anne Royall* (Cedar Rapids, 1909).

⁴⁰ See Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, 561-62, 584-85, for an account of Beveridge's change of attitude toward Chief Justice Roger B. Taney. George Bancroft was Secretary of the Navy but eighteen months, from March, 1845, to September, 1846.

P. 56, line 11. Jameson, not Jamieson.

Small Comments on Chapter VIII.

P. 1. I should think that the episode about John Quincy Adams might be abbreviated, but on the other hand something additional might be found about Lincoln in connection with it, or in connection with the session, in H[enry] W. Hilliard's *Politics and Pen Pictures* (New York, 1892).

P. 2, note 3, line 8. Faneuil, not Fanuel.

P. 7, line 28. Zachary, not Zachariah.

P. 10, note 1, last line. [Elihu] Burritt, not Burrett.

P. 11. It would be more exact to say that those who came into the Free Soil party from the Democratic party, in New York, came usually from that faction of the Democrats known as the Barn-burners.

Last line of text on that page, and line 5 on p. 12, will everyone know what is meant by locofocos?

P. 11, note 4, line 3. [Horace] Greeley, not Greely.

P. 17, note 2. [William] Schouler, not Scouler.

P. 21, line 22. "Avowed," see a previous note.

P. 26, line 23. Ditto.

Pp. 33 and 34, might perhaps be shortened.

P. 34, last line but one, Faneuil.

P. 35, line 15. Senator George F. Hoar was not the son of Judge E. Rockwell Hoar, but his brother. Both were sons of Samuel Hoar.

P. 40, line 11. Country should I suppose be county.

P. 41, note 1, line 4. Some word is omitted.

P. 49, lines 4 to 6. My notes from judicial cases in Kentucky reports leave on my mind no doubts that, aside from genuine cases of re-capture of fugitive slaves, kidnappings of free negroes also occurred, under the pretences of legal recapture.

P. 51-1/2, note 1. It is probable that the original manuscript of a bill, showing any amendments that were made, is still to be found in the House files, badly kept as they are.

I should think that pages 51-1/3 and 51-2/3 could be shortened.

Small Comments on Chapter IX.⁴¹

P. 3, line 20. McGuffey should be [William Holmes?] McGuffey.

Line 24. There is a great tendency of late to use "tremendous" for anything of large extent, but I believe it is better to keep it closer to its literal meaning, of not only large but terrible or formidable.

P. 16, line 14. Sir Tom Moore should be Sir John Moore.

P. 43, line 1. "Avows," see previous comments on this particular.

P. 67, line 13. Same remark.

Small Comments on Chapter X.

P. 5, note 2. To record the fact that the "picayune" and the "bit" actually

⁴¹ Jameson on February 11, 1926, had written that he admired especially Chapter IX.

were coins, as were those you have first mentioned, I think I should say "the picayune or Spanish half-real of 6-1/4 cents (not 6-1/2)," "the bit or real of 12-1/2 cents." Most people are now too young to remember that reals and half-reals were then in considerable circulation. Even in my boyhood they occasionally turned up.

P. 7, line 8. The young farmer is called "William M. Dawson," while in note 1 the name is given as "Dorman."

P. 10. The last three lines and the three lines preceding might probably be consolidated.

P. 11, last line. "Whom" has been printed for who.

P. 19, in the last line of the second paragraph of quotation, some word seems to have been omitted.

P. 35, line 22. For "he," it would be clearer to substitute Lincoln.

P. 38, note 1. Do you mean that the letter was known when Lincoln's works were edited and was intentionally omitted? If so, all right, but if the letter is one that has since been discovered the phrase might seem a needless reflection on the editor of that collection.

P. 39, line 6. I should think the last word must have been "has" instead of had.

P. 42, note 1. I should think this note could be much shortened. The extent of the crash in 1857 is, for all general purposes, pretty well known, and for the specific purpose of establishing what is said in your main text much of this note will seem not to have been necessary.

P. 56, line 5 from the bottom. "A struggle," etc., something seems here to have been omitted.

I add one general remark. Men frequently use mss. or MSS. for the adjective or for the singular of the noun, but properly ms. is the abbreviation of the singular noun or the adjective, and mss. of the plural noun.

March 24, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON :—

Are you dead entirely? Please don't forget to send me that book about the original of the Declaration.⁴² Also don't forget the first two chapters of volume two.

As I think I wrote you, I am still struggling through the choppy waters of the Missouri Compromise repeal. Our "popular" histories as to that vital transaction seem to have been written exclusively from the account given in [Salmon P.] Chase and [Charles] Sumner's "Appeal to the People" in which, as you know, there was some truth but a great deal more falsehood.

To an amateur like myself, the question constantly thrusts itself into my face whether it is the business of the biographer — or historian — to write the truth or to perpetuate propaganda.

⁴² "Like the weak character I am, I have yielded to our Philadelphia friends, and shall make a talk there on June 2 at the opening of their sesqui-centennial celebration. My subject is the sources of the Declaration of Independence." Beveridge to Jameson, March 6, 1926, Jameson Papers.

March 30, 1926.

MY DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

No sir, I am very far from dead. It has to be admitted that I have not yet read the first two chapters of your second volume, but I have had for a long time to occupy myself, during every hour that I could work, with certain publications and other concerns of the Carnegie Institution, in whose historical affairs there has been of late a great congestion. I hope to have the pleasure soon.

As to the two volumes of *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, ed. [Edmund C.] Burnett, I long since requested the appropriate officers of the Carnegie Institution, up at Sixteenth and P streets, to send them to you, and I have from them a letter of March 11, saying that they had promptly sent them to you. I am distressed that you have not received them. I suppose they were addressed simply "Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, Indianapolis, Indiana," and if the postmaster at Indianapolis (no doubt a republican) does not know where Hon. Albert J. Beveridge lives, your friend [Harry S.] New can easily find a more intelligent substitute for him!⁴³ If however the books can not be found, please let me know, and if there is an immediate need, and a difficulty of waiting while the volumes are traced, I will mention that the Indiana State Library has all the publications of the Carnegie Institution, including these.

May 24, 1926.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE :

I am now at last able to send back to you Chapters I. and II. of your second volume, with some comments. I have found them exceedingly interesting and valuable, though I question whether so many pages in which Lincoln hardly appears at all will not seem to make too long a digression, though of course it is necessary that these matters should be treated at some length in order to explain Lincoln's national career, and this is the appropriate point at which to do this.

Hitherto my comments on your chapters have mostly been confined to quite small things. After reading the first of these two chapters, however, I found myself moved to some dissent on much larger grounds. You set out to lay the scene for Lincoln's slavery debates and subsequent political career by exhibiting the state of the contest respecting slavery as it appeared to slaveholders and to abolitionists, impartially, and the procedure is, ostensibly and by intention, that of quoting both equally, but the impression which the text makes on my mind is that you sympathize much more with the Southern opinions on the subject than with any others. I should make general comments on two matters: First, your apparent emphasis on the agreeable side of slavery and on the merits of Southern society, and secondly, your sympathy with the notion that but for the abolitionists slavery would have been ameliorated by the slaveholding legislatures until it disappeared.

⁴³ Harry S. New, political enemy of Beveridge since his loss of the Republican nomination for senator to the latter in 1922, was at this time postmaster general, an office which he held from 1923 until 1927.

In your picture of Southern ante bellum society, you rely greatly on the word of travellers. I think that this is an insecure reliance in respect to such matters. There have been a few travellers, such as Arthur Young and F. L. Olmsted, who, intent on disinterested social observation, go everywhere, see all sorts of places, and strike an average that one can rely upon. Olmsted was a prince of observers, and he went through the back country as well as the seaboard slave states, and observed the small slaveholders and the non-slaveholders quite as much as the less numerous great planters; but your ordinary traveller goes where he has letters of introduction, and sees the show places, and if he is a writer, writes of that which gives a glow to the reader rather than that which is drab and usual. If we had no statistical facts respecting Southern society, and were forced to base our judgments on the statements of travellers, no one could complain of us, but, on the contrary, there are plenty of available facts that discount the praises of many of your travellers. The statistics, for instance, are harder to study, but they are more solid.

Magazine writers of recent years have pleased their readers by depicting the social life of the South, even in the colonial period, as one of magnificence or splendor. In reality, it was characterized by a rude plenty, but on the whole the South was a backward region. Stately mansions figure in every novel. How many were there? The chief work on the historic homes of Maryland figures about twenty handsome houses, of a period in which there were forty quite as good in Massachusetts, but when a more ambitious Virginian writer publishes a book showing photographs of two hundred plantation houses in that state, one perceives that, in that much larger state, there were thirty or forty that would have been called handsome in the Massachusetts of the same period, and the rest were what we would have called ordinary farmhouses. So of all sorts of particulars. Standards of cleanliness in Southern houses were, as they still are, distinctly lower than those of Northern houses. They abounded in flies. Material comforts were fewer. A writer in 1865 well said that the Northerner's idea of comfort rested in material appliances, the Southerner's in personal service. As to the development of the Southern intellect, we are not left to the observations of travellers, but can see for ourselves what their literary productions in print were. They were thin and provincial. It is always replied that a great many cultivated people have no desire to publish anything. That is true, but there are always some who write and publish, and we can compare the product of those who did so in the South with those who did so in the North or in any European country of that time. It was a backward country. Your citations from travellers would not give anyone the notion that white illiteracy stood enormously high, nor that most of your men of the aristocratic class chewed tobacco and drank too much whisky.

Much depends on numbers. How numerous was the higher planting class? A few thousands. It is true that their ascendancy was greater than their numbers would indicate. This was due to the organization of society, no doubt, but I think a good deal of it was also due to a cause which I have never seen set

forth in print, but which, if there is anything in it, is important for one of the crucial questions in respect to the coming struggle, how did it happen that the non-slaveholding whites, who constituted the large majority of the Southern population, followed with such enthusiasm the lead of the planting aristocracy in a cause which, on the whole, was very much less in the interest of the former than of the latter? A great deal of that motion, I believe, was due to the extraordinary infatuation of the Southern whites for public speaking (let me tell you some time the story of Raleigh Colston). They were besotted in their admiration for eloquence. I think, by the way, that that is a mark of a backward population. People who can not read and write are carried away by the highfaluten talk of such speakers as the old-time ante bellum orators. Voters of more education and intelligence, accustomed to get their political knowledge from the printed page, and to think it over, are not so easily influenced to act contrary to their own interests by oratorical bunk. This however is a digression, though the solidity of the South in 1861 does need examination.

As to the second point, that but for the outcry of the abolitionists the South was in a fair way to get rid of slavery by its own efforts, that was always a good talking point, but the facts seem to me to give it no support. In the twenty years after the Revolution, respectable minorities in the Virginia and Maryland legislatures could be got to vote for general emancipation, but those minorities steadily diminished, and after the big beginnings of cotton culture one hears nothing more of them — nor before that, in any of the states farther South. The debates of 1830-1832, in Virginia, are sometimes said to show such tendencies, but the votes do not. Was not the price of slaves steadily rising till 1860? How is it to be imagined, against such evidences as that, that the Southern legislatures were likely to wipe out two billions of Southern property? But I had better be returning to my real trade of small points. They refer to marks on the edge of the pages mentioned.

P. 3. Not many ever went to Oxford and Cambridge.

P. 7. I do not think that mountain men of the South, as a rule, cared more for the nation than for the state, or cared anything about the freedom of the blacks. They were opposed to the planting aristocracy of the lowlands, which was ruling the state in its own interest, and therefore they took sides against it, and were thought to be Union men. Their ignorance was very deep. As late as 1883 my cousins found in western North Carolina not a few persons who had never heard of Washington or of England, and the first negro who came up into that valley was immediately shot as an intruder.

P. 10. Lady Emmeline Stuart-Wortley (not Lady Emmeline Wortly). Is her book really a valuable source?⁴⁴

P. 15. It may be that most Presbyterian ministers in Mississippi were graduates of Princeton, but is it not also true that nearly all ministers in Mississippi were Baptists and Methodists of inferior education? I suppose

⁴⁴Lady Emmeline C. E. Stuart-Wortley, *Travels in the United States during 1849 and 1850* (London, 1851).

that Mississippi and Alabama to this day are more than 90 per cent. of those two denominations.

Just below, why were the daughters of planters sent North for education? Plainly, because no good education was to be had in the South. But of course all but a small minority of planters' daughters were *not* sent North for education. [Joseph H.] Ingraham⁴⁵ may say that the smallest town had a private school, but I should not wish to say it myself; and, by the way, in a great many places you will seem to be saying things on your own authority when you are merely giving the opinions of your informants.

P. 18. The importation of slaves became illegal in 1808, but it did not cease. Thousands were brought in illegally all the way down to 1861.

P. 19. On the alleged gradual increase of Southern sentiment for emancipation I have already spoken, meaning however general or legislative action, which is here implied. Individual manumissions tended to increase, but were much checked by the laws.

P. 20. If [William G.] Simms was sufficiently right to be worth quoting, how account for the insurrections of Gabriel and Denmark Vesey, at much earlier dates?⁴⁶

P. 22. But *why* should abolitionists seem to Southerners to represent the Northern attitude toward slavery and the South when the abolitionists were a small minority (as the Liberty Party votes showed) and strongly disapproved of by the majority in the North, a fact easily ascertainable in the South?

P. 31. In this Massachusetts case of 1755, Mark and Phyllis, slaves of Captain John Codman of Charleston, were put to death for poisoning their master, Mark being hanged, and Phyllis burned (though apparently after strangulation) in accordance with the existing law, in Great Britain and in Massachusetts, affixing the penalty for petit treason. I do not remember that any were imprisoned, and believe that Captain Codman had only these two slaves. Anyhow, there is here nothing in the nature of a revolt. The case is fully narrated by my father's old friend A[bner] C. Goodell, in vol. XX., of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society.⁴⁷

P. 37. I think Judge [Joseph H.] Lumpkin's⁴⁸ remark is pure delusion. I see no evidence of any such tendency toward general emancipation in Georgia in the time he refers to. What action of the Georgia legislature gives the slightest support to his statement?

P. 38. I always find myself somewhat irritated by this Southern talk of slavery having been forced upon the South, either by the English or by other slave-traders. If there had been no buyers there would have been no sellers.

⁴⁵ [Joseph H. Ingraham], *The South-West. By a Yankee*, 2 vols. (New York, 1835).

⁴⁶ William Gilmore Simms, with three others, published *Pro-Slavery Argument* (Philadelphia, 1853), which may be the book which Beveridge had quoted. See Thomas W. Higginson, "Denmark Vesey," *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston), VII (June, 1861), 728-44; and "Gabriel's Defeat," *ibid.*, X (September, 1862), 337-45.

⁴⁷ Abner C. Goodell, "The Murder of Captain Codman," *Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings* (Boston), XX (1882-1883), 122-57.

⁴⁸ Joseph H. Lumpkin was chief justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia, 1848-1867.

Are we to suppose that the ship captains brought their cargoes of slaves to ports where they knew they were not wanted, and by threats of bombardment forced the reluctant merchants of Charleston to buy them at a high price? The correspondence of Henry Laurens and other such does not look that way. As to the second point, that most of the blacks had been brought by the ship owners of New England, all the statistical statements that I have ever seen on that subject are taken from one and the same source, a table presented by a Maryland Senator in a debate in the Senate in 1821, and covering about four years.⁴⁹ So far as that table goes, it shows half the importations to have been in English ships, the rest various, among them a considerable number of New England vessels. But as for any general statements, based on the importations during a long period of years, only one person is in possession of the facts, and she has not yet published them.

P. 39. Why quote foreign anti-slavery writers as to emancipation in the North having been due to this one cause, when we know so well, from a great variety of sources, what the reasons were, and that they were various.

P. 48. "Comparatively few slaves wanted to be free." Slaves who had no chance whatever of being free doubtless gave the matter no thought, but in regions like Kentucky and Maryland, where they had a good chance to escape, for some reason many of them did so. The main reason must have been that they preferred to be free. My grandfather told me of a fugitive slave in Boston who, in a group of what was then called Cotton Whigs, was being questioned by them as to his reasons for fleeing. Did he not have a good master? Oh yes, pretty good. Was he not well fed? He was. Did he have to work excessively hard? He did not. Well, on the whole, why should he have run away? "Well," said he, "Gentlemen I believe my position down there is still vacant, if any of you think you would like to take it." In this and in a great many other matters remarks of travellers are far less convincing to my mind than the numerous cases of escaping slaves which I have just been reading in the proof-sheets of our first volume of *Judicial Cases concerning Slavery* — records of what actually happened, "the very form and pressure of the time."⁵⁰

P. 49. The number 154,000 seems incredibly large. Where did they go, for the total negro population of the Middle Atlantic and East North Central States, into which they fled, if anywhere, was 172,000 in 1850, and 195,000 in 1860, according to the censuses?

P. 50. What is here stated as an indisputable fact, is rather shattered by the fact that the largest variety of such ownership was the ownership of widows and children and husbands by free negroes who could not secure the emancipation of these relatives but managed to purchase them.

⁴⁹*Annals of Congress*, 16 Cong., 2 sess., 72-77. See Elizabeth Donnan, *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America*, 4 vols. (Washington, 1930-1935), IV, 506. The material referred to at the end of this paragraph is contained in this volume.

⁵⁰Helen T. Catterall (ed.), *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, 5 vols. (Washington, 1926-1937). Volume I related to England, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

P. 51. I should not say abolition of the slave-trade, but prohibition; and below, all statements of great age of negroes are to be viewed with suspicion, as I could prove from the censuses if it did not take too much space.

P. 52. Statements about the number of murders of laborers elsewhere in the world at that time had not the slightest basis, because there were no statistics that would show the facts.

P. 53. Have such statements any value? How many New Englanders were thus occupied?

P. 54. If this statement were correct, there would not have been so many fugitives.

P. 56. This statement casts light on a point that I have raised above about the desire of the South to free the negroes if only it had been left alone.

P. 62. The falsity of the two statements I have marked is shown perfectly well by many passages in the book of *Judicial Cases concerning Slavery*.

In most of these cases, I have been criticizing statements made by authorities that you use but which may or may not represent your own opinions. In many of them, however, the reader will be apt to think that you are agreeing with your authorities, else you would not quote them. Much difficulty would be avoided if the chapter were greatly reduced. I quite admit that it is necessary to show, not only what the facts were, but what people in the North and people in the South thought them to be, but I am sure that this could be done with sufficient vividness in fewer pages and with fewer quotations. I am afraid that these two chapters will seem to many readers to belong to the "Times" rather than to the "Life" of Lincoln, and to be a longer digression from the current narrative than need be.

Upon chapter II., you will be relieved to know that I have no such array of small criticisms to bother you with. I think however that, in general terms, the chapter makes too much, in proportion, of the doings in Congress, especially in the Senate. These speeches, which you summarize so fully, were of great importance, and had an influence far beyond anything which senatorial speeches now have; but yet I am sure that Lincoln was watching the country also, and that the movements of public opinion in the country might well be brought in, even by abridgment of some of the speeches. In the past ten years there have been several efforts by historical students of the younger set, in books and articles, to show forth what movements of public opinion played around the Nashville Convention and the Debates of 1850. I also think that there ought to be an explicit statement somewhere, early in the chapter, as to what the actual measures were, that were up for consideration. Also, it would be well that the Nashville Convention, first spoken of on p. 23, as if familiar, should be explained.⁵¹

I ought to apologize for the length of this letter, which may prove not to be helpful at all. I have enjoyed reading the chapters. I should still more enjoy reading the next one, which you indicate is on the way. I am obliged

⁵¹ The Nashville Convention, June 3, 1850, was called to recommend withdrawal from the Union should the Congress pass a group of measures opposed by the southern states.

from a desperate fit of the blues. I have just finished chapter four and am plunging into the icy and *unexplored* waters of chapter five.

So when I found that you approved chapter three, I felt stronger, warmer and better prepared to make the dive.

Of course you are right — you always are right — in saying that Lincoln's unworthy speech in Springfield in 1852 is too bulky to go into the appendix. That astonishing performance will have to be printed in full in some other place. Suppose we talk about it when I see you in Washington — unless, indeed, you can do what I have asked you to do so many times, come up here for a week end.

All of your other suggestions are sound and, obviously, good sense. I shall attend to every one of them as you intimate. Mr. Morse (John T. Morse, Jr., Editor of the American Statesman Series) called my attention to the word "avowed."

With reference to Douglas and Lincoln: You will see from chapter four, which I am sending under separate cover, that Lincoln emerges from his chrysalis and makes the first great speech of his life. Chapter four is in reality, a continuation of chapter three — in fact, all of these chapters are a continuation of the other. It must be annoying to you scholars to read a section at a time — each chapter presents scenes of various acts in one great overwhelming and, I might say, over-powering drama.

I am venturing to send this chapter to you on your vacation and notwithstanding the mass of stuff you have on hand, because it connects so intimately with chapter three and because I thought perhaps you might find it of interest to see how I deal with the elements that, when finally amalgamated, made up the Republican party.

Nothing in your letter pleased me more than to know that my dear old friend, Dr. Haynes⁵⁵ of Indianapolis, is your neighbor, and that you have seen him. He is one of the very best men all around I ever have known anywhere. Although he is a preacher, he is a man in whom you and I can take one hundred percent stock. He is open-minded, tolerant, kind, brave — in fact, a *Christian* without any buncombe.

He is one of the most valued members of our Indiana Committee for the endowment fund, and takes a helpful interest. Dr. Haynes has a high and most deserved influence in Indianapolis and among all classes of people. Since my young manhood until this day, I have considered it one of the happiest incidents of my life that I have had his friendship and approval.

Pray give him my love when you see him. . . .

September 20, 1926.

MY DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

I read with real pleasure the third and fourth chapters of your second volume. They are excellent, and I have only one general suggestion to make, namely, I continue to think that the background has been sketched with too much amplitude, and too many details. Throughout the third chapter and

⁵⁵ This was Malthias Loring Haines.

nearly half of the fourth, Lincoln appears little, even less than I think he rightly might if your book was going to be a "Life and Times" rather than a biography, pure and simple. The ordinary reader would, I think, say that in that chapter and a half Douglas is the hero rather than Lincoln, and perhaps he would say that, admitting the politics of the time to be essential toward explaining the rise of Lincoln, your text makes relatively too much of politics in the halls of Congress, as distinguished from those developments of political thought and feeling in the nation at large to which Lincoln's mind was so sensitive (most histories exaggerate, I think, the importance of congressional debates and manoeuvres, it being easier to see and state what goes on there than what goes on in the whole United States). Anyhow, however this all may be, I should venture to advise the reduction of the third chapter and the first part of the fourth.

I can testify that, to one reader, there was a great and immediate gain of interest when, about page 29 of chapter IV., the figure of Lincoln emerges again. Here, I said to myself, we have Beveridge the biographer again, who, in my judgment, is superior to Beveridge the historian. All this is said with perfect consciousness that the history is necessary toward explaining the man; it is merely a question of proportion and scale.

Now to add my usual terminal moraine of small criticisms.

Chapter III., p. 1, line seven of text, I think it is going too far to say that no detail can be omitted.

Page 25, last lines, can we rightly speak of the Democratic party as shrinking to sectional dimensions, when we remember how great a number of adherers it kept all through the Civil War?

Page 40, last paragraph, second line. I think this is perhaps the first time that the term "popular sovereignty" is used. I rather think it should be defined or explained more fully.

Page 44, line 7, "chief protagonist" is tautology. The protagonist in the Greek drama, from which the term comes, was the chief actor. I think you should say either chief advocate or protagonist merely.

P. 48, note 2, J. A. Donaldson should be "A. J. Donelson." Andrew Jackson Donelson was not merely the former private secretary of Jackson, but a nephew of Mrs. Jackson.

Page 68, last line but one, for "Electro" read Alecto, who was one of the Erinyes or Furies.

In chapter IV. I have not found any similar things to note.

I do not send my copies herewith, but wait till I learn whether you would wish me to send them to Beverly Farms or to Indianapolis. . . .

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,
September 21, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON :

Under separate cover, I am sending you chapter five. I have slaughtered regiments, divisions, Army Corps of details and dates; yet I fear there are still too many incidents.

Nevertheless, I cannot see how anybody can understand the sudden growth of the Republican Party and Lincoln's political career without, at least, an outline of the Kansas troubles and the assault on Sumner.

I have spent the whole summer on this one chapter; and I'll be hanged if I can do any better.

So when you get time, do look it over and tell me what to do. Mark on the margin as much as you like.

P. s. I sent another copy of chapter four to you at Washington. Have you yet had time to read it?

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,
September 22, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON:—

Thank you for your good letter of September 20. Your criticisms are, of course, accurate, as they always are. I shall make the necessary corrections.

With reference to the use of the word "Electro": I quote that from Butler's speech as reported in the *Globe*. Might it not be well to show the correction in a foot note?

Your big suggestion as to the scope of the book goes to the heart of my whole theory of biography. I have stated this at some length in an article entitled "The Making of a Book" which will soon be published in the *Saturday Evening Post*.⁵⁶ The last two-thirds of that article is given to a description of the writing of biography and history. Perhaps it may interest you.

My idea is that a biography is a drama; that in this drama many characters appear; that in certain scenes some of these characters are bigger than the hero; that the hero gradually comes to the front and that when the curtain falls, he is holding his center of the stage.

So in my Marshall, Washington and Jefferson come in almost as much as Marshall himself — in many places far more conspicuously than Marshall himself. Also there are several chapters in which Marshall does not come on the stage at all. But in such chapters, the situations are developed which make it necessary for him to appear and which explain what he says and why he says it when he does speak.

I am following the same plan with the Lincoln. To write about Lincoln only — how he looked and acted, what he said, etc., etc. — is, to my mind, a good deal like going to a play in which there are many characters including the mob, but in which only the hero comes upon the stage speaking lines which, without the remainder of the play, are well-nigh senseless.

This is my only apology and excuse for giving so much attention to the Missouri Compromise, the Know Nothings, the temperance movement, Kansas, Sumner, etc., etc. Without any one of these elements, the Republican Party could not possibly have come into being or continued; and if Lincoln would have had any public career at all, it necessarily would have been far different from the career he actually did have.

As to what was going on in the country rather than in Congress: As you

⁵⁶ *Saturday Evening Post* (Philadelphia), CXCIX (October 23, 1926), 14.

know, I was, myself, in the Senate for twelve years and I know from experience that the speeches made there were meant to reflect and influence the opinions of local constituencies. This was true even in small matters; and, on big questions, it was conspicuously so. After all, who knows better what was going on in his part of the country than the man in Congress who becomes an expert in keeping his ear to the ground and wants, above all things, to be re-elected.

But what actually did happen in Congress between 1850 and 1860 accurately registered developments throughout the nation. However, I have made extensive use of newspapers and private letters to show what was in the mind of the people; and to show, too, that what was said in Congress affected the general thought.

I shall be in Washington one of these days and will come around and sit at your feet as Saul sat at the feet of Gamaliel.

Thank you again, dear friend, for your great kindness in taking the time and trouble to go over my bulky mss. I have said to you many times before but I cannot say it too often, that I appreciate the favor you are doing me more highly than I can describe to you in words.

P. s. Send chapters back to me here. On account of the newspaper collection at Worcester and the material in Boston, I shall be here for the remainder of the year.

November 4, 1926.

DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

I am sorry that I was out of town when you so kindly invited me to come to dinner with you and Mark Sullivan. I should have enjoyed the occasion very much. Mr. Sullivan was a classmate of my brother's at Harvard, and I know him little, but should be glad to know him more.

I read with great interest your Chapters Five and Six of Vol. II., but the only serious suggestion I have to offer is to suggest a doubt whether you are right in concluding that, in the conflict in Kansas, the Free State settlers were of no higher grade, in the scale of civilization, than those who came in from Missouri. My impression has been otherwise. My father was a temporary pioneer in Oregon in 1851-1852, when the bulk of the settlers near him were mostly Missourians, and I received from him a strong impression that they were much more backward than those who came from Illinois or such states. I think that it is still held in the state of Washington that the main reason for Oregon's not going ahead faster is "Too Much Missouri." In 1891 I watched a procession of 45,000 Grand Army men, knowing that I should never again have an opportunity to see so many soldiers of the Civil War, and observed that, very plainly, the Missouri contingent was by far the most backward and countrified looking that presented itself. I asked the question a few days ago of a very judicious professor of history who was brought up in Westport, Missouri. He said that the early Missouri settlers in Kansas were strictly frontiersmen, natural born frontiersmen, so to speak, while the Free State settlers in Kansas were persons who had made themselves fron-

tiersmen for the nonce, but up to the time of their emigrating had mostly been dwellers in regions that in 1855 had long since passed the frontier stage — Illinois, Ohio, or New England. This is so natural an estimate that I should rather hesitate to adopt [Wendell?] Phillips's observations made in recent years (Chap. Five, p. 25, note 3). Meanwhile, I agree with the observation in your recent letter, that a fairly full treatment of the Kansas troubles is necessary toward an understanding of the Bloomington speech and of all that followed in Lincoln's life.

As usual, I have a few minor cavils to propound.

P. 20, line 3, I doubt if I should use the term "side-burn" whiskers, which is modern slang by humorous perversion of "Burnside"; and yet, as Burnside came to prominence later, we would hardly say "Burnside whiskers." One might best say simply "side-whiskers." I doubt if they were ministerial at that time. If they seem ministerial now, it is probably because ministers have been more conservative as to the cut of their jibs than other people.

P. 45, last line. I think it is far from being true that *most* preachers had followed [Henry Ward] Beecher's example. What I used to hear in my young days was that far too many ministers ignored the whole controversy, or out of conservatism and love for the Union, were inclined to cry, peace, peace, where there was no peace.⁵⁷

P. 65, line 10. Is it not putting it too strongly to say that never before had any Senator besmirched the good name of a particular state?

P. 69, note 1. My father told me of the extraordinarily severe treatments which [Charles Edouard] Brown-Séguard, the chief neurologist of the time, gave to Sumner in Paris, and in the light of them, I can not think that the allegations that his injuries were not serious deserved to be played up so prominently. I rather think that it was a clear case of great harm.

Your copyist capitalizes *The* in such expressions as The Emigrant Aid Company, and even The Republican party and The Declaration of Independence. I hope to goodness that you are not going to do that in the book. There is a tendency that way lately, and ladies have written to me of The National Society of The Colonial Dames of America, and a university press or two mentions systematically The University of Chicago as if the word "the," as an essential part of the corporate title, became a word of tremendous importance. Why not also Of?

P. 77, line 21. The mention of John C. Fremont as of Georgia may mislead some excellent readers, who will doubt what you later say about the Republican party being sectional, not understanding how unreal was Fremont's connection with that state.

P. 78, note 1. I should think that the second paragraph was a fair case for omission.

Chap. Six, p. 30, line 3. This name should be spelled Breckinridge. John C., the Vice-President, spelled his name that way, though all the rest of his family connections spelled it Breckenridge.

⁵⁷ Henry Ward Beecher's position was that a willingness to compromise with slavery in order to maintain the Union was inconsistent with Christianity.

P. 35. The document prepared by the conference of our three ministers at Ostend (and at Aix-la-Chappelle) is most commonly called the "Ostend Manifesto," and I think that is best; it was really not a circular.

P. 39, line 14. Is it entirely fair to Justice John McLean (not John R.) to leave him with this characterization? Wendell Phillips would say anything when angry, and apparently he was usually angry.⁵⁸

P. 89. It seems not quite correct to say that South Carolina ignored the election as useless; but electors had never been chosen by popular vote. She continued in 1856, as before, to have electors chosen by the legislature. Also, I believe that constitutional purists do not apply the term "electoral college" to the whole body of electors throughout the Union but describe the group of electors from each state as its electoral college.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,
November 13, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON:

Just got back and have your fine letter of November 4. Every one of your suggestions is sound and will be observed. Particularly, will I modify that part of the page about the Border Ruffians since what I said has given you the "impression" that I have said that they were equal to the New England emigrants.

That particular part is quite a tangle. The Kansas Free State which constantly relates the difficulties that took place all the time between the New Englanders and the ordinary emigrants from the North and Northwest, I find was published by two South Carolinians and not by Delahay.⁵⁹ In fact it seems to be pretty clear that the Emigrant Aid Company's men under Robinson irritated the ordinary settlers from Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, etc.⁶⁰ Practically all were for a Free State; but the New Englanders and the men from the Middle West disliked one another almost as much as the New Englanders disliked the Border Ruffians.

However, you hit the nail on the head when you say that the men from the Missouri border counties were "born frontiersmen." I shall make the modifications as you suggest.

One point more; you ask: "Is it not putting it too strongly to say that never before had any Senator besmirched the good name of a particular state?" I think that statement is accurate. Can you recall any other case in our whole history up to the time that Sumner attacked South Carolina where any man in either the Senate or the House ever "besmirched" the good name of any State whatever?

⁵⁸ Of Justice John McLean, Wendell Phillips said that he had "made more pro-slavery law on the bench than all the pro-slavery judges put together." Albert J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1858*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1928), II, 395.

⁵⁹ The newspaper, the *Topeka Kansas Free State*, was at one time declared "a nuisance" by the grand jury at Leocompton. Mark W. Delahay was the publisher of the *Leavenworth Territorial Register* which took the free state side.

⁶⁰ Charles Robinson was the Kansas agent of the New England Emigrant Aid Company.

Let me thank you again, dear Jameson, as I have done so many times for the trouble you take in going over my mss. You saved me from several errors of fact in my *Life of Marshall*, and you have saved me several times in my *Lincoln*. I am no end obliged to you. As you know, I have a real horror in making an error in a statement of fact. Indeed, I feel I have a sort of obsession for accuracy, even as to details. Of course, this makes my work ten-fold harder. But, when I see you at the meeting of the Council, I shall back you into a corner and make you listen to my troubles.

BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.,
December 3, 1926.

DEAR JAMESON: . . .

I am up to my ears and over my head in the *Dred Scott* case. What startling revelations! The John P. Hale mss. show *exactly* the same thing that the [Lyman] Trumbull mss. show.⁶¹ Worse still, [Franklin] Pierce, in his last Annual Message to Congress, December 2, 1856, frankly declared that the Missouri Compromise was "null for unconstitutionality"; and still worse, Francis W. Bird stated with acrid positiveness at the Worcester Disunion Convention, *January 15, 1857*, that the Supreme Court would soon decide the "*Dred Scott* case" just as Taney did "decide" it. So what the Supreme Court would do and did do was known to everybody nearly two months before the decision was handed down.

It is a hard job and a painful one to chop through the thorny brambles of propaganda with which the facts of that famous decision have been covered; and again the eternal question faces me as to whether the dramatic truth shall be told. I shall pin you in a corner at Rochester,⁶² and again exact from you the priceless boon of your clear-headed judgment.

January 13, 1927.

MY DEAR MR. BEVERIDGE:

The youthful Henry Adams's remarkable account of the session of 1860-1861 is printed in the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, vol. XLIII., pp. 656-687.⁶³

About the panic of 1857, however, there must be some misapprehension. I could not remember any special monograph about it when you were speaking, and I can not now find that there is any. Perhaps it was the panic of 1837 that I mentioned, though I don't now see why I should have.

Your latest chapter has not yet arrived here, but doubtless will do so in a few days.

Thank you very much for a very good dinner, and a very pleasant evening, full of interest.

⁶¹ The John P. Hale Manuscripts are in the New Hampshire Historical Society; the Trumbull Manuscripts, in the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

⁶² The annual meeting of the American Historical Association was to be held in Rochester. Many of the letters exchanged between September 22, 1926, and the time of the meeting in December related to the endowment and are here omitted.

⁶³ The title is "The Great Secession Winter of 1860-1861."

4164 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, INDIANAPOLIS
Jan 17, 1927.

DEAR JAMESON :

Thanks for the Adams citation.

Yes, I think it was the 1837 panic — we talked about it two years ago. I can find nothing of recent date on the collapse of '57, but a great deal was written at the time and I have all of that, of course.

How strange that no one ever has made note of the effect of that panic on the fortunes of the Republican party, or even on Buchanan's Lecompton policy! Both were and are obvious and fundamental. I shall point out that fact in my next chapter.

Am tied up here with an infected antrum and won't get to Chicago for a week or two.

Am so glad you enjoyed the dinner and talk. To me, those were golden hours. You never were so entertaining and informing.

I am relieved that you think the absence of comment on Dred Scott by those who wrote Trumbull, Hale et al, shows that "the people" knew little about that decision and cared less.

That fact is the more significant because the preachers and the Republican press ripped and tore so much about it.

The enforced rest here may be a good thing for me — the doctors *scoldingly* say that I'm working too hard — but it [is] irritating; and when I get to Chicago, I'll make up for lost time.

[P. s.] Ive written Chicago that I'll speak at our Endowment Fund banquet there — but no other speeches till I finish vol. II.⁶⁴

⁶⁴In the final letter in this correspondence, that of March 22, 1927, Beveridge said that he was sending Chapter VIII and asked that if it was to be returned after May 1 it be sent to Beverly Farms. On April 27 death ended the work of his pen.