

STATE HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY OF IOWA

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

# The Annals of Iowa

---

Volume 6 | Number 4 ( 1904)

pps. 248-265

---

## Iowa in the Territory of Missouri

William Salter

ISSN 0003-4827

Material in the public domain. No restrictions on use.



This work has been identified with a [Creative Commons Public Domain Mark 1.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

---

### Recommended Citation

Salter, William. "Iowa in the Territory of Missouri." *The Annals of Iowa* 6 (1904), 248-265.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17077/0003-4827.2972>

Hosted by [Iowa Research Online](http://iowaresearchonline.org/)

# IOWA IN THE TERRITORY OF MISSOURI.

1812—1821.

BY REV. WILLIAM SALTER, D. D.

The people of Orleans Territory having organized a State government, and named it Louisiana, and the State being admitted into the Union in April, 1812, Congress gave another name to the Territory of Louisiana, and called it the Territory of Missouri, the boundaries remaining as before, that is, covering the whole of the Louisiana Purchase north of the thirty-third parallel. William Clark was Governor, and continued in office through the whole life of the Territory. Edward Heimpstead was chosen delegate to Congress, a man of character, efficient in securing legislation for the support of schools, a native of Connecticut.

On the eighteenth of June, 1812, Congress declared war against England. In the eastern States it was a war for "free trade and sailors' rights." In the west, on the part of England, it was a "traders' war," to keep the Indian trade and the Indian country in the hands of the British fur companies. To this end the British traders supplied the Indians with arms, as Tecumseh said to a British general, "You gave us the tomahawk; you told us that you were ready to strike the Americans, that you wanted our assistance, that you would get us our lands back." He had visited the Sacs of Rock river, the Ioways, and other tribes, to secure their alliance. Black Hawk and his warriors were enlisted in the British service. A British officer gave him a British flag, and placed a "Royal George" medal around his neck, saying, "Your English father has found out that the Americans want to take your lands, and he has sent me and his braves to drive them back to their own country." In the course of the summer Mackinaw and Detroit were captured, and the garrison at Chicago massacred. For

more than a year Fort Madison was threatened with a similar fate. It was a lone post, 250 miles from its base of supplies at St. Louis, and the most northern spot on the Mississippi where the authority of the United States was represented by soldiers and the flag. The garrison consisted of about one hundred men, officers and privates; there were also a few men in charge of the factory, or trading house, which the government had erected, pursuant to the treaty of 1804.

On the 5th of October and the two following days a party of Winnebagoes beleaguered the fort. They shot fiery arrows, and hurled burning brands upon the block houses, destroyed the corn fields, killed the live stock, and killed and scalped a soldier who had exposed himself outside the fort. By direction of the commanding officer, Lieutenant Thomas Hamilton, at an evening hour when there was no wind and the fort not endangered, the factory was burnt, to save its contents from falling into the hands of the savages, at an estimated loss of five thousand five hundred dollars. A contemporary report says, "Lieutenants Hamilton and Barony Vasquez have done themselves much credit in the defence of the post. No lives were lost in the fort. Many Indians must have been killed."\* Some of the military authorities proposed the evacuation of the fort, but General Benjamin Howard, in command at St. Louis, objected that it might embolden the Indians. He also said that an expedition to erect a garrison commanding the mouth of the Wisconsin river was contemplated, and that Fort Madison would be of service in the prosecution of the expedition. In April, 1813, General Howard on an inspection tour visited the fort and advised holding it, though the necessary preparation for evacuation might go on. The fort was twice attacked in July, and in the morning of the 16th of that month a corporal and three privates were surprised at an outpost and butchered. The Indians occupied higher

---

\*Niles' Register, Oct. 31, 1812. Annals of Iowa, iii, 105.

ground, and kept up the siege, so that no one dared venture outside the fort. There were many soldiers on the sick list. As the supplies were about exhausted, and promised reinforcements failed to arrive, and some feared the fate of their butchered companions, it was concluded to abandon the fort. A trench was dug to the river. In the night of September 3d, the men moved down the trench on their hands and knees to boats on the shore, when the order was given to set fire to the block houses and barracks, and the garrison were on their way down the Mississippi, and the fort was in flames, before the savages lying within gunshot were aware of the movement. The stone chimney of the fort remained standing for several years. The site was known as "Lone Chimney." The Indians called it "Po-to-wo-nock," the place of fire.

Prominent in Missouri Territory for his military services was Henry Dodge. From captain of a mounted rifle company at the beginning of the war he rose to the rank of Brigadier General by appointment of President Madison. By his courage and skill, having great knowledge of Indian character, himself perfectly fearless, he overawed and composed hostile and wavering bands, and protected the frontier settlements. Notable among his actions was saving the lives of a band of Miamies that General Harrison had sent west of the Mississippi, in order to put them out of the way of British influence. These Indians proved perfidious, and became a terror to the settlements on the Missouri river. General Dodge was sent to chastise and correct them. On reaching their village it was found deserted. They had taken to the woods. On being collected together, they gave up their arms, and the booty taken from the settlers whom they had robbed and murdered; they only begged to be spared their lives. The general accepted their surrender, and was making preparations to send them back to their former country, when a troop of "Boone's Lickers," whose kindred and neighbors had been plundered and slain

by the Miamies, rode up intent to kill every one of them. The instant General Dodge was informed of this, he rode to the spot where the Miamies were upon their knees, a death-prayer to the Manitou on their lips, and the "Boone's Lickers" in the act of levelling their guns upon them. Spurring his horse between the guns and the Indians, he placed the point of his sword at the bosom of the captain of the troop, and forbade the shooting. After some harsh words the captain ordered his men to put up their guns. The Miamies expressed the warmest gratitude to General Dodge for saving their lives. They were soon conducted to St. Louis, and conveyed to their home on the Wabash. General Dodge, recalling the scene in later years, said that he felt more pride and gratification in having saved the lives of his Miami prisoners than in any triumph in arms.

In order to break up a nest of British traders and hostile Indians on the Upper Mississippi, Governor Clark early in May, 1814, went up the river with a gunboat and barges and 150 volunteers and 60 regulars, and built a fort at Prairie du Chien. The Governor returned to St. Louis, leaving the troops to hold the fort, but an overwhelming force of British and Indians compelled its capitulation on the 17th of July. About the same time, troops on the way up the river with reinforcements and supplies, under Captain John Campbell, met with a furious assault from the Sacs and Foxes at Rock Island. The savages were marshalled by Black Hawk, and swarmed about the boats on both sides of the river. They killed nine, wounded sixteen of the Americans, captured one of the boats with its stores, and compelled a retreat. The British commander at Prairie du Chien reported it as "perhaps the most brilliant action fought by Indians only, since the commencement of the war."

To chastise those Indians and destroy their villages and cornfields, another force was sent from St. Louis in August under Major Zachary Taylor. Approaching Rock Island, a British flag was seen flying, and a cannon shot that struck

Major Taylor's boat gave him the first warning that a British force would dispute his passage. A lieutenant from Prairie du Chien had come in answer to an appeal from the Indians, bringing a brass three-pounder and two swivels. They were posted on the west side of the river. At the same time bands of Foxes, Winnebagoes and Sioux came down the Mississippi to help the Sacs. Black Hawk again marshalled the Indians on both sides of the river. The guns were well handled. The Indians dragged them from one position to another with high glee, and drowned each report of the guns with yells and acclaims. After fatal skirmishing, eleven men badly wounded, three mortally, finding it impossible to dislodge the enemy without endangering his whole command, Major Taylor retired down the river. This was on the 6th of September, 1814.

The British and their savage allies now held the Upper Mississippi. Whether or no they should continue to hold it, was one of the vital questions before the Commissioners who had already been appointed to negotiate a peace between Great Britain and the United States. A British officer sent this word to Black Partridge, a famous Pottawattamie chief, and to chiefs of other tribes: "When the French left Canada they asked us (the British) to take care of the Indians. We will do so, and unless the Americans abandon all the country on this side of the Ohio, we will not make peace with the Americans." The British Commissioners at their first meeting with the American Commissioners, August 8, 1814, insisted that the United States set apart a portion of the Northwest to the Indian tribes, to be held by them in sovereignty under a guarantee of Great Britain. They also asked the right of navigation for British subjects upon the Mississippi. However preposterous these demands, and denied as they were by the American Commissioners, they show the British animus of the time. The same summer, the city of Washington was captured, the Capitol and the President's house were burnt, and preparations were

making to capture New Orleans and take possession of Louisiana. At the same time it was expected that Spain would cede Florida to England, so that the territory of the United States would then be circumscribed by England, be confined to its original limits, and there be a Greater Britain on the American continent. This was the dream of British propagandists. But the Commissioners yielded the points upon which they had insisted. It was agreed that the boundaries of the two countries remain as before the war; and Spain still held Florida. The British traders had brought upon the Lakes and the Mississippi a larger supply of goods for the Indian trade than ever before. They hoped to retain their ascendancy, and keep that trade. But after the peace, the United States excluded them from that trade in our territory. "Their ascendancy over the Indians in the late war must be remembered," said Mr. Calhoun. He traced to it our greatest disasters in that war.

In the treaty of peace, Great Britain looked after its Indian allies, and provided that the United States should put an end to hostilities with them. Accordingly, the United States summoned all the tribes upon the Upper Mississippi and Missouri rivers to meet in council, in the interest of peace. They assembled in June, 1815, at Portage des Sioux, upon the Mississippi, on the neck of land just above the mouth of the Missouri. It was a great assemblage of chiefs and warriors of many tribes. Governor Clark, Governor Edwards, of Illinois Territory, and Auguste Chouteau, of St. Louis, were the Commissioners on the part of the United States. General Henry Dodge was present with a military force to preserve order and guard against surprises and disturbances. Treaties were made with twelve tribes, whose chiefs and warriors, one-hundred and twenty-four in all, signed their respective treaties. In each treaty, except that with the Sacs of Missouri river who had kept peace with the United States, it was agreed that "every injury or act of hostility by one or either of the contracting

parties shall be mutually forgiven and forgot, and there be perpetual peace and friendship between all the citizens of the United States and the individuals of each tribe." Several of the tribes had their hunting grounds in what is now Iowa. The Sacs of Missouri river and the Foxes assented to and confirmed the treaty of November 3, 1804, by which their lands east of the Mississippi were sold to the United States.

The Sacs of Rock river, meanwhile, remained hostile. Pains were taken to conciliate them. They were invited to send a deputation of their chiefs to meet the Commissioners. But they declined, and they continued their depredations upon the frontier settlements. Some warriors at Portage des Sioux offered to go and chastise them, but the United States "preferred their reclamation by peaceful measures," and awaited their return to a better mind. When Black Hawk first heard from the British commander at Prairie du Chien of the peace between England and America, that officer said that "Black Hawk cried like a child." Inveterate in his hostility to the American people, his heart was with the British. His band was known as the "British Band." The next year he changed his mind, and went with some of his chiefs and warriors to St. Louis, where they all signed a treaty in which they represented themselves as "now imploring mercy, having repented of their conduct, and anxious to return to peace and friendship with the United States." They also declared their "unconditional assent to the treaty of November 3, 1804." Here for the first time Black Hawk touched the goose quill, "not knowing," he said seventeen years afterwards, "that by the act he consented to give away his village." He asked, "What do we know of the laws and customs of the white people?"

The original plan of the government, from the days of Washington, to establish factories for the Indian trade, and employ its own agents, was now abandoned, and the trade was thrown open to individuals and companies under "regu-



tations," which were generally disregarded. John Jacob Astor bought the trading posts and fixtures of the British traders, and he and others formed companies and made great profits. The Indians were exploited, as before by British traders, whiskey and the white man's vices making havoc among them.

A steamboat first reached St. Louis on the second day of August, 1817. On the sixteenth of May, 1819, a steamboat first entered the Missouri river, and passed up to the mouth of Chariton river; later in the same year, the "Western Engineer," a Government steamboat, passed along the western shore of Iowa to the Council Bluff of that time. They were the heralds of an advancing civilization, of a new people in the wilderness. The Indians were astonished and astounded at them. An extension of military defences followed, high up the Mississippi at Fort Snelling, and on the Missouri at the Council Bluff, under the energetic action of John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of War. Additional treaties of peace and friendship were made with other Indian tribes. These things led to many new settlements in Missouri Territory. The population doubled in five years. There was a similar increase, though not as large, in the adjoining Territory of Illinois. In that Territory, though with less population than in the Territory of Missouri, the people, pursuant to an enabling act of Congress, organized a State government, and with a smaller population at the time than any other State before or since, the State of Illinois was admitted into the Union, December 3, 1818.

At the same time the people of Missouri Territory were equally desirous of a State government, and the Legislature sent a memorial to Congress on the subject.

It stated that the

population was little short of one-hundred thousand souls, was daily increasing with a rapidity almost unequalled, and that the Territorial limits were too extensive to admit of a convenient government. It asked for a division of those limits, and for authority to establish a State with the following boundaries: on the north, a line drawn due west from the mouth

of Rock river; on the east, the Mississippi river; on the south, a line beginning at the 36th degree of north latitude, thence in a direct line to the mouth of Black river, thence up White river to the parallel of 36° 30', thence with that parallel due west to a point from which a due north line will cross the Missouri river at the mouth of Wolf river; on the west, the said due north line.

The memorial added:

To a superficial observer these limits may seem extravagant, but attention to the topography of the country will show they are necessary. The districts of country that are fertile and susceptible of cultivation are small, and separated from each other at great distances by immense plains and barren tracts, which must for ages remain waste and uninhabited. These frontier settlements can only become important and respectable by being united, and one great object is the formation of an effectual barrier against Indian incursions, by pushing a strong settlement on the Little Platte to the west, and on the Des Moines to the north.

Soon after the presentation of this memorial to Congress, a bill to authorize the people of Missouri Territory to form a State government was introduced in the House of Representatives on the 13th of February, 1819, when a motion was made by James Tallmadge, Jr., of New York, to prohibit the further introduction of slaves into the proposed State, and give freedom to all children of slaves born there after the admission of the State into the Union, at the age of twenty-five years. Heated debates followed for several days. A few quotations from some of the speakers will show their different views. It should be remembered that the importation of slaves into the United States, though prohibited in 1808, was still carried on. John W. Taylor, of New York, said:

Cast your eye on that majestic river which gives name to the Territory, for the admission of which into the Union we are to provide. Contemplate the States hereafter to unfold their banners over this portion of America. Our votes will determine whether the high destinies of this region shall be fulfilled, or whether we shall defeat them by permitting slavery. I am not willing to declare the country west of the Mississippi a market for human flesh. In vain you enact laws against the importation of slaves, if you create an additional demand for them by opening the western world to their employment. While a negro man is bought in Africa for a few gewgaws, and sold in New Orleans for twelve or fifteen hundred dollars, unprincipled men will prosecute the traffic.

Thomas W. Cobb, of Georgia, said:

Could gentlemen suppose that the southern States would submit to a measure, which would exclude them from all enjoyment of the region that belonged equally to them as to the northern States? He ventured to assure them that they would not. The people of the slaveholding States know their rights, and will insist upon them. He might subject himself to ridicule for attempting a spirit of prophecy, but (turning to the author of the motion) he warned the advocates of this measure against the certain effects it must produce, destructive of the peace and harmony of the Union. They had kindled a fire which the waters of ocean could not put out, which only seas of blood could extinguish.

James Tallmadge said:

Language of this sort has no effect on me. If a dissolution of the Union must take place, let it be so. If civil war, which gentlemen so much threaten, must come, I can only say, let it come! My hold on life is probably as frail as that of any man who hears me, but while that hold lasts, it shall be devoted to the service of my country, to the freedom of man. The violence which gentlemen have resorted to will not move my purpose. I have the fortune and the honor to stand here as the representative of free men who know their rights, who have the spirit to maintain them. As their representative I will proclaim their hatred to slavery. Has slavery become a subject of so much feeling, of such delicacy, of such danger, that it cannot be discussed? Are we to be told of the dissolution of the Union, of civil war, and seas of blood? And yet with such threatenings, in the same breath, gentlemen insist on the encouragement of this evil, an evil threatening the civil and religious institutions of the country. If its power and its impending dangers have arrived at such a point that it is not safe to discuss it on this floor, what will be the result when it is spread through your wide domain? Its present aspect, and the violence of its supporters, so far from inducing me to yield to its progress, prompts me to resist its march. It must now be met, and the evil prevented.

Extend your views over your newly acquired territory, so far surpassing in extent your present limits that that country which gave birth to your nation hangs but as an appendage to the empire over which your Government is called to bear sway. Look down the long vista of futurity. See your empire, in advantageous situation without a parallel, occupying all the valuable part of the continent, inhabited by the hardy sons of American freemen, knowing their rights, inheriting the will to maintain them, owners of the soil on which they live, interested in the institutions which they labor to defend, with two oceans laving their shores, and bearing the commerce of your people. Compared to yours, the Governments of Europe dwindle into insignificance.

But reverse the scene. People this fair domain with the slaves of your planters. Spread slavery over your empire. You prepare its dissolution;

you turn its strength into weakness; you cherish a canker in your breast; you put poison in your bosom.

It has been urged that we should spread the evil rather than confine it to its present districts. Since we have been engaged in this debate, we have witnessed an elucidation of this argument, of bettering the condition of slaves by spreading them over the country. A trafficker in human flesh has passed the door of your Capitol on his way to the West, driving before him some fifteen victims of his power; the men handcuffed and chained to each other, the women and children marching in the rear, under the guidance of the driver's whip. Such has been the scene witnessed from the windows of Congress Hall, and viewed by the members who compose the legislative councils of republican America! This reasoning is fallacious. While slavery is permitted, the market will be supplied. Our extensive coast, and its contiguity to the West Indies, render the introduction of slaves easy. Our laws against it are highly penal; and yet it is a well known fact that about fourteen thousand slaves have been brought into our country this last year.

Henry Clay, of Kentucky, Speaker of the House, took part in the debate:

He denied the right to prohibit the carrying of slaves into Missouri, as in violation of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution, which entitles "the citizens of each State to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." He charged the advocates of prohibition with being under the influence of negrophobia, proscribing the people of the South, cooping them up, preventing the extension of their population and wealth. He further said that the spread of slavery would cure or palliate its evils, that prohibition would be cruel to the slaves, leaving them to destruction in the old worn out States, instead of allowing them to share in the fat plenty of the new West.

In the Senate, Rufus King, of New York, maintained the Constitutional right and the duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in Missouri. Having been a member of the Convention which formed the Constitution, his words carried force and weight. Though spoken without heat or passion, they were "the signal guns" (said Thomas H. Benton) of the controversy which soon agitated the nation. Mr. King's speeches, delivered February 27, 1819, were not reported. He spoke from notes. By request, he published the substance of them in the following November. "This publication," said John Quincy Adams at the time, "has largely contributed to kindle the flames now raging through the

Union." "We never have observed so great a body of argument pressed into a smaller space," said Niles' Weekly Register. A brief resume may show the course of Mr. King's argument:

The Territory of Missouri belongs to the United States, and is subject to the government prescribed by Congress. The clause of the Constitution which gives this power to Congress is comprehensive and unambiguous.

The question respecting slavery in the old Thirteen States was decided before the adoption of the Constitution, which grants to Congress no power to change what had been settled. The slave States, therefore, are free to continue or abolish slavery. Since 1808, Congress has had power to prohibit, and has prohibited, the importation of slaves into the old States, and at all times has had power to prohibit such importation into a new State or Territory. Congress may, therefore, make it the condition of a new State, that slavery shall be prohibited therein. This construction of the Constitution is confirmed by the past decisions of Congress.

If Congress possess the power to exclude slavery from Missouri, it remains to be shown that they ought to do so. The motives for the admission of new States into the Union, are the extension of our principles of free government, the equalizing public burdens, and the consolidation of the Nation. Unless these objects are promoted by the admission of new States, no such admission can be justified.

The existence of slavery impairs industry, and the power of a people. When the manual labor of a country is performed by slaves, labor dishonors the hands of freemen. If Missouri is permitted to establish slavery, the security of the Union may be endangered, and other States that may be formed west of the Mississippi will extend slavery instead of freedom over that boundless region.

To secure to owners of property in slaves greater political power than is allowed to owners of other property, seems contrary to our theory of political rights. In a slave State five free persons have as much power in the choice of representatives to Congress, and in the appointment of presidential electors, as seven free persons in a State in which slavery does not exist. This disproportionate power and influence was conceded to the slave States, though with reluctance, as a necessary sacrifice to the establishment of the Constitution. It was a settlement between the Thirteen States, and faith and honor stand pledged not to disturb it; but the considerations which led to it, the common share of those States in the war of the Revolution, and in the effort "to form a more perfect union," were peculiar to that time and to those States, and not applicable to new States. Its extension would be unjust and odious, and the free States cannot be expected to consent to it, and we may hope the other States are too magnanimous to insist on it.

Freedom and slavery are the parties which this day stand before the

Senate, and upon its decision the empire of the one or the other will be established. If slavery be permitted in Missouri, what hope can be entertained that it will ever be prohibited in any of the new States that may be formed west of the Mississippi? If we can pass our original boundary without effecting the principles of our free governments, this can only be accomplished by vigilant attention to plant, cherish, and sustain the principles of liberty in the States that may be formed beyond our ancient limits.

A bill to authorize the people of Missouri to form a State government, and prohibiting the further introduction of slavery, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 97 to 56, on the 16th of February. But in the Senate, after a long and animated debate in which Rufus King spoke as above, the clause prohibiting the further introduction of slavery was struck out by a vote of 22 to 16, on the 27th of February. After a conference of the two Houses, the Senate refused to concur in the prohibition of slavery, and the bill fell to the ground.

At the same time, a territorial government was established for the part of Missouri Territory south of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ . It was named Arkansaw. A motion to prohibit slavery in it failed in the House, 86 yeas, 90 nays, February 19th; and in the Senate, 14 yeas, 19 nays, March 1st. The Fifteenth Congress expired March 3d, 1819.

For many months the whole country was agitated with the question. The northern people called for a restriction upon the extension of slavery west of the Mississippi. Pennsylvania declared in its legislature, "that it was the boast of the people of that State that they were foremost in removing the pollution of slavery from amongst themselves, and that veneration for the founders of the Republic, and a regard for posterity, demanded a limit to the range of the evil." The legislatures of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Ohio, and Indiana, joined in declarations to the same effect. Martin Van Buren was a member of the State Senate of New York, and voted to instruct the members of Congress from that State to oppose the admission into the Union of

any State from beyond the original boundary of the United States, without the prohibition of slavery therein. With prophetic foresight Rufus King said, "the entrance of slavery beyond the Mississippi will operate to the disadvantage and humiliation of the States where slavery is prohibited."\*

The southern States were equally positive on the other side. They claimed the right, under the Constitution, and under the treaty with France, to carry slaves into Missouri. Persons who had taken slaves there held public meetings in the Territory, and denied the right of Congress to interfere in the matter.

The question was resumed in the Sixteenth Congress. Many speeches were made. In the House, Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, who had been a member, like Rufus King, of the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, defended the right to hold slaves, and spoke of the benefits of slavery. He commented on the Ordinance of 1787 as "chargeable with usurpation," and said that "the great body of slaves are happier in their present condition than they could be in any other, and the men who would attempt to give them freedom would be their enemies." By 93 to 84 votes, the House passed a bill in which the further introduction of slavery into Missouri was prohibited.

In the Senate, William Pinkney, of Maryland, made a speech of three hours in opposition to Rufus King's speech in the previous Congress. He spoke of the "restriction of slavery as dooming Missouri to inferiority, placing shackles upon her, putting the iron collar of servitude about her neck, instead of the civic crown of freedom upon her brows." The part of the speech which was reported occupies sixteen double-column pages in the Abridgment of Debates in Congress, vi. 435-450. Thomas H. Benton said: "The speech was the master effort of Mr. Pinkney's life, the most gorgeous ever delivered in the Senate, dazzling and over-

\*Rufus King—Life and Correspondence, vi. 237.

powering." It concluded with the hope that the matter might be disposed of in a manner satisfactory to all by a prohibition of slavery in the territory north and west of Missouri. This was on the 15th of February, 1820. The following day Rufus King spoke for more than an hour in support of the House bill. He said:

The principles set forth in the preamble to the Constitution, which proclaim the purpose of its establishment, are dishonored and violated in the extension of slavery into territory beyond the ancient limits of the United States. It seemed strange that the men of the free States were blind to this violation of the Constitution.

An amendment to the House bill was now proposed by Jesse B. Thomas, of Illinois, to prohibit slavery north and west of Missouri, as Mr. Pinkney had suggested. This was adopted the next day by 34 to 10 votes, Mr. King and Mr. Pinkney voting for it. The same day, upon the question of the admission of Missouri with slavery as part of a Compromise, Mr. King and seventeen other northern senators voted against such a Compromise, as did Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, and William Smith, of South Carolina, but for the opposite reason that the Compromise prohibited slavery north and west of Missouri. The two senators from Illinois, one from New Hampshire, and one from Rhode Island, joined with twenty southern senators in supporting both parts of the Compromise; the vote being 24 yeas, 20 nays.

After having mixed up Maine with Missouri in the matter, conditioning the admission of Maine upon the admission of Missouri, making the latter a rider to the former, and after renewed threats if slavery in Missouri was prohibited, and after a conference of the two Houses, the House of Representatives yielded. They struck out the prohibition of slavery in Missouri by a vote of 90 to 87, and adopted by a vote of 136 to 42 the Compromise made in the Senate.

It was on the 2d of March, 1820, that freedom gave way,



and slavery gained a political ascendancy which it held for forty years. The Compromise was conceived in the interest of slavery, but could not have carried without votes from the free States. In the House of Representatives, only five of the forty-two votes against it were from the north. "The northern members embraced and adopted it," said Mr. Calhoun. John Randolph called it "a dirty bargain," and its northern supporters who did not stand by their convictions, "dough-faces." President Monroe approved the Compromise bill, first taking the opinion of his cabinet, in which John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, and the others all concurred, that Congress had a right to prohibit slavery in territory of the United States. Mr. Adams said that he favored the Compromise "from extreme unwillingness to put the Union at hazard." That was the overshadowing consideration with the northern members of Congress who voted for it, and with the northern people who acquiesced in it as closing an angry controversy, averting a civil war. In letters to friends Rufus King gave his views:

The Compromise is deceptive. The slave States, with recruits from senators and representatives of the free States, have carried the question. They have triumphed over us. We have been shamefully deserted in the House of Representatives. The result will be fatal. The pretended concession is of no value, a mere tub to the whale; for it is revocable at pleasure, and has been provided as an apology to members of the free States who have assisted in putting us under a government of the privileged order, henceforth to be our masters. Well, therefore, may we consider ourselves conquered, as is indeed our condition.

One State may be formed on the Mississippi that may be a free State; the country further west is a prairie resembling the steppes of Tartary, without wood or water except on the great River and its branches. Not only may the exclusion of slavery be repealed, but it is avowed that if the country should be settled, the restriction on the territory will not apply, and is not intended to apply to any new State, but that such State may establish slavery if it shall think proper to do so.\*

Similar views to those of Rufus King were taken more than thirty years afterward by Stephen A. Douglas in

---

\*Rufus King—Life and Correspondence, vi. 287-296.

breaking down the Missouri Compromise, and eighty years afterward by the president of the College at Princeton, New Jersey, who says:

With Missouri a slave State, slavery, which was of the fixed and accepted order of society in the south, and the foundation of her aristocratic system, got a new hold, and enjoyed a new reason for being.†

Congress refused to the State of Missouri the boundary line, drawn west from the mouth of Rock river, and reduced it to the parallel which passes from the western border of the State through the rapids of the river Des Moines to the river Des Moines, thence down said river to the Mississippi. Senator William A. Trimble, of Ohio, speaking from personal knowledge of the valley of the Des Moines, advocated giving that fine valley to the State which should hereafter be formed north of Missouri. Congress also reduced the western boundary of the State from a line drawn at the mouth of Wolf river to one passing through the mouth of Kansas river.

Pursuant to an enabling act of Congress, representatives of the people of Missouri met in a Convention, and formed a State constitution. Henry Dodge, of St. Genevieve county, was a member of the Convention. The Constitution made it the duty of the legislature to "pass laws to prevent free negroes and mulattoes from coming to and settling in the State." Inasmuch as in some States persons of color were citizens, this contravened the Constitution of the United States, which "entitles citizens of each State to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Consequently, when application was made for the admission of Missouri into the Union, this contravention of the Constitution of the United States stood in the way. After heated debates in both Houses, Henry Clay, Speaker of the House, by what was deemed a master stroke of policy, brought on an arrangement that conditioned the admission of Missouri into the Union upon the declaration

---

†Woodrow Wilson. A History of the American People, ii. 252.

of a Solemn Public Act by its legislature, that no law shall ever be passed by which any citizen of any State shall be excluded from the privileges and immunities to which he is entitled under the Constitution of the United States. The legislature did as required, and transmitted a copy of the Solemn Public Act to President Monroe, whereupon, pursuant to a law made for the case, he announced by proclamation the admission of the State into the Union, August 12th, 1821.

Thirty-three years later, March 3d, 1854, Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, in the Senate of the United States, called that action of the legislature of Missouri "a burlesque, the richest specimen of irony and sarcasm ever incorporated into a Solemn Public Act." Sixty-seven years later, a Missouri historian called it a "farce" and "absurdity" done with "commendable alacrity."\*

After an existence of eight years the form of government called the Territory of Missouri gave way, one part to the Arkansaw Territory, one part to the State of Missouri, the remainder, the vast region north to the British line and west to the Rocky Mountains, lapsing into its aboriginal condition.

---

\*Lucien Carr—Missouri a Bone of Contention, p. 150.

---

THE DAYS pass on, and the old controversies and animosities die with them; but while remembrance lasts there lasts, too—or rather comes in the years of change—a fondness for those with whom we have measured swords, and gave and took the lusty blows of youth. Friends and enemies, are they not really the same? Shall we not know them as such in the days to come? At all events, the shaping of our lives is due in equal measure to foe and friend.—*Harry Quilter, in Chambers' Journal.*

Copyright of Annals of Iowa is the property of State of Iowa, by & through the State Historical Society of Iowa and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.