




1-1-1963

The Attitude of Indiana's Congressional Delegation during the Civil War toward Slavery and the Negro: 1861-1865

Emma T. Randall
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>

 Part of the [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Randall, Emma T., "The Attitude of Indiana's Congressional Delegation during the Civil War toward Slavery and the Negro: 1861-1865" (1963). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. Paper 304.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact fgaede@butler.edu.

Name of candidate:

Emma T. Kendall
.....

Oral examination:

January 17, 1937

Date

Committee:

Emma Lee Thornbrough, Chairman
.....

David M. Silver
.....

William L. Huff
.....
.....
.....

Thesis title:

The Attitude of Indiana's Congressional
.....
Delegation during the Civil War toward
.....
Slavery and the Negro
.....

January 23, 1937

Thesis approved in final form:

Date

Major Professor Emma Lee Thornbrough
.....

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
COMMISSION ON THE REVISION OF THE CHINESE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
(1901-1908)

James P. McCall

To complete the requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Arts

Chicago, Illinois, June 10, 1908.

Very truly,
Yours,
James P. McCall

UP
1901
1901
1901

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	i
I. THE STATUS OF THE NEGRO IN INDIANA BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR	1
II. THE SLAVERY ISSUE IN POLITICS	11
III. INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, March 4, 1861 - March 3, 1863	27
IV. INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, March 4, 1863 - March 3, 1865	63
V. SPEECHES OF THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO	81
VI. SPEECHES OF THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO	113
CONCLUSION	153
NOTES	158
BIBLIOGRAPHY	171

PREFACE

The question of slavery and the Negro was one which agitated the thinking of the citizens of the United States from the founding of the country until the great Civil War which abolished slavery. The status of the freedmen continued to be the most perplexing problem from the Emancipation Proclamation through the tempestuous days of reconstruction. The speeches of the Indiana delegation to the Congress, as reported in the Congressional Globe, provide abundant evidence as to the attitudes of the delegation toward the Negro minority both slave and free. The question of slavery and the related question of the status of the free Negro in the United States were two of the fundamental issues in the Civil War. Among the most difficult and controversial problems facing Congress during the war years were measures dealing with these two questions.

In this thesis I have examined the attitudes on the Negro question of the members of the Indiana delegation to the Congress of the United States during the period 1861-1865. Two Congresses were in session during this period--the Thirty-seventh and the Thirty-eighth. The Globe and newspapers of the period have been my two primary sources of information. Every shade of opinion was expressed ranging from the utterances of so-called Abolitionist Republican George W. Julian, to the ultra-conservative sentiments voiced by Daniel Voorhees, Democrat. The same wide variance of opinion is apparent in the editorial comment of the newspapers such as the radical Indiana True Republican contrasted with the reactionary Indiana Daily State Sentinel. That much pro-Southern sympathy and hostility toward the Negro existed is

not a surprising fact when one considers that a large number of the inhabitants of Indiana came from southern states such as North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee. Many of them had been driven North by the competition of slave labor.

As a background for this study I have briefly touched on the status of the Negro in Indiana in the period before the Civil War. For this information used in Chapter I, I have drawn heavily on Dr. Emma Lou Thornbrough's book, The Negro In Indiana Before 1900. Also as a background for this paper I have discussed the rise of the slavery issue on the national scene from the Wilmot Proviso to the Compromise of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. The fusion movement of 1854 and the resulting rise of the Republican party as a sectional party opposed to the extension of slavery into the territories have been described. I have also dealt with the elections of 1856 through 1862 with a brief discussion of the issues and platforms in those campaigns. I have reviewed the Liberty and Free Soil movement in Indiana. The differences of viewpoint of Democrats and Republicans on slavery and the Negro question have been discussed. So that the backgrounds of the spokesmen and representatives of the two parties might be known, I have included biographical sketches of each member of the Indiana delegation to the Thirty-seventh and Thirty-eighth Congresses. Little was available by way of biographical material for some of those men, whose careers were apparently rather undistinguished and commonplace. Others, however, were active and important members of the Congress in which they served. The record discloses many of their speeches and resolutions made before the Congress in their efforts to sway or block legislation. Necessarily the subject matter of many of these speeches was concerned with the

slavery issue and the Negro question, undoubtedly the most controversial problems of the day.

Negro slavery existed when the Constitution was formed and, as we know, in order to gain acceptance of that document, compromises were made on the importation of slaves and the matters of representation and taxation. As early as 1795 the Congress adopted a fugitive slave law to aid the slave masters in the pursuit of their fleeing slaves. Then the South gradually built an economy and a way of life based on slave labor. Any interference with the institution or any attempt by the Federal Government to check the spread of slavery into the territories was regarded by the slave holding states as an unwarranted and malicious interference with the property rights of the individual. The Missouri Compromise, the Compromise of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill were all measures adopted to ward off the impending crisis. Even the Republican party in its 1860 platform conceded that the Federal Government had no right to interfere where it existed by state law. This was a sentiment also expressed by President Lincoln in his 1861 inaugural address. The feeling of reluctance to interfere with the South's "peculiar institution" was again manifest in President Lincoln's delay in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation. During the course of the War measures affecting slavery and the Negro were met with determined resistance by members of the Congress including a number of the Indiana senators and representatives. Legislation to abolish the fugitive slave law, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, for the confiscation of rebel property including slave property, for compensated emancipation, legislation to use Negroes to carry the mails, to use Negro troops, for the abolition of slavery by the Thirteenth Amendment and for a Freedmen's Bureau was bitterly opposed by a vociferous minority in the Senate and the

House. Dire predictions of the results of Negro equality, which opponents of the aforementioned legislation feared, were prevalent. These views were supported largely by the Democratic members of the Congress who were violent in their denunciation of Republican efforts to interfere with "states rights." They were equally vehement in their charge that the sectional Republican party had broken all promises made in the party platform which had pledged non-interference with slavery where it already existed.

The debates and arguments on these questions will form the bulk of this paper in as far as views were expressed on each of these subjects by our Indiana Senators and Congressmen.

The research for this thesis was directed by Dr. Emma Lou Thornbrough of Butler University to whom I am greatly indebted for her direction and helpful criticism.

CHAPTER I

THE STATUS OF THE NEGRO IN INDIANA BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

In the period before the Civil War Indiana was notorious for the severity of its Black Laws and the prejudice which its people showed toward the Negro in the territorial period. During this period there was an important element in the state which sought to legalize slavery. This fact became quite apparent as continued efforts were made to ignore the Northwest Ordinance.

The first Negroes in Indiana were apparently the slaves of early French settlers. There is a report of a settlement in 1746 on the Wabash River, probably Vincennes, which included five Negroes. Negroes were no doubt brought in by trade with ports on the lower Mississippi, by British merchants from Jamaica, and by Indians who had raided white settlements and had carried off slaves.

The life of slaves in French settlements was regulated by a Black Code which had been laid down by the French Government and which provided the rights of free men for manumitted slaves. The slaves were also extended the benefits of baptism, the marriage ceremony, and religious instruction. When this territory came into the possession of the United States at the end of the Revolutionary War, no effort was made to interfere with the rights of the French to their slave property even after the Northwest Ordinance was adopted in 1787. Article VI of this Ordinance provided that: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory otherwise than in the punishment of crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted." It was the generally accepted opinion of most persons

that this measure could not be retroactive and therefore both slavery and involuntary servitude continued to exist in Indiana.¹

The first governor of the Northwest Territory, Arthur St. Clair, more than once stated that he believed that the Ordinance was not intended to interfere with slavery where it had previously existed and was simply put into effect to prevent future importation of slaves.

Pro-slavery forces gained control of Indiana politics as the population rapidly increased after 1800 and as more and more settlers moved in from the slave states, some of them bringing their slaves with them. As a result of this circumstance, in 1805 and 1806 petitions to the Congress were received from the Indiana Territory asking for the suspension of the article in the Northwest Ordinance which forbade slavery. The petitioners based their requests on the fact that legal sanction of slavery was an object almost universally desired by the citizens of Indiana and that this growth had been retarded by its prohibition. The Congress did not act favorably upon the requests, but the fact that such request should have been made was indicative of the feeling of the times.²

Further action in this regard was taken by the Indiana territorial legislature in 1805 when it passed a law entitled "An Act Concerning the Introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into this Territory." Any person who had purchased or owned slaves outside the territory was authorized by this legislation to bring them into Indiana and bind them in service.³ Slaves over fifteen years of age could be contracted to service for an indefinite period. The indenture was to be recorded with the county clerk within thirty days after the arrival of the slave within the territory. If the

slave refused the terms offered him, the master could have him taken out of the Territory within sixty days without losing his title and the slave could then be sold for life.⁴

Attempts were made to secure the repeal of this law which so openly violated the spirit and letter of the Northwest Ordinance. This act remained in effect until 1810, but even its repeal did not bring an end to the practice of indenture immediately. Slaves were still brought into the Territory, freed, and then coerced into signing long term contracts of indenture. Also indentures made before repeal were still in effect.

Special laws were passed for the regulation of the conduct of the slaves and indentured servants. A slave might be whipped for laziness or disorderly conduct. Absence from home for a distance of more than ten miles, participation in riots, routs, unlawful assemblies, and seditious speeches were punishable offenses. Gatherings of slaves and indentured persons for social reasons were discouraged. Slaves who were mistreated or who were unlawfully held, however, might resort to the courts.⁵

Efforts were made to discourage the migration of free Negroes into the Territory but no legislation was successfully passed. Discriminatory practices were prevalent and Negroes were denied the right of suffrage and of serving in the militia. As early as 1803 Negroes, mulattoes and Indians were prohibited by law from testifying in courts against any persons other than Negroes, mulattoes and Indians.⁶

The Constitution of 1816 provided that: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in this state otherwise than in punishment for

crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, nor shall any indenture of any Negro or mulatto hereafter made and executed out of the bounds of the State be of any validity within the State." The effect of the state Constitution was not immediate and slavery and involuntary servitude continued until 1820. Many persons had believed that the Constitution was not retroactive and had no effect on persons already held in servitude. A Supreme Court decision of 1820 established that slavery had been abolished by the adoption of the state Constitution but it was not until 1821 that a decision was made about indentures. Even so, in spite of the decision, a few slaves and indentured servants continued to be held perhaps because of their own ignorance of the law or because of their desire to keep the security of their masters' homes.⁷

During the period between 1816 and the Civil War the Negro population of Indiana gradually increased although not as rapidly as the white population. Negroes also settled more widely throughout the state. After 1831 they were required by law to register with county officials and to post bond for their good behavior if they wished to become residents of the state. In 1851 the newly adopted state Constitution entirely prohibited Negroes from coming into the state to settle. They were also prohibited from voting, from serving in the militia, and from testifying in court against white persons. Negro children were denied the right to attend public schools. Further, a colonization movement was financed, partially through state funds, to encourage Negroes to leave for a settlement in Liberia, Africa.

The Negroes who came to Indiana in the ante-bellum period were the free Negroes who came from other states, the recently emancipated from

other states, and the fugitive slaves. Fugitive slaves came in decreasing numbers after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 and were more or less transient as they usually moved on to Canada in their search for freedom. Those emancipated slaves who left their home states were forced to do so when laws were passed after 1830 in most states of the South requiring that the freedmen must leave the state within ninety days or else lose their freedom. Some of these were removed to Liberia but most moved to northern states.⁸

In their efforts to reach the North many of these freedom seekers were aided by Indiana Quakers. The Anti-Slavery Friends group raised money from voluntary subscription to make this work possible. Others, including many slave owners who felt a responsibility for their slaves, aided in the work of settling freed slaves in Indiana and other northern states. These fugitives who came to Indiana were aided by what was known as the Underground Railroad and were sent on their way to Michigan and Canada. Both Negro and white residents of Indiana helped in this effort.⁹

A law of 1831 passed by the Indiana General Assembly required that a Negro who came into the state show his certificate of freedom or expect to be seized as a fugitive slave and be turned over to the custody of a sheriff. Later the law was amended to require a five hundred dollar bond as a pledge of good behavior. This law resulted from the increasing prejudice against Negroes in the pre-Civil War era, a prejudice which was again manifest in the overwhelming acceptance of the Negro exclusion article of the 1851 Constitution. Indiana was not as strongly affected by abolitionist sympathy as most Northern states and there was a reluctance to antagonize

the Southern states. There was also a strong feeling against the immigration of Negro labor into Indiana as a possible source of competition with white labor.¹⁰

The colonization movement which began with the organization of the Indiana Colonization Society of 1829 gained considerable interest and support even from church groups, although some of these groups later withdrew their support, having begun to believe that the solution of the problem was freedom for the Negro and an elevation of his status. The Negroes themselves resented this movement to remove them from the land of their birth. The Colonization Society became inactive in 1838 but was revived in 1845. In 1850 Governor Joseph A. Wright asked that the General Assembly appropriate state funds for sending a colonization agent into the field and financing an Indiana settlement in Liberia. Many persons, including Robert Dale Owen, were firmly convinced that the solution of the race problem lay only in the separation of the races by colonization. The plan for a separate Indiana colony in Liberia was not realized but an agent was put in the field to promote the colonization idea. Little enthusiasm was generated among Negroes and few left the state as a result of the Colonization Society. The Indiana Board of Colonization admitted its failure in its last report covering the year of 1863.¹¹

The governments of free states had a distinct problem in their obligation to return fugitive slaves and in the responsibility to protect the free Negro population of their respective states from possible kidnapping by slave hunters. In Indiana a law was passed in 1810 providing a stiff penalty for any person who tried to remove a Negro from the state without

proving before a judge of the Court of Common Pleas that he had a legal right to do so. The Negro was also given the right to sue for damages.

Other personal liberty laws were passed including one of 1819 which provided for the fining and lashing of persons found guilty of manstealing. The Indiana law required a warrant for the arrest of the suspected fugitive and required a jury trial in the case. Penalties were also provided for forging certificates of emancipation and for harboring and employing fugitive slaves. These laws were frequently violated and the kidnapping of Negroes continued. In strongly anti-slavery communities slave seekers met with much hostility and often with the threat of bodily harm. In still other communities the slave masters received cooperation from the inhabitants who recognized the rights of these masters to recapture their slave property.

The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 made the enforcement of that act the responsibility of Federal officers rather than of local officials. Unlike other Northern states Indiana did not raise violent protest against the Fugitive Slave Act feeling that the slave owners had a legal right to redeem their property.¹²

The Negro was faced with many restrictions not only of a legal nature but was also subject to severe economic and social pressures. They were forced to endure many of the same disabilities as Negroes in the Southern states. One of the important discriminatory measures was aimed at intermarriage, such as a law prohibiting mixed marriages passed in 1818. While this law did not appear in the revised laws of 1818, 1824, 1831 and 1838, a new law was passed in 1840 which fined the parties to such a marriage,

the clerk who issued the license, and the minister who performed the ceremony. These penalties were revoked at the next session of the Legislature but were reimposed in 1842 and remained in force until the revision of the laws in 1852.¹³

Anti-Negro feeling mounted in the 1840's and 1850's and was frequently manifested in violence against Negroes. Even the state Legislature of 1858 proposed a series of resolutions which uphold the spirit of the Dred Scott Decision that the Negro was not a citizen. They asserted a belief in the inferiority of the Negro and that the race had not been included in the pronouncements of the Declaration of Independence. These resolutions were not passed but were manifest evidence of the strength of the anti-Negro feeling.

Although a few Negroes became affluent property owners, most subsisted on very little and were relegated to the most menial jobs earning a livelihood as farm laborers, in domestic service, as cooks, waiters and stewards. A few followed trades of barbering, carpentry, plastering, brick masonry and blacksmithing.

This anti-Negro prejudice was carried over into the war years during which time attempts were still made to capture fugitive slaves. Colonization proposals were still offered and alarm began to grow at the prospect of increased migration of freed Negroes into Indiana who might possibly offer competition on the labor market.

Although Negroes in Indiana did not enjoy a great deal of security or personal liberty, some humanitarian efforts were made for his protection and for the improvement of his status. Conspicuous for their part in these

efforts were members of the Society of Friends who were always interested in preventing illegal seizure and kidnapping of Negroes. They frequently interceded in the Negro's behalf spending both time and money in these efforts. Also the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law which was part of the Compromise of 1850 caused more men who had been moderate in their criticism of the slave system to become outspoken in opposition to and abhorrence of this system, especially as it brought slave catchers into their own communities in greater numbers.

As regarded Negro suffrage a number of petitions were received as the constitutional convention of 1850 met. These petitions asking that the Negro be given the right to vote were received from groups of Baptists and Anti-slavery Friends. However, all were tabled by action of the delegates. Only Schuyler Colfax, who denied his personal interest in the matter, but who expressed himself as taking cognizance of the wishes of certain groups in the state, proposed a resolution that the Committee on Elective Franchise be instructed to consider submitting a separate article on Negro suffrage to the voters. This proposal met with violent opposition from all except one delegate who proposed incorporating a provision for Negro suffrage into the main body of the Constitution.¹⁴

In churches there was also a color line drawn. While there were colored members to be found in many white denominations, for the most part Negroes formed their own churches. The Quaker Church showed the greatest interest in the religious instruction of Negroes by distributing Bibles, by teaching illiterate Negroes to read the scriptures, and by promoting the reading of scriptures in Negro schools. Although the membership in the Friends Church was not restricted by race very few Negroes became members.¹⁵

As far as education was concerned, while Negro children were not specifically excluded from early schools of the state, it was presumed that these schools were for white children. The school law of 1852 which provided some state tax for public schools specifically barred Negro children from the benefits of the law. In view of these facts, before 1869, Negro education was principally provided for by private schools and teachers. In this field also the Quakers took the lead. Their committees on People of Color had as a principal function the provision of this education. Weekday schools were established, funds raised, teachers recruited, books furnished, and supervision provided. In some schools costs were provided by tuition paid by the pupils. In addition efforts were made by the Quakers to secure the admission of Negro children into district schools.¹⁶

The foregoing facts make it apparent that the majority of Indiana citizens in the period before the Civil War were firmly convinced of the inherent inferiority of the Negro and were of the opinion that he was not entitled to the protection of the Constitution as a citizen. As property they believed that he was to be returned to his owner should he flee in search of freedom. As less than a citizen he was not to be accorded the right of suffrage, the full protection of the courts, nor the privilege of association in schools, churches, employment or other areas with the white citizens of Indiana. There were those few, however, who dared to declare their deviation from these convictions. These hardy souls were usually scornfully denounced and declared to be abolitionists or worse.

A growing anti-slavery sentiment during the period of compromise led finally to the establishment first of a Free Soil party and then the Republican party.

CHAPTER II

THE SLAVERY ISSUE IN POLITICS

A bill authorizing funds for the purchase of territory from Mexico was introduced into the House of Representatives in 1846. David Wilmot of Pennsylvania proposed an amendment to the bill which provided that in territory gained from Mexico "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of said territory." This proposal stirred up bitter controversy in all parts of the country as well as in Congress. The North generally approved the bill but mass meetings and conventions were called throughout the South to oppose it. The measure was passed by the House twice, but was defeated both times in the Senate. The South favored a "non-interference" doctrine and argued that the right to possess personal property was guaranteed by the Constitution. They regarded slaves as property and felt that individuals therefore had the right to take this property into any territory they chose.

In Indiana both Whigs and Democrats supported the belief that this territory should remain free. The division of opinion arose over the method of prohibiting slavery from the territory. There was a resulting split in the legislature over the question of slavery extension. Jacob B. Julian of Wayne County introduced a joint resolution in the Indiana legislature on the subject. It instructed the senators and representatives in Congress to pass a "Wilmot Proviso." The Democrats twice blocked action on this believing that it would be dangerous to bring the slavery extension issue onto the floor of the Legislature until after the senatorial election. Shortly after the election of Democratic Governor James Whitcomb several

resolutions were introduced which urged the Congress to pass a declaration for the purpose of deterring slaveholders from taking their slaves into the territories. The Democrats were of the opinion that such a resolution would antagonize less than a prohibiting law. There is no record that further action was taken on the resolution after it was laid on the table of the House where it apparently remained until after the Legislature adjourned.¹

In the election of 1848 neither Democrats nor Whigs were outspoken on the slavery question. This evasion of the issue led to the formation of a third party, the Free Soil party. The new party, unlike the Liberty party of 1840 which had advocated abolition, only opposed the extension of slavery into the territories. The Free Soilers included Martin Van Buren's New York followers of the Liberty party, Free Soil Democrats and Whigs. The slogan adopted by the party was "Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor and Free Men." Martin Van Buren was nominated for the presidency. While Van Buren was unable to carry any state, he was able to split the Democratic vote in several states. The party also elected thirteen members to the House of Representatives who were able to hold a balance of power in a house almost evenly divided between Democrats and Whigs.

The Free Soil movement in Indiana was an outgrowth of the old Liberty party. The progress of the movement was disappointing to its supporters as neither Indiana Whigs nor Democrats deserted the folds of their old parties in wholesale numbers to join its ranks. The chief supporters of the movement remained those who had for a long time supported the anti-slavery movement. A state convention was held on July 26, 1848, and

resolutions were drawn up which supported Martin Van Buren and the Free Soil platform adopted at the Buffalo Convention.²

Some became part of the Free Soil movement to register their disapproval of the nomination of Zachary Taylor for the Presidency. Lew Wallace, whose hatred of Taylor dated from the Mexican War, was one of these. His bitterness stemmed from an incident in which Taylor had condemned volunteers from the Second Indiana Regiment for cowardice. Mr. Wallace became the editor of the Free Soil Banner published during the campaign, a paper which was supported by David Butler, a leading lawyer of the state and a Democrat.

The election of Zachary Taylor, a Whig and a slave holder, caused the Democrats of Indiana to see the possibility of making political capital out of the charge that the Whigs and slaveholders had formed an alliance. The Democratic state convention even included a plank in its platform urging Congress to prevent the introduction of slavery into California and New Mexico. Even the party's nominee for governor, Joseph A. Wright, who had formerly opposed the Wilmot Proviso, became a moderate on the issue. Wright, who was also a colonization society leader, found it politically expedient to change his views. Indiana's Democratic congressmen, John L. Robinson, William W. Wick and Graham N. Fitch all announced their support of the Wilmot Proviso and Congressman Fitch denounced his Democratic brethren in the South for their desertion of the party with the resulting election of a Whig.³

In 1849 the Democrats made a concerted effort to win back the members of the party who had strayed into the Free Soil ranks in 1848 and to court the favor of ex-Whigs as prospective party members. They had little hope

of winning over the hard core abolitionists. Such actions drew the scornful criticism of the Whigs.⁴ That both Democrats and Whigs were successful in winning back members to the party fold was so apparent that the Free Soilers nominated no party ticket in 1849. Both Democratic and Whig candidates had announced that they were in favor of the Wilmot Proviso, prohibition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the removal of the seat of the Federal Government to a free state.⁵

A contest developed in the Whitewater Valley, a Quaker stronghold, which was the result of party discontent. George W. Julian, supported by a coalition of Independent Whigs, Free Soilers and Democrats, became the opponent of Samuel W. Parker, who had been an ardent supporter of Zachary Taylor in 1848. Julian had been a Whig who had turned to the Free Soil movement. This caused him to be reviled and deserted by his friends and even by his brother who dissolved their law partnership in the face of the abolitionist charges hurled at Julian in 1848. In consequence of his abolitionist expressions he had been called an "amalgamationist," a "woolly head," an "apostle of disunion." It was ridiculously alleged by his enemies that he carried a lock of Frederick Douglas' hair to "regale his senses with its aroma when he grew faint hearted."⁶ This bitter feeling against abolitionism had also been manifested when he was threatened by mob violence by his own neighbors.⁷ Although Parker, Julian's Whig opponent, accused him of being an abolitionist of twenty years standing, Julian won by 153 votes, a feat accomplished through the combined efforts of the Democrats, who could not have won by themselves, and the Free Soilers and independent Whigs. It was highly significant that this upset could have been accomplished by those dissatisfied with their own parties.

It is interesting to note that at the national meeting of the Free Soil party in Pittsburg in August in 1852, it nominated as its vice-presidential candidate, George W. Julian. Also in May of 1852 a Free Soil convention had been held in Indianapolis. Represented at that convention were abolitionists, Wilmot Proviso Democrats, Van Burenists and Anti-Fugitive Slave Law Whigs. The presence of these diverse elements gave a prospect of the fusion movement which was to follow.

The first difficult problem facing the Congress of 1849 was that of slavery in the territory acquired from Mexico, the admission of the State of California and the admission of Utah and New Mexico. The South objected to the admission of California as a free state as that would upset the balance of power between slave and free. It also clamored for a more effective fugitive slave law to offset the effects of the Underground Railroad. The North was opposed to these arguments and demanded that slavery and the slave trade be abolished from the District of Columbia. Indiana Whigs and Democrats both agreed that California should be admitted with her constitution which prohibited slavery. Congressman Graham N. Fitch condemned the South for resisting the admission of California as a free state.⁸

To reconcile these opposing factions a compromise measure was offered in the Senate in January, 1850, by veteran Senator Henry Clay. His proposals were that California be admitted without slavery; that territorial governments be organized in New Mexico and Utah without definite proposals for slavery; that the boundary between Texas and New Mexico be fixed; that the slave trade, but not slavery, be prohibited in the District of Columbia; that a more effective fugitive slave law be passed; and that Congress have

no power to interfere with slavery in the slaveholding states. Clay's compromise was much debated with the Southern senators declaring that no compromise was possible. The speech which turned the tide, however, was that of Massachusetts' Daniel Webster who, in his 7th of March speech, appealed for compromise "not as a Northern man but as an American." He thereby brought upon himself the bitter criticism of the Northern spokesmen but he had saved the compromise which was adopted in practically the same form as it had been written. In South Bend young Schuyler Colfax, a Whig, was unwilling to accept Clay's compromise proposals. Richard W. Thompson, who represented the Whig element in southern Indiana, was also skeptical about Clay's measures. The Lafayette Courier condemned the South for its demand all, yield nothing principles. On the subject of the Compromise Senator Jesse Bright announced his willingness to take a middle conservative course, a course which seemed to have been chosen by many members of his party in Indiana as well as by many Whigs. Bright's discussion was lauded by Michael C. Garber of the Madison Courier who proclaimed that Indiana was for compromise.⁹

Only Indiana's Free Soil contingent in the Congress spoke out against compromise. George W. Julian decried the "subserviency of the North to the slave interests." He voiced the sentiments of his Whitewater district constituents who had become aroused about compromise. Wayne County Democrats in a meeting passed resolutions opposing the extension of slavery into free territory and favoring the admission of California "unconnected with any other subject."¹⁰

When the Compromise of 1850 came to a vote in Congress, five members of the Indiana delegation in the House accepted all of its provisions, four

representatives opposed the Fugitive Slave Act and Representative McGoughey, the only Hoosier Whig, supported all the bill except the Texas boundary settlement. Representative Julian was the only Hoosier to take a radical position on the whole compromise. Indiana Senator Whitcomb approved the bill in its entirety while Senator Bright failed to vote for the fugitive slave provisions.¹¹ Although a majority of the citizens of Indiana accepted the compromise as a whole, much dissatisfaction was expressed with the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law. Many Indiana congressmen were put in the position of having to explain their voting for the law.¹² The majority of Hoosier newspapers threw support to the compromise and urged tolerance for the offensive Fugitive Slave Law. Individuals who favored the compromise also urged that "patriotism, good faith, constitutionalism, and observance of law" prevail.

By the end of 1850 many Hoosiers had come to accept the compromise as a "temporary and incidental evil for a permanent and inherent good."¹³ The North was pleased with the admission of California as a free state and with the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. The South was encouraged by the fact that the Texas territory given up to New Mexico was still open to slavery. The Wilmot Proviso had been defeated. A stricter fugitive slave law was also a victory for Southern interests. Both Democrats and Whigs approved the compromise in the election of 1852. The greatest advantage gained by the North through the compromise was a ten year period of time during which its industrial might raced far ahead of that of the South, a factor which was a decided advantage in the war to follow. This compromise was, as we know, only a temporary respite from the problems which were to follow.

The truce created by the passage of the Compromise of 1850 was shattered in 1854 by the debate on a proposal to organize the region between the Missouri River and the Rockies known as Nebraska. This bill to organize the territory by dividing it at the fortieth parallel into Kansas and Nebraska was proposed by Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois. It declared the Missouri Compromise line null and void. The people in the territories were to be free to decide the fate of slavery in their respective territory. It was assumed that Nebraska would be admitted as a free state and that Kansas would be admitted as a slave state. The debate was thus renewed. The passage of the bill revealed a serious division within the parties. Southern Democrats and Whigs favored the bill and voted for it while Northern Whigs voted against it. Northern Democrats were divided in their opinion. The Whig party was nearly destroyed by the ensuing controversy and Democratic unity was seriously undermined. Northern states, in defiance of the Fugitive Slave Act, passed additional personal liberty laws.

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was the signal for a determined effort by both proslavery and anti-slavery forces to encourage settlers of their own sympathies to settle the Kansas territory in greater numbers than the opposing group. Bloodshed and violence were the result.

The impact of the struggle had a marked effect upon the political parties. The Whig party weakened and divided, soon was to disappear. The pressure for a new political party became more urgent as a large body of citizens began to feel that their needs were not being met by the parties with which they were affiliated. A new party was the result of this discontent. It was organized early in 1854 in Wisconsin and spread rapidly

to other states. A later meeting was to be held in the same year at Jackson, Michigan, at which a platform calling for the repeal of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and nation-wide measures to prevent the extension of slavery, was adopted. The name "Republican" was also adopted.

On July 13, 1854, ten thousand men were said to have assembled for a state convention on the courthouse lawn in Indianapolis. All the elements opposing the Democratic party were there including the men who had long been prominent in Democratic circles who were tired of the domination of Jesse Bright, Democratic party boss, and his henchmen. Know-nothings, Free Soilers, temperance men and a few abolitionists also came. A platform was adopted opposing the extension of slavery and demanding the restoration of the Missouri Compromise Line. The party at this time did not identify itself with the Republican party. The persons who became members of the new party considered that they had left their own parties only temporarily and regarded this as a people's movement. They therefore took for themselves the name "People's Party" or Fusionists.

Widespread disapproval of the People's mass meeting was voiced by the Democratic press. The Democratic Sentinel described the mass meeting as being "composed of all the odds and ends of society, politics and religion. Abolitionism, Know-Nothingism, hypocrisy and bad liquor formed such a compound of villainous smells as never offended nostril."¹⁴ The fears of the Democrats at the strength of their opponents were justified because the People's party elected the state ticket by nearly ten thousand. The next

state legislature had a Senate of 26 Democrats and 24 Fusionists. In the national House of Representatives there were two Democrats and nine Fusionists from Indiana. The Fusionists attributed their victory to the rebellion of the people against corruption and bossism of the Democratic party and to popular disapproval of the slavery and temperance planks of the Democratic platform.

On July 13, 1855, an organizational meeting of the People's party was held. Because of the Kansas situation slavery had become the dominant issue of the day although temperance and anti-Catholicism, the latter issue advocated by the Know-Nothings, were matters of slight local concern. The attendance equalled that of July 13, 1854. There was still a reluctance on the part of some members of the People's party to adopt the name "Republican," although party leaders, Henry S. Lane and Oliver P. Morton, urged it. Some insisted on using the name "American" or "Know-Nothing" and were willing to merge their forces temporarily with the new movement. They were not willing to give up their old allegiances permanently. A number of Whigs and Democrats were also among those unwilling to give up their party affiliation permanently.

The campaign of 1858 was entered into with great vigor. O.P. Morton, H.S. Lane, Gov. Love S. Orth and George W. Julian were among the prominent Republican speakers. The Democratic cause was represented in the campaign by Joseph A. Wright, Jesse B. Bright, Thomas A. Hendricks, David W. Voorhees, David Turpee, Joseph A. McDonald and others. The Republicans emphasized "Free Press, Free Speech, Free Labor, Free States and Fremont." The Democratic speakers reviled the Republicans for championing "Free Niggers, Free Dirt, Free Fight, Free Whiskey, Fremont and Freedom."¹⁵

The Democrats had nominated for governor Ashbel P. Willard to oppose the Republican nominee, Oliver P. Morton. The two stumped the state in joint debate. Henry S. Lane, Schuyler Colfax, Godlove S. Orth, George W. Julian and others actively participated in the campaign. The Republicans or Unionists were defeated in the state election on October 4, 1856. The Democrats gained four congressmen, getting six congressmen to the Republicans' five.

By 1858 there was no longer any question about accepting the name "Republican." The American Party had disappeared and the temperance issue had lost its importance. The situation in Kansas now dominated all other issues. Citizens of Indiana were made aware of all the outrages there by letters from friends and relatives in that territory. The Republican convention of 1858 assembled in Indianapolis and the only objections to the proceedings came from George W. Julian, abolitionist, who opposed the conservatism of the platform adopted.

In the Democratic convention which met on January 7, 1858, Lew Wallace offered a plank which endorsed the Kansas-Nebraska Bill thereby creating an angry situation. The result of the bitterness aroused led to the calling of a mass meeting of anti-slavery Democrats on February 22, 1858. This assembly endorsed the Douglas position and read the Indianapolis Sentinel, a Democratic newspaper, which was anti-Douglas, out of the party.

Prominent among the Republicans participating in the campaign were Albert G. Porter, future governor of Indiana; Schuyler Colfax, congressional nominee in the tenth district; and Benjamin Harrison, who had just opened a law office in Indiana. The Republicans lost the state by only about 2,500

votes but gained three men in the Congress. The years between 1858 and 1860 were to provide time for both the Democrats and Republicans to prepare themselves for the struggle of 1860 which would test whether the Democratic Party would continue to hold its superiority.

Indiana politicians began their campaign activity before their national party conventions. Candidates for state offices were buttonholing prospective supporters as early as March of 1860 and political activity grew more frenzied as time went on.

The outstanding figures in the Republican Party at the time were Oliver P. Morton and Henry S. Lane. An understanding was reached that if the Republicans were successful, Lane would go to the Senate and Morton would hold the second place on the ticket and become governor. Morton reluctantly agreed to the proposition believing that things still might work out so that he might become Senator. On March 4 these two men opened the Republican canvass after which they resumed their political campaigning in the state. The party's flexible slavery plank in its platform enabled Republican orators to shift their expressed views to suit their audiences. Most of their speeches were conservative in tone, however.

Indiana Republicans had a most active part in the Republican convention held in Chicago in May, 1860. Lane and Morton headed the Indiana delegation. This delegation had agreed that the nomination of a conservative presidential candidate and the adoption of a moderate platform would be necessary if the voters of Southern Indiana were to support the Republican ticket. The formation of a Constitutional Union Party which was given support by some Indiana Know-Nothings furnished an additional reason for

advocating conservative Republican action. A name which had begun to attract attention was that of Abraham Lincoln whose conservatism on the slavery question was acceptable even to the citizens of Southern Indiana. Schuyler Colfax and others of the old Whig Party favored the nomination of Edward Bates of Missouri but his popularity had begun to decline even before the convention. The antagonism of important German leaders, who remembered Bates' cooperation with the Know-Nothings in 1856, was largely responsible for this.¹⁶

On the opening day of the convention most of the Indiana delegates were still divided between Bates and Lincoln. George W. Julian of the radical wing of the party, supported Salmon P. Chase of Ohio. The more conservative majority was opposed even to William H. Seward who had become the man for Lincoln to beat. There was no great problem for Indiana Republicans who decided to shift from Bates to Lincoln as both Bates and Lincoln were former Whigs and moderate in their slavery views. Many felt that the more radical Seward's nomination would be death to the Republican cause in Indiana. Henry S. Lane said repeatedly that he did not care to expend his time and money in carrying on a hopeless campaign. He, together with Andrew P. Curtain, gubernatorial candidate of Pennsylvania, personally appealed to the leaders of every delegation to support the nomination of Abraham Lincoln.¹⁷ The influence of the Indiana and Pennsylvania delegations, perhaps more than anything else, led to the nomination of Lincoln. This fact was also emphasized in a letter from John DeFrees to Schuyler Colfax in which he said: "We Bates men of Indiana concluded that the only way to beat Seward was to go for Lincoln as a unit... We made the nomination."¹⁸

Indiana cast its votes solidly for Lincoln who was nominated on the third ballot. Even George W. Julian's newspaper promised support for Lincoln and the Indianapolis Daily Journal declared: "There is no doubt but that the unanimity of the Indiana delegation for Lincoln was the cause of his nomination. If Indiana had divided or given her strength to any other candidate, it is absolutely certain that no concentration could have been made on Lincoln, for it was only the united effort of both Indiana and Illinois men that secured the cooperation of Pennsylvania and some New England states at the last hour."¹⁹

Jesse Bright, who had come from Washington to the Democratic state convention in Charleston in April, had lost his fight to alienate the support of Indiana Democrats for Stephen A. Douglas. Bright declared that he would stump Indiana county by county in opposition should Douglas be nominated.²⁰ He was given a valid excuse to make good his threat when the national party convention, which met in Baltimore in June, split. Two separate Democratic tickets were nominated with the northern Democrats nominating Douglas on a popular sovereignty platform. The southern wing chose as its candidate John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky on a platform which demanded Congressional protection for slavery. The Bright faction of the party sponsored a Breckenridge mass convention in Indianapolis and chose a slate of electors. The Breckenridge campaign did not pose as serious a threat to the aspirations of the Douglas Democrats as did the Bell-Everett campaign to the Indiana Republicans. The chief interest for Indiana citizens centered on the contest between Lincoln and Douglas.

The rising slavery agitation caused the Republicans to deny any responsibility for it. The Indianapolis Journal, a Republican newspaper, declared

that a Democratic or Constitutional Union victory would rationalize the South's "peculiar institution." It further stated that there was "no protection against this result but the election of Lincoln" who was "pledged to resist the elevation of slavery above the local position in which the Government placed it." Most Republicans were opposed to Abolitionism and denied that an attack on slavery anywhere was planned. Lincoln's conservatism was played up and the abolitionist opposition to his conservative views was offered as proof of his acceptability to the less radical members of the party. Caleb S. Smith, who was to be chosen for a cabinet post by President Lincoln, was one of those who scoffed at the idea that the Republican party favored abolitionist doctrines for Negro equality. He announced in one of his campaign debates that he stood for the Republican party principle of non-interference with slavery in the states and non-extension into the territories. Henry S. Lane also professed to stand with the founding fathers upon the principle that freedom is national and slavery local.²¹

The Democrats desperately predicted that the "irrepressible conflict" would become a reality in the event of a Republican victory. They added that Civil War or a peaceful division of the Union would be the inevitable result. They chose to revile the Republicans rather than to expound at length their own views of the slavery question.

The electorate was never clearly informed by either party as to what their views were toward the extension of slavery. The Republicans accused Daniel W. Voorhees, Democratic candidate for Congress from the Seventh District, and other Democrats, of being Disunionists. They felt that a Republican victory would end the sectional struggle and begin a new era of good feeling.²²

The whole Republican state ticket was elected by majorities of nearly 10,000 and the legislature was Republican in both houses. After the October elections the Republicans vigorously participated in the campaign to elect Lincoln as President. They won seven of the eleven districts and elected Dunn, Julian, Porter, White, Colfax, Mitchell and Shanks. Lincoln won Indiana's electoral votes by a large majority. The agreement made before the Republican state convention was carried out and in 1861 the state legislature made Henry S. Lane senator and Oliver P. Morton governor. The Republicans had much to rejoice about as this was the first defeat the Democrats had suffered since 1840 and they were not to be victorious again until 1876. This rejoicing was not unmarred, however, because even before all the ballots had been finally counted, the South Carolina legislature had called a convention to meet on December 17 to consider South Carolina's position in the Union. The adoption of an ordinance of secession on December 20 followed by similar action of other Southern states soon put the Republican exultation over its exciting victory far into the background.

CHAPTER III

INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

(March 4, 1861 - March 3, 1863)

Harmony did not long prevail in Republican ranks after the 1860 victory and the party was seriously threatened with disintegration. Party leaders were unable to find common ground on which to unite dissenting factions. On economic policy as well as the slavery question there was a basic difference between radicals and conservatives who had declared a truce only during the 1860 campaign.

Such disharmony was greatly encouraging to Indiana Democrats who confidently awaited the collapse of Republicanism when the repercussions of Southern secession threatened to overwhelm the Republican party in Indiana. The Democrats assumed the role of Union savers and promised to rescue the nation from the situation which threatened it. As conciliators they pointed out that the only hope of the South lay in placing its confidence in the Democratic party. They declared that no trust could be put in a party which had adopted such a platform as the Republican platform of 1860 or in a President who would not declare his conservative intentions.

Numerous compromise proposals were debated and rejected. Only Representatives William Dunn and David Kilgore of the seven man Indiana Republican delegation were interested in making concessions to the South, and only a few Republicans were willing to support the proposal of Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky to restore the 36 degrees 30 minutes Missouri Compromise line and to provide a Congressional slave code to protect slavery south of that line in present territory and in territory to be acquired in the future.

Excitement and anxiety permeated the minds of the people of Indiana when news was relayed by telegraph on the night of April 12 that Fort Sumter had been fired upon. All business was suspended on the following Saturday, April 13, as crowds gathered in the streets of the state capital. Two mass meetings held that night taxed the capacity of the halls in which they were held. In the days which followed Indiana feverishly prepared for war.¹ The Indianapolis Daily Journal proclaimed Indiana's loyalty in an editorial which declared: "We are no longer Republicans or Democrats. In this hour of our country's trial, we know no party but that which upholds the flag of our country."²

Talk of peace and compromise died down and even the staunch Democrats, Thomas Hendricks and Daniel Voorhees, announced their support of the government in its effort to preserve the Union. They and other members of their party followed the lead of Stephen A. Douglas in loyal support of the administration. This period of truce did not long resist the pressures of political factionalism, and party politics were revived as Democrats renewed their efforts as the opposition party. Criticism of President Lincoln's action in declaring martial law, suspending the writ of habeas corpus, and in making arbitrary arrests in Maryland was expressed by those who doubted the constitutionality of such measures. Fears were voiced by the Democrats that the war was being turned into an anti-slavery crusade and that it was ceasing to be a struggle to save the Union.

The turbulence of this chaotic period was the background for the meeting and deliberations of the Thirty-seventh Congress which began on March 4, 1861. The first session lasted from July 4, 1861, until August 6, 1861. The second session began on December 2, 1861, and was concluded on July 17,

1862. The third session began on December 1, 1862, and continued until March 3, 1863. A special session of the Senate was in assembly from March 4, 1861, until March 28, of the same year.

Indiana's delegation to this Congress included men who had a wide divergence of opinion on the issues of the day. Their convictions on slavery and the Negro problem were typical of the varying opinions throughout the rest of the country. The Republicans in the group included those who advocated compromise and appeasement and who were totally opposed to any abolitionist war. The Democrats represented the conservatives who were absolutely against interference with states rights and with the constitutional privileges of the slave holders. They were interested only in the restoration of the Union as it had been before the war.

Indiana senators in this Congress were Henry S. Lane, Republican, and Jesse D. Bright, Democrat. Senator Bright's expulsion in 1861 brought Joseph A. Wright, Unionist, to fill his seat temporarily until the next legislature elected David Turpie, Democrat, to serve Bright's unexpired term.

In the House of Representatives Republicans Schuyler Colfax, William McKee Dunn, William Mitchell, Albert G. Porter, John P.C. Shanks, George W. Julian and Albert S. White spoke for their party.

The Democrats were represented in the House by James Cravens, William S. Holman, Daniel Voorhees and John Law.

Of great prominence in Republican ranks, a conservative who realized the importance of compromise, was the popular Henry Smith Lane, who was

born on February 24, 1811, in Montgomery, Kentucky. Mr. Lane chose the law as his profession and after moving to Indiana he began practicing, having been admitted to the bar at Crawfordsville. His political career began with his election as a Whig to the Indiana legislature in 1837. In 1840, he was elected to the Congress in the great Harrison "hard cider" campaign. Mr. Lane, while not a debater, was a well known public speaker who had great appeal for the masses. In his youth he was known as the "Wabash orator" and had few superiors as a stump speaker.

Mr. Lane was a friend and admirer of Henry Clay and vigorously stumped the state for him in the 1844 presidential campaign. Clay's defeat put an end to Mr. Lane's political career for a number of years and he appeared only for occasional campaign speeches until he was persuaded in 1849 to become a candidate for Congress. In this campaign both he and his Democratic opponent, Joseph E. McDonald, favored abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and if this could not be accomplished, were in favor of moving the seat of government to free soil. Lane was defeated.

Mr. Lane figured prominently in the affairs of the People's party of 1854, the forerunner of the Republican party, and was in attendance at all of its mass meetings and rallies. He became the recognized leader of the Republican party in Indiana and on July 4, 1856, he was president of the National Republican convention which met in Philadelphia.

In 1859 Mr. Lane was selected to contest the seat of Jesse D. Bright in the Senate whose election had been challenged by the Republicans as illegal. The Republicans charged that the Democrats had, in 1857, in a quasi-convention called without the consent of the Republican-dominated

Senate, elected Jesse D. Bright and Graham N. Fitch to the Senate. When the Republicans regained mastery of both houses in 1859, they elected Henry S. Lane and Monroe McCarty, the latter a liberal Democrat, to displace those elected in the informal convention of 1857. Mr. Lane accepted the honor although he knew that there was little likelihood that Bright and Fitch would be excluded. He was denied a seat as the Senate was largely Democratic.

In 1860 Lane was the gubernatorial candidate of the Republican party and was elected over his Democratic opponent, Thomas A. Hendricks, by a majority of more than 9,000. Two days after being inaugurated as governor of Indiana he was elected United States Senator for six years in accordance with the previous understanding of party leaders.³

Although he was born in a slave state, Mr. Lane professed to be opposed to the institution of slavery declaring that he stood with the founding fathers on the principle that freedom was national and slavery local. Although advocating the non-extension of slavery, Senator Lane was in favor of colonization on a voluntary basis.⁴ He showed no sympathy for the abolitionists, but did give evidence of interest in the welfare of the Negro by voting for the passage of Senate Bill 536 which provided for the incorporation of an institution for colored youth in the District of Columbia. This bill was designed to "educate and improve the moral and intellectual of such of the colored youth of the nation as were placed under its care and influence."⁵ Mr. Lane was always extremely popular with the rank and file of party members and was easily able to rally their support for party principles.

After the expiration of his senatorial term on March 3, 1867, Henry S. Lane never re-entered public life.

A Democratic leader whose indiscretion caused him to be removed from the Thirty-seventh Congress was Jesse D. Bright, who was born in Norwich in Chenango County, New York, on December 18, 1812. The Bright family moved in 1820 to Shelbyville, Kentucky, for a few months and then to Madison, Indiana, which was at that time a wealthy and thriving city. There Jesse Bright, as a young lawyer was privileged to have contact with the most brilliant barristers of the state. The law was his avocation while politics was the driving urge which guided him.

In 1843 Bright was chosen for lieutenant governor as running mate to James Whitcomb. He was president of a state senate equally divided between Whigs and Democrats. At the next session of the legislature, with a Democratic house majority and an equally divided senate, Bright was chosen as junior senator from Indiana to serve with Edward A. Hannegan in Washington.

By 1845 Bright had made himself absolute boss of the Democratic party in Indiana. His sentiments were typically those of a section which was largely composed of "loud, boastful Jacksonian Democrats," who were in religion old-fashioned Baptists and shouting Methodists. Many of these people were from the South and had Southern sympathies, including keeping of Negro bondsmen themselves.⁶

On December 27, 1845, Jesse Bright took his seat in the Senate. He was sympathetic to the institution of slavery and in the debate over the Compromise of 1850 he spoke out to urge tolerance, forbearance, patience and justice on the part of the two extremes. Mr. Bright's greatest

influence was felt in private conversation and in committee work. He did not make many public addresses.⁷ Bright's voting record was influenced by the wishes of his constituents who were largely pro-slavery in their sympathies.

Jesse Bright was reelected to the United States Senate on January 11, 1851, and became one of the outstanding Democratic leaders of the Senate. Speaking in Congress on the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, Bright declared that at least nine-tenths of the voters of Indiana supported him in approving compromise measures and in opposing and repudiating Disunionists South and Abolitionists North.⁸

The close election of 1857 resulted in a divided legislature and in a dispute over the election of Jesse D. Bright and Graham N. Fitch as senators as has been explained previously.

When the struggle for the admission of Kansas began, Bright urged its admission under the Lecompton Constitution adopted by the pro-slavery faction in the Know-Nothing territory, and thus brought upon himself the unreserved enmity of Stephen A. Douglas, who led the opposition to the Lecompton Constitution.

In the period of secession and in the early days of the Civil War, Bright declared himself unwilling to vote either men or money to invade the states which had declared themselves out of the Union, until every effort at compromise had been exhausted. Bright and other Democratic members of the Congress were often accused of being obstructionists, and even traitors. Many withdrew from the Senate and others were accused of treason in the hope that they might be expelled. Senator Bright was one of those

attacked. On December 16, 1861, Morton W. Wilkinson, a senator from Minnesota, introduced a resolution for the expulsion of Jesse D. Bright. The evidence furnished as proof of his treason was a letter to Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy.⁹

Bright at first offered no comment in his defense and the matter was turned over to the Judiciary Committee. Considerable debate ensued in which Bright's critics denounced him as having betrayed his trust as a United States senator while his defenders pointed out that the most that could be said about the letter was that it was indiscreet but certainly not treasonable. Among his attackers was Henry S. Lane who had contested Bright's seat three years before. On February 5, Bright began an impressive defense of himself. He expressed himself as being a victim of a partisan attack based on political motives. When his speech was concluded, he went to the office of the Public Land Commission where he received the result of the vote of 32 for expulsion and 14 against it. Thus ended the career of Jesse D. Bright as a Senator.¹⁰

A Unionist who had been prominent in Democratic politics was Joseph Albert Wright, who was both Representative and Senator from Indiana. He was born in Washington, Pennsylvania, on April 17, 1810, and moved to Indiana about 1820 with his parents, who settled in Bloomington in 1825. Having chosen law as his profession, he commenced practice in Rockville, Parke County, Indiana, in 1829. In 1833 he became a member of the state House of Representatives and then served in the state Senate in 1840. Elected as a Democrat to the Twenty-eighth Congress, he served from March 4, 1843, to March 3, 1845. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in

1844 to the Twenty-ninth Congress. Mr. Wright held the governorship in Indiana from 1849 until 1857. He was appointed by President Buchanan as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Prussia in June, 1857, in which position he served until July, 1861.¹¹

On September 7, 1865, the citizens of Indianapolis gave Mr. Wright a reception on his return from Prussia on which occasion the chief address was delivered by General Ebenezer Dumont. This address, quoted by both the Indianapolis Daily Journal and the Sentinel of April 9, 1861, gave prominence to a letter written by Mr. Wright from Prussia in which he had declared the necessity for the Government's dealing firmly with the rebels. Mr. Wright urged that any individual who attacked the Union should be struck down as a traitor and a rebel. This testimony of Mr. Wright's loyalty to the Union cause, his outspoken support of the war effort, and his apparent lack of sympathy for the rebels led to his appointment by Governor Oliver P. Morton to fill the Senate seat left vacant by the expulsion of Senator Jesse D. Bright. This choice by the Governor of a Democrat turned Unionist, while severely criticized in some quarters, did much to strengthen the Union cause. Mr. Wright served in the Thirty-seventh Congress from February 24, 1862, to January 4, 1863.¹²

Although Wright favored the preservation of the Union, on the slavery question he favored a policy of non-interference and supported the view that emancipation would bring many unwanted Negroes into Indiana.

Appearing on the scene briefly to fill the unexpired term of expelled Jesse D. Bright, David Turpie, Democratic Senator from Indiana, was regarded as a moderate because of his support of the war effort. He was born in

Hamilton County, Ohio, on July 8, 1828. The family later moved to Lafayette, Indiana. Turpie's early career as a lawyer began in Monticello, Indiana, where in 1852 he was persuaded by a group headed by a former client to run for the legislature. With some misgivings he finally agreed and was nominated by acclamation in the two county Democratic conventions held at Oxford, the county seat of Benton County, with both Democrats and Whigs pledged to his support. His campaign was culminated with success and his career in the General Assembly began in January, 1853. Not a candidate in 1854, Turpie nonetheless was active in the campaign against the opposition, then called the People's party. In 1858 David Turpie was again elected to the legislature as a Democrat in a Whig district.

The Democratic convention of 1860 nominated Thomas A. Hendricks for governor and David Turpie for lieutenant governor to run against Henry S. Lane and Oliver P. Morton. Although the Republican candidates were elected both Mr. Hendricks and Mr. Turpie were later to succeed to the senatorship.

In July, 1862, Turpie was unanimously nominated by the Democratic convention of the Ninth District as a candidate for Congress against Schuyler Colfax. As was customary the two candidates stumped the district in joint debates. It was in this 1862 election that Mr. Turpie was defeated by Colfax although the Democrats carried the state and the legislature.

A partisan clash of major proportions developed over the need to elect a United States Senator for the unexpired term of Jesse Bright and a Senator for the new term in March. The Republican effort to pass a resolution that no man be elected to office by the Legislature who did not favor a vigorous prosecution of the war and who was not unalterably opposed to the

severance of any state or states from the Union was the signal for trouble to begin. Some Democrats felt that the resolution cast a reflection on their loyalty. The Republicans then resorted to the strategy of absenting themselves from the Senate to prevent a quorum and thereby blocked action upon a proposal for a joint session for electing the Senators. This bolt continued for two days and was met by bitter criticism from Democrats and even from many Republicans. The Democrats threatened that all legislative action would be impossible if the Republicans did not carry through with the election. The Republicans yielded, and on January 14, 1863, David Turpie was elected for the unexpired term of Bright, while Thomas A. Hendricks was elected for the long term.¹⁴ Turpie's service was limited to the brief period he spent in the Thirty-seventh Congress.

One of the most important men in Republican ranks was Schuyler Colfax, who was born in New York City on March 23, 1823. He came from good stock as his grandfather, General William Colfax, was a Revolutionary War general, a member of Washington's life guard, a corps of selected men, of which group he became the commander near the close of the war. William Colfax married Hester Schuyler, a cousin of General Phillip Schuyler. Their son was Schuyler Colfax, father of Representative Schuyler Colfax. In 1841, Colfax moved to South Bend from New Carlisle, Indiana, where the family had settled in 1836.

Quite early Colfax manifested an interest in journalism and after gaining some experience as a reporter on the Indiana State Journal, he was persuaded to act as principal editor of the South Bend Press, a Whig newspaper. This same newspaper was purchased in 1845 with the help of a friend, Albert

W. West, and the paper with Colfax as editor was named the St. Joseph Valley Register. In the columns of this newspaper he announced his views on the slavery issue. He was opposed to the extension of slave territory and was eager for the day when the Southern states would see fit to adopt some feasible plan of emancipation.¹⁵

In 1848 Mr. Colfax was chosen as delegate to the National Whig convention of which he was made secretary. In 1850 he was elected a member of the Indiana Constitutional convention. He became the Whig candidate for Congress in 1850 from the Ninth Congressional District and participated in a series of joint debates with his opponent, Dr. Graham N. Fitch of Logansport. Popular disapproval of Colfax's vote in the Constitutional convention for free admission of Negroes to the state was no doubt a factor in his defeat.¹⁶

The question of Negro suffrage had also been an important point discussed at the Constitutional convention. The delegate from St. Joseph introduced, on October 26, a resolution that the committee on elective franchise be instructed to investigate the feasibility of submitting a separate amendment to the people on the question of Negro suffrage. Schuyler Colfax, at the time was not in favor of it, but thought that the question should be submitted to the voters separately. He realized that if such a provision were included in the body of the Constitution, it would not be ratified or adopted. He further felt that this was a matter on which the voters should have an opportunity to express themselves. If not given such an opportunity, he estimated that from five to ten thousand, who favored Negro suffrage, might vote against the Constitution as a matter of principle. Colfax's proposal was voted down 62 to 60.

Colfax, in the same 1850 convention, as has been previously said, placed himself on the unpopular side of the controversial proposals to prevent Negroes from coming into the state and from acquiring property in the state. He became the champion of the colored minority in the debate which ensued, pleading that the inalienable right of all men to possess property had been granted by the Indiana Constitution in 1816. He declared, "The Negro is either a man or a brute, and should be treated as one or the other. We ask you to treat them with humanity and not to crush them as you would do vermin out of your sight." He further declared that he hoped to see the time come when, as in England, the slaves would become forever free. Mr. Colfax could at least reconcile himself with a partial victory as the provision to exclude Negro immigration into the state was included in the constitution without the clause restricting colored persons from owning property.¹⁷

During the exciting days when the Nebraska question was being debated, Colfax took the position that slavery should not be extended into the territories. He at this time was a Know-Nothing though he chose to deny it.¹⁸ At the convention of anti-Nebraska men which met at Indianapolis July 13, 1854, a movement which led to the formation of the People's party, Mr. Colfax was nominated for Congress to run against Mr. Eddy, a Democrat from the Ninth District, who was already seated in the House and who ran on a platform which endorsed the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Colfax was congratulated for his victory over his opponent by Godlove S. Orth, Know-Nothing leader in Indiana, who was elated that Mr. Colfax, one of those endorsed by the Know-Nothings, should have been nominated by the People's party and elected.¹⁹

While serving in the Congress Colfax took a stand in favor of abolition and confiscation. When General Fremont, commanding in Missouri, got into difficulty by declaring the slaves of all rebels emancipated, Mr. Colfax

wrote to President Lincoln expressing his belief that the loyal men of all parties were in favor of Fremont's action. Of the Emancipation Proclamation he said, "The President under the war power vested in him has struck a blow at slavery for which the world had waited so long."

As to the admission of West Virginia Mr. Colfax said, "I confess, also, that I shall welcome it now with peculiar pleasure when I see that her people have provided for the ultimate extinction of slavery, and when she comes here knocking at our door with the tiara of freedom on her brow."²⁰

In a letter to the Republican convention preceding the campaign of 1862 he endorsed the national administration's policy of confiscation of rebel property and declared himself in favor of striking at slavery as the "cause of all our woes" in every way possible including the amendment of the Constitution.²¹

One of the events of Mr. Colfax's career while Speaker of the House was his privilege to sign the proposed Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. This measure had passed the Senate but in the previous session had failed to get the necessary two-thirds in the House. Upon the pleas of President Lincoln for reconsideration of the amendment it was supported by a vote of 119 to 65. Mr. Colfax personally requested that his vote as Speaker be recorded among the affirmative votes so that he might represent the sentiments of his district. He later in a letter to his friend, Francis Leber, said, "I would not have missed recording my vote for the great measure of Freedom, for all the honors of a dozen Speakerships."²²

On December 5, 1863, Colfax had been named Speaker of the House by acclamation. A letter from a constituent of Mr. Colfax, copied from the LaPorte Union of March 3, which was included in an editorial in the

St. Joseph Valley Register, revealed the high regard in which he was held by his fellow Hoosiers. The letter commended Representative Colfax as the best presiding officer its writer had ever seen in the chair, an honor to his district and state, who should be returned to the next Congress.²³

One of the more conservative members of the Thirty-seventh Congress was William McKee Dunn, a prominent Republican. He was born in Hanover, Jefferson County, Territory of Indiana, on December 12, 1814. Mr. Dunn was first a Whig and then on dissolution of that party, a Republican. He became a member of the state House of Representatives in 1848 as a Whig and was a delegate to the state convention in 1850.

Mr. Dunn's views on the extension of slavery into the Mexican Cession territory are expressed in a minority report made by him in the Indiana legislature in 1849.²⁴ In this report we find him joined by George W. Julian and G.W. Blakemore who based their objection to the majority report on the fact that it did not assert the power of Congress to exclude slavery from the Mexican Cession territory by legislative enactment. They complained that the recommendation to Senators and Representatives to vote for a joint resolution recognizing the territory to be free and to use all constitutional means to keep it free was inadequate. They declared that without restraint or limitation the territorial legislature should have the power to legislate on the subject of slavery as well as on all other subjects. If such power were withheld, the minority contended that, since a large portion of the territory was adapted both by soil and climate to slave labor, they feared that settlers would soon establish slavery there, being accustomed to this institution. Mr. Dunn made a fervent plea for Congressional regulation of slavery's extension into the territories, a power which he declared was undeniably invested in the Congress. He further urged the application of the

sixth section of the Ordinance of 1787 by which Indiana had been kept free. The report made no proposal for interference with slavery where it legally existed and therefore Dunn could support it with good conscience.²⁵

Following the constitutional convention of 1850 and until 1858, Mr. Dunn engaged in the legal profession and due to his interest in public affairs frequently spoke out on public questions. He expressed his indignation at the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and was antagonized at the Dred Scott Decision. His outspoken criticism of President Buchanan's administration placed him at the head of the opposition and led to his nomination in the summer of 1858 to represent his district in Congress. The 9,363 votes which he received gave him a seat in the Thirty-seventh Congress.

Although it was unusual for a newly elected congressman to become prominent in the affairs of the House in his first term, Mr. Dunn soon became a conspicuous and vocal member of the Republican side of the House. He was regarded as one of the more conservative members of the Republican delegation in this Congress as he was in favor of a war only for the restoration of the Union. His record gave evidence that he was consistently opposed to the extension of slavery into the territories and that he was opposed to making slavery the sole object of the war.²⁶ He favored abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, but advocated gradual emancipation and the compensation of slave owners. He advocated colonization of freed Negroes and on December 4, 1861, introduced a resolution for the colonization of "freed persons of African descent."

Representative Dunn's conversation is described by his congressional colleague, George W. Julian, who said, "Always an incorrigible conservative,

Mr. Dunn was a Kentuckian of the Border State School and although a friend of mine and a very upright and gentlemanly man, he had a genius for being on the wrong side of vital questions during the war. Speaker Colfax used to say laughingly that in determining his own course he first made it a point to find where McKee Dunn stood; and then having ascertained Julian's position, he always took the middle ground, feeling perfectly sure that he was right."²⁷

During the summer and fall of 1862 it became increasingly apparent that the Government must use all of its authority and power to put down the rebellion. Congressman Dunn consequently threw off his conservatism and then the Congress met in December, he became the advocate of what was considered extreme measures to destroy the Southern armies and to bring the citizens of the rebellious states under the authority and laws of the Union. This led him to advocate rigid execution of confiscation laws and to support a bill for the enlistment of Negroes into the army.²⁸ Mr. Dunn's last speech in the Congress was delivered on February 24, 1863, a few days before the close of his term. In this speech he advocated that extraordinary powers be granted the President to conscript men for the army so that the rebellion might be suppressed and the Union saved. This speech coming from one long noted for his conservatism, was greatly influential in the House and the country.²⁹

Mr. Dunn's bid for reelection to the Thirty-eighth Congress was defeated by Democrat Henry W. Harrington. His defeat was attributable to an accumulation of factors so disastrous to the Republican cause in 1862. The reverses to Union arms had made the war unpopular with many. Mr. Dunn's endorsement of the President's Emancipation Proclamation and his support of

the Conscription Act, which were both bitterly opposed in Southern Indiana, aided in his downfall. This was a fate which he shared with many who had acted with him in the Congress.

Of less prominence was Republican Representative William Mitchell. Little information is available on his life and speeches or of other important contributions made by him to the business of the Congress. Perhaps, after having served his first term of apprenticeship as a Congressman, he might have made more concrete contributions to the Thirty-eighth Congress, had not his bid for reelection been defeated.

Mr. Mitchell was born in Root, Montgomery County, New York, on January 19, 1807. He attended the public schools, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1836. He moved to Kendallville, Noble County, Indiana, and commenced the practice of law. He became a member of the state House of Representatives in 1841. We have no record of his political affiliation at this time.

In 1860 he was elected to the Thirty-seventh Congress as a Republican. He was regarded as a firm supporter of the Union who raised many troops for the Union's cause and who contributed both means and labor for its support.³⁰

Albert Gallatin Porter, a Republican of Democratic antecedents and a staunch conservative, was born in Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Indiana, on April 20, 1824. He studied law, commencing practice in Indianapolis.

During the days of the slavery agitation which had caused a breaking up of party lines and because of the pro-slavery inclinations of the Democratic party, many anti-slavery Democrats broke away from the party and

affiliated themselves with the new Republican party. Among those who followed Oliver P. Morton's lead in this action was Albert G. Porter. Mr. Porter actively campaigned for Mr. Fremont in 1856 and in 1858 was nominated by the Republicans for the Sixth District for Congress. In the congressional debates which followed he supported all measures for the prosecution of the war and opposed any compromise not based on an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Federal Government. He was renominated by acclamation in 1860 and re-elected by an increased majority. He declined a renomination for a third term being compelled by economic necessity to return to the practice of law to provide a living for his family.

In the Congress Mr. Porter stood for the use of money derived from wide scale confiscation in the South where the masters were Democrats. On the matter of Negro equality Mr. Porter reflected the prevailing attitude of his Southern Indiana constituents as he replied to a critical colleague thus: "It is not probable, sir, with the prejudices of my early education that I would be too likely to have great sympathy for Negroes. In Indiana we have adopted a constitutional provision that no Negro, whether he be bound or free, shall be allowed to come within its limits. Why was this provision adopted? Because it was believed that Negro labor should not be suffered to come into competition with white labor in Indiana. What is the policy of the Republican party? It is to exclude slavery from the territory for that identical reason; and in the canvass I made in the Sixth district of Indiana, I always took that position. I never advocated the position that Negroes should be put on an equal socially or politically with the white race. My colleague knows very well that the Republicans of Indiana advocate no such doctrine. He knows full well that we put our advocacy of the

exclusion of Negroes upon the same ground upon which it was put in our state convention,--that Negro labor should not be allowed to come into competition with white labor in the territories."³¹

On February 19, 1861, he further gave his views on slavery in a state of the Union address to the Congress. He was prompted to urge concession as he expressed his reaction to the report of the Committee of Thirty-three. He pointed out that the framers of the Constitution had treated slavery as an institution to be tolerated but not fostered by the Federal Government. While they recognized its existence and protected it against external interference, they discouraged its extension leaving its regulation to local law. Thus, he declared, had they dealt with the situation as it existed. In this war crisis he urged the use of justice and mutual concession for the purpose or cooling angry passions. The assumption of the Constitution that slavery would gradually disappear by state regulation had not been realized, he asserts, because of the increased production of a society which owed its culture to slave labor. This evil therefore became fastened as a necessity on the economy of the South. Now that the increase of the slave population with its importance to pecuniary considerations had interwoven with the social system and industrial structure of the South, any attempt to interfere with slavery could only be regarded by the South as a threat to its way of life. The resulting reaction had been secession and violence.³²

Mr. Porter believed that the fears of the South would only be allayed by a constitutional amendment which would plainly guarantee protection for its slave system, a guarantee offered by the proposal of the Committee of Thirty-three. He urged that this amendment be submitted to the people for approval. This change in the Constitution which would protect the South

against interference with its domestic policy together with a strong guarantee for the return of the fugitive slaves would be important steps toward restoring harmony and concord. The amendment would also assure the South that the Republican party had no intention of interfering with the South's domestic situation and that it would make it apparent that the territorial controversy could be settled by allowing the conditions of soil and climate to determine whether slavery should exist in a territory. Even though Mr. Porter had joined the Republicans, he held on to his traditionally Democratic pro-slavery sympathies. He reproached the South, however, for its policy of perpetual agitation and for the extension of slavery into all territories without regard for soil or climate.

He concluded with an expression of optimism for an imminent reconciliation for union and peace in which all but two or three states would join.³³

One of the more radical Republicans was John Peter Cleaver Shanks, Representative from Indiana, who was born in Martinsburg, Virginia (now West Virginia), on June 17, 1826. His father left Virginia in 1839 on account of opposition to slavery. On the June day of their departure, John, then a thirteen year old boy, walked with his father near a field where he saw poorly clad slave women working under the supervision of a well dressed white man who encouraged their labors with the whip in his hand. His father commented on the repulsive scene and explained that those slaves were of a class of robust slave women especially selected by farmers in the more northern and healthier slave states for the purpose of breeding a supply of slaves for regions farther south. This revolting practice was regularly followed just as northern farmers chose the finest specimens of breeding animals from which to supply the market demand for cattle, horses, hogs and

mules. He pointed out that this vicious system caused the separation of husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, whenever the master's desire for gain might prompt their sale. He deplored the fact that such a "foul" blot should darken the land of Bibles, churches, and professed Christians in an age of civilization under a professed free government." This was his reason, he told the boy, for fleeing with his family from this "moral Sodom" before it was too late. He further predicted to young John that war would be the inevitable result of the great crime of slavery, if not in his lifetime then certainly in the future. The words of his father made a great impression on the young Shanks and created in him an abhorrence of slavery and of every form of oppression. It made him the friend of the Negro, the poor and oppressed, as he explained in later years.³⁴ Such a disgusting scene, which gave evidence that the slave system had reduced Negroes to the animal level and which gave proof also of the degradation of both master and slave, could not but have been a brutal disillusionment for a young and impressionable mind, an impression which would have a lasting effect of the formation of his character and future actions.

The family settled in the wilds of Jay County, Indiana. As a young man in 1849, Shanks began the practice of law in Portland, Indiana. He entered the field of politics as a Whig and was elected to the Indiana legislature in 1853. In 1856 he aided in the organization of the Republican party. He did not claim "infallibility" for his party but declared that its most important mistakes were those of omission.³⁵

Mr. Shanks voluntarily fought in the first battle of Bull Run in July, 1861. He declined an appointment by President Lincoln as a

brigadier-general because he said that his experience at Bull Run had demonstrated that promotions should be withheld until men proved that they were competent to command.

He accepted appointment on the staff of General Fremont and served with him in Missouri. When the general was relieved of his command, Shanks remained with his successor, General Hunter, until the reassembling of Congress.

Mr. Shanks was elected as a Republican to the Thirty-seventh Congress, serving from March 4, 1861, until March 3, 1863. On July 15, 1861, he introduced a resolution in the House to secure a record of names of all persons "who had held or who should hold office under the government having previously bound themselves by oath to support the Constitution of the United States and who had then engaged in rebellion against it." He believed that this roll of traitors would guarantee against such persons holding office thereafter and would furnish valuable evidence of the "kind of civilization that was bred of Southern slavery."

On December 20, 1861, Mr. Shanks offered another important resolution in the House in which he submitted that "the constitutional power to return fugitive slaves to their masters rested solely with the civil department of government and that the order of the Secretary of War December 6, 1861, to General Wool for the delivery of a slave to Mr. Jessup of Maryland as well as all their military orders for the return of the slaves are "assumptions of the military power over the civil law and the rights of the slave." This resolution was the first congressional action against the return of slaves. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee and became the basis for an article of war.

Mr. Shanks' personal courage was demonstrated in the election campaign of 1862. Warned by his friends not to come to the town of Hartford, Indiana, in his congressional district where he planned to make a campaign speech, he, accompanied by a fellow Republican, Joseph C. Maddox, came anyway. Before their arrival a mob had destroyed the ballot box and threats on Mr. Shanks' life were being made. Mr. Shanks had armed himself and in spite of the noise and protest, he spoke his mind freely and emphatically and denounced the conduct of the mob. He condemned them for their hesitation in the face of those counselling treason and for their refusal to provide the assistance for the soldiers of the Union armies. He shamed them for refusing to give material aid to the war effort and for their refusal to go to the battlefields themselves. Order was restored when troops were sent to the place.³⁷ Mr. Shanks went down to defeat along with many of his Republican colleagues but was later elected to the Fortieth and the three succeeding Congresses serving from March 4, 1867, to March 3, 1875.

Undoubtedly the most radical Republican member of the Indiana delegation in the Congress was George Washington Julian who was born on May 5, 1817, near Centreville, Wayne County, Indiana. His father and mother were natives of North Carolina who had migrated to Indiana in the early 1800's, being among the earliest settlers in the Indiana Territory. Julian was admitted to the bar in 1840 and soon began to take an interest in politics. Influenced chiefly by the writings of Dr. Channing, Julian became a staunch opponent of slavery.³⁸

George W. Julian began his political career as a Whig, casting his first presidential ballot for General Harrison in 1840. In 1849 he was elected to the Congress over the Honorable Samuel W. Parker as has been

previously mentioned. His first speech on the slavery question was delivered to the Thirty-first Congress on May 14, and was pervaded with the tone of uncompromising radicalism which made him unpopular in many quarters. This speech was widely copied by anti-slavery newspapers.³⁹

Mr. Julian deplored the situation which existed in his own state of Indiana where he accused both Democrats and Whigs of pledging to the suppression of anti-slavery sentiment. He referred to the state as an "outlying province of the empire of slavery." He claimed that the black codes instigated by Indiana's large Southern population "bore witness to their perfect loyalty to slave-holding tradition." He charged that even while Indiana was a territory her inhabitants had repeatedly sought the introduction of slavery, and declared that her black laws had disfigured her legislation from the beginning. He declared that her record had been made still blacker by the adoption of the 1850 Constitution with its thirteenth article which prevented Negroes from coming into the state while discouraging white men from letting them remain. He condemned the law which denied Negroes any share in the school fund while taxing them for its support, and the law which forbade them to testify in cases against white men thus placing them at the mercy of any "white villain who might take the precaution to perpetrate an outrage."⁴⁰ It was these convictions which first attracted him to the Free Soil party and then to the Republican party where he continued a relentless battle against the compromisers in the party.

In 1856 Mr. Julian came into prominence as vice-president of the National Republican Convention in Pittsburg, having become active in the movement to find a new party. He opposed fusion with Know-Nothingism and Douglasism and ever tried to strengthen the elements of radicalism in the party.⁴¹

In January 1861, Mr. Julian, having been elected as a Representative to the Thirty-seventh Congress, decided to satisfy his curiosity about the newly-elected Mr. Lincoln by visiting him at his home in Springfield. He explained that as a Free Soiler and a member of the radical wing of the Republican party he had misgivings about the man who as a Kentuckian and a conservative Whig had supported General Taylor and later General Scott at a time when the Whig party had sacrificed its principles "on the altar of slavery." He regarded Mr. Lincoln as a man who had secured the nomination through "the diplomacy of conservative Republicans" who had a marked dread of abolitionism. He was gratified to find that Mr. Lincoln was less reserved and more emphatic than he had anticipated.

Among the measures which Mr. Julian introduced and supported in the Thirty-seventh Congress were a bill to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 and a bill extending the Homestead law over lands of states of the South in restricted allotments to black and white. He supported measures such as confiscation of rebel property, arming of Negroes as soldiers, abolition, and complete enfranchisement of the freedmen.

Julian was one of the few Republicans with anti-slavery convictions who was able to stem the conservative tide of 1862 and be returned to the Congress. He was able to do this in spite of the intense hostility of Governor Morton and his friends throughout the State, nearly all of the politicians in the district, and nine of the Republican newspapers in the State.⁴²

George W. Julian was a man of high honor and integrity who was unwilling to sacrifice principle for popularity. The Indiana True Republican, in

commenting on his election, characterized him well as it praised his righteous opposition to slavery.⁴³

Julian was highly critical of President Lincoln for his willingness to have the institution of slavery preserved if this would preserve the Union and for pressing upon Congress a scheme of colonization in Chiriqui, Central America, a scheme which was espoused by Senator Pomeroy.⁴⁴

One of the most moving experiences of Mr. Julian's career was his opportunity of seeing the final passage of the bill for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting slavery. He described the event as "one of the grandest events of the century" and told vividly of "the packed galleries, the anxiety and suspense and the deathly stillness which pervaded the Chambers of Congress before it was known that the measure had finally passed. The cheering that rang out on that occasion surpassed all precedent and beggared all description," Mr. Julian tells us. He continued, "It seemed to me I had been born into a new life and that the world was overflowing with beauty and joy while I was inexpressibly thankful for the privilege of recording my name on so glorious a page of the nation's history." Mr. Julian also commented on the elation of the abolitionists who had not expected to see their efforts crowned with success in their own generation and told of their satisfaction at seeing, a few days later, Dr. Roch, a colored lawyer of Boston, being admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States when only a few years before this court had announced the Dred Scott Decision. This satisfaction was heightened when shortly thereafter the Rev. Garnett, a Negro, preached a sermon for the House. Mr. Julian concluded, "Evidently the Negro was coming to the front."⁴⁵

Mr. Julian continued as a staunch defender of Negro rights throughout his Congressional career which included his service in the Thirty-seventh and four succeeding Congresses.

A Republican of less prominence but a good party man who voted with his Republican colleagues on all the issues was Albert Smith White. He was born at the Clove near Washingtonville, Orange County, New York, on October 4, 1803. He was graduated from Union College, Schenectady, New York, in 1822. After coming to Indiana he was admitted to the bar in 1825 and began the practice of law after a brief period in Rushville and Paoli. He settled permanently in Tippecanoe County in 1829 and resided thereafter either at Lafayette or his farm near Stockwell.

He became assistant clerk of the state House of Representatives in 1830 and in 1831 clerk, a job which he held until 1835. He was an unsuccessful candidate for election in 1832 to the Twenty-third Congress. As a Whig he was elected to the Twenty-fifth Congress serving from March 4, 1837, until March 3, 1839.

In this Congress he introduced a few resolutions but did not enter into debate. He was not a candidate for renomination in the House in 1838 being involved with business interests as president of several railroads. Elected to the United States Senate he served from March 4, 1839, to March 3, 1845, declining the honor of being reelected. Instead he moved to Stockwell, Indiana, and resumed the practice of law. During this period he voted and acted with the conservative Whigs voting against the policy of Texas annexation in all its forms.

He was elected as a Republican to the Thirty-seventh Congress and served from March 4, 1861, until March 3, 1863. His most notable contributions to

this Congress were the introduction of a resolution to appoint a committee to propose a plan for gradually emancipating the slaves of the border states and the reporting of a bill for indemnifying owners of slaves in Maryland, Missouri and other border states. It was this bill which was said to have cost him his renomination, although the plan was supported by President Lincoln. He did not receive the nomination to the Thirty-eighth Congress, Godlove Orth being chosen instead as the Republican standard bearer.⁴⁶

James A. Cravens was one of the four Democrats included in the Indiana Congressional delegation elected in 1862. He together with his colleagues William S. Holman, John Law and Daniel W. Voorhees were truly representatives of conservative Democratic opinion in their championship of states rights, race prejudice, and the constitutional privileges of the South.

Mr. Cravens was born in Rockingham County, Virginia, on November 4, 1818. The family moved to Indiana in 1820, and settled near Hardinsburg, Madison Township, Washington County. Cravens entered politics in 1848 and in 1849 was elected a member of the state House of Representatives. He also served in the state Senate from 1850 to 1853.⁴⁷

As the threatening events of 1861 created concern about the future, in the event that peace and compromise should fail, some of the men of Southern Indiana considered the possibility of permanent division. One group believed that the most acceptable plan was to form a reconstructed union or a Northwestern Confederacy in alliance with the South. This plan presented economic advantages in that such an alliance would give the inhabitants of Southern Indiana access to the great rivers of the South while a Northern alliance would force them to use the more costly artificial transportation,

the railroads. Congressman Cravens was impressed with the soundness of this plan and expressed his views in a letter on April 7, 1861, to William H. English. He suggested a division of Indiana and Illinois to create a new state from the southern portions of the two states. The new state was to be called Jackson. He wrote, "I cannot obviate the fact that our interest is with the South and I cannot reconcile the separation."

Similar opinions were expressed by many of the inhabitants of the river counties, but when commerce on the Mississippi was temporarily interfered with, by the Confederates, anger gave impetus to the sentiment that the Union must be preserved by force.⁴⁸

As the war progressed Congressman Cravens and his Democratic colleagues were zealous in their support of the Union cause and endorsed an energetic war policy. Congressman Holman, in correspondence with Allen Hamilton on October 9, 1863, declared that, "The devotion of Congressman Cravens remains unsurpassed."⁴⁹

Mr. Cravens was reelected to the Thirty-eighth Congress where he served until March 3, 1865. He was not a candidate for re-nomination in 1864.

William Steele Holman, an outstanding Democratic and ultra conservative legislator, followed in the footsteps of his father, Jesse Lynch Holman, a prominent pioneer citizen of Indiana. William Steele Holman was born on September 6, 1822, at Vereastau, the ancestral homestead, near Aurora, Indiana. Having embarked on a political career he was named as a senatorial delegate to the state convention which had been called to revise the Indiana Constitution. This convention was overwhelmingly Democratic, -

including thirty-three Democrats and seventeen Whigs. One of the issues which became subject for debate was the resolution by James Rariden that the convention fully approve the famous Compromise of 1850 adopted by the National Congress. In the ensuing debate Mr. Holman said that he deplored the attempt of some members to make this a political issue or a question of party politics. He urged that they adopt the patriotic sentiments of the people of Indiana, "that knows no North, that knows no South, that knows nothing but the Union."

He warned that the "peculiar institution of slavery" was a menace to the Union which only the adoption of compromise measures could allay. Only the spirit of concession, he concluded, would be able to hold the Union together.⁵⁰

The reputation which Mr. Holman gained at this convention caused him to be elected to the lower house of the first General Assembly which met under the new Constitution. He served in 1851 and 1852.

In 1854 he was defeated as a Democratic candidate for Representative from the Fourth District. In 1856 his hopes were again dashed. His third attempt in 1858 was crowned with success and he was elected to the Thirty-sixth Congress. In expressing his views on the slavery controversy he urged a more conservative and more national policy and stated that he did not believe that Congress had the power to legislate on slavery because the subject was purely a domestic one. During the entire period of the Civil War, Holman was a Union man and was against acts of violence such as John Brown's raid. He had predicted that the attitude of the politicians at Washington would lead to open war. While he thought that slavery was the immediate cause of agitation, he felt that the basic issue was the attempt

of the Republican party to extend the power of the Federal Government as opposed to the Democratic party's effort to restrict that power to its Constitutional limits.

In the exciting campaign of 1860 Holman opposed the Bright group and threw his support to Stephen A. Douglas. He was renominated at this time by the Democratic party in the Fourth District of Indiana and was re-elected in October, 1860.

Mr. Holman thought that the dissolution of the Union could only result from the precipitate speech and action of "rash Southern leaders and arrogant Northern Republicans." He felt that compromise should be attempted and supported as a last resort, such as the Crittenden Plan, even though he did not wholeheartedly favor it. In this he had many assurances from his constituents in Indiana that they supported his opinions. In the middle of January, 1861, Holman finally conceded that the country was in the midst of a revolution but felt that the Government had no authority to use coercive measures. In December, 1861, he urged the Congress not to regard the war as one of conquest or subjugation but as one to preserve the Union. On the subject of slavery he urged that interference with it would be unwise and instead of promoting the country's interest would forever alienate the South. He also opposed the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.

Holman became a leader of Northern Democrats in the Thirty-eighth Congress. He offered a series of resolutions condemning the doctrine that the states of the Confederacy were out of the Union and should be held, in defeat, as territories or subjugated provinces. Neither did he believe that a Constitutional amendment was necessary to abolish slavery which he contended would be dead at the end of the war anyway.

When the last session of the Thirty-eighth Congress ended on March 3, 1865, William S. Holman withdrew from Congress for one term, having been defeated in his bid for renomination to the Thirty-ninth Congress.⁵¹

One of the most bitter assailants of the Republican administration was Democrat Daniel W. Voorhees, who was born September 26, 1827, in Butler County, Ohio. He was quite young when his parents moved to Fountain County, Indiana. Having made the law his profession he became affiliated in a law partnership in April, 1862, with Honorable Edward A. Hannegan, a former United States Senator from Indiana. In 1854 he was nominated by acclamation as Democratic candidate for Congress, in which contest he was defeated by his Republican opponent by only two hundred and thirty votes. It was in November, 1857, that Mr. Voorhees, upon the suggestion of Judge Huntington, moved to Terre Haute, in Vigo County, Indiana. Mr. Voorhees was successful in the Congressional elections of 1860 and 1862, although in the election of 1864 his election was successfully contested by his opponent, Henry D. Washburn.

Daniel Voorhees was noted for his intense race prejudice and was accused of being a disunionist. He denounced all schemes for emancipation as a betrayal of the promises made by the Republicans at the beginning of the War.⁵² His pro-Southern sympathies were severely criticized. A letter of criticism in the Daily Evening Gazette of February 10, 1863, as copied from the Richmond Virginia Dispatch accused Voorhees of Confederate sympathies and of admiration for General Stonewall Jackson.⁵³

Indiana Republicans heaped violent abuse on Mr. Voorhees and proclaimed him the representative man of Indiana "Copperheads." His angry attacks on

the policies of the President increased charges of his disloyalty although the Republicans could never find proof of this. Voorhees was eloquent, hot tempered and passionate in his partisanship. His championship of the Constitution and states rights and his confirmed race prejudices won the admiration of his constituents whose views he reflected.⁵⁴

The depressing Union military reverses of 1862 followed by the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation raised tension to the point where the army threatened to use force against Mr. Voorhees whom it branded as a domestic traitor.⁵⁵

Mr. Voorhees felt that the way of life which the founding fathers had established under the Constitution was being destroyed by the Republican administration and he sought to block the economic and social revolution which was taking place. His outspoken protests against these trends made him the "idol of Democracy of the Wabash Valley."⁵⁶

Another Democrat of conservative views, a good party man, was John Law who was born in New London, Connecticut, on October 28, 1796. He came of a distinguished family. His grandfather, Richard Law, was a member of the Continental Congress and it is interesting that three generations of Laws served in the Congress at the same time that three generations of Adams were also serving. John Law's grandfather, Richard Law, served with John Adams; the father of Judge Law served with John Quincy Adams and Judge Law himself sat with Charles Francis Adams. As a young man Law left his native state and came to Indiana, proceeding to Corydon. There in 1817 he was admitted to the bar. He then moved to Vincennes on December 15, 1817, and began to practice his profession. In his earlier years Judge Law was

a Whig, but during his last twenty-five years he was a Democrat, "a staunch party man who acted with the party on all political questions." Why he changed his party affiliation is not explained.⁵⁷

His colleague, Daniel Voorhees, in a speech delivered before the Terre Haute bar on October 10, 1873, shortly after the decease of Judge Law said in tribute to him:

"When I entered the Congress, twelve years ago last July, I there met Judge Law, as the senior member of the Indiana delegation...I rejoiced that he was my colleague, and always sought the benefit of his experience and ability...The period of his public service was stormy and bitter, yet I never knew Judge Law other than temperate, wise and just, both in his speeches and votes...He was regarded also with the highest respect and consideration by the members of the dominant party. They treated him with courtesy and deference on the floor, and made him a favorite in social life. Thaddeus Stevens, leader of the administration side of the House, held more friendly relations with Judge Law than with any other members of the minority in the Thirty-seventh and Thirty-eighth Congresses. Mr. Stevens was very harsh with and intolerant of inferior men, and bestowed his respect and friendship on but a few. He discovered in Judge Law those qualities which he most prized and for which he himself was so greatly distinguished --strong practical sense and an unbending devotion to the principles he espoused."⁵⁸

These were the men who represented Indiana in the Thirty-seventh Congress. Their backgrounds as were their beliefs were diverse and varied. Many reflected the beliefs inculcated in them in the environment in which

they grew up, having been born or having lived in a slave-holding state or in the southern part of Indiana where pro-slavery sentiment was prevalent. Senators Bright and Lane and Representatives Cravens, Holman, Law and Voorhees were good examples of this environmental influence. George W. Julian, also influenced by his constituency, found the Quaker population of his Whitewater district a bulwark of support for his abolitionist ideas. On the other hand, John P.C. Shanks, a Southerner by birth, was influenced by the unhappy recollections of his childhood about the vicious slave system to turn against this evil and to give his ardent support to anti-slavery principles.

All of these men, then, were to become actors in the tense drama which unfolded in the Congress in the years of 1861 to 1863. Some played a major role frequently engaging in debate and contributing to the business of the Congress. Others played but a minor part. Most of them were good party men with the Republicans supporting the administration while the Democrats denounced its policies and voted to obstruct passage of its measures.

CHAPTER IV

INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

March 4, 1863 - March 3, 1865)

Throughout the year of 1861 the Republican party continued to urge loyal Democrats to forget party affiliations and to join in the Union movement. Prominent among Democrats who joined this movement were Ebenezer Dumont and W.S. Holman. These men and others who followed this example were given prominence at the Union party meetings. Ex-Governor Wright joined with them when he returned from his assignment as minister to Prussia. Wright, Governor Morton, Henry S. Lane, Colfax, Ebenezer Dumont and Albert Porter were given special invitations to a Union meeting held in Indianapolis on September 17, 1861. This meeting stressed in a resolution the need to present a united front and to reject offers of peace and compromise. The truce between the parties did not last long. The Union party was clearly Republican dominated, and soon the Democrats, as the campaign of 1862 approached, were aiming the fire of their political oratory at the Unionists. The masses of the Indiana Democrats agreed with the outspoken sentiments of Hendricks and Voorhees and were not in sympathy with Wright. By 1862 party politics had been revived even though the Republicans in their state convention in 1862 still tried to keep the non-partisanship ideal alive by dropping the word "Republican" from their title and adopting the title "Unconditional Union Party."

The Democrats were fearful that the war might become an anti-slavery crusade and that the interests of the Abolitionists might be put before those of the whole country. The Democrats continued to play upon race prejudice in radical speeches in the campaign which followed. They attempted

to instill the fear that if abolition were effected, the freed Negroes would rush into Indiana and other northern states to furnish competition for white labor. Their utterances fell upon receptive ears as most Hoosiers were opposed to interfering with the institution of slavery where it was already established. Even the Republicans, with few exceptions, had little humanitarian interest in the Negro and were quick to protest any inclination toward greater Negro equality. This eagerness to disclaim any abolitionist sympathy increased as anxiety to appease the Border States grew.

The Democratic state Convention assembled in Indianapolis on January 8, 1862, in spite of the protests of those who doubted the wisdom of a party gathering at this time. Thomas A. Hendricks, as president of the convention and keynote speaker, deplored the Republican intrusion on civil liberty and its "violation of the Constitution." He, however, pledged loyal Democratic support for the prosecution of the war and the restoration of the Union.

All citizens without regard for party affiliations were invited to attend the Union party convention on June 18, 1862. The radicals of the party such as George W. Julian regarded the Union movement as a conservative effort to "surrender to the Democracy and to evade the real issue of the war." The radicals called it a "Morton-Wright plan to bring together the fag-ends of all the office seeking, plunder-grabbing cliques of Indiana."¹

Typical editorial comment, critical of the Union movement, was found in the Daily Sentinel in which it was declared:

"The call for the Union State Convention is a confession of Republican weakness...is an acknowledgment that Republicanism is a failure. The

Republican party is to be abandoned, cast to the dogs, and in its stead a 'Union Party' is to be formed. The 'Union Party' movement is only a revival of the old dodge which the opponents of Democracy have resorted to for success. In 1854 and 1855 the same men who were figuring in the Know-Nothing organization, in the Temperance Party, in the People's Party are now leaders in the proposed Union Party."²

The more radical Republicans worked at local Union meetings to block passage of all compromise resolutions. They felt that the party could not afford to retreat from its anti-slavery position. Their efforts were viewed with alarm by Governor Morton.

The Conservatives gained control of the State convention. Governor Morton, as president of the convention, urged that party differences be buried until after the successful conclusion of the war and denounced the plot to divide southern Indiana from the northern part of the state in a Northwest Confederacy. Most of the other principal speakers were "War Democrats," whose influence was expected to draw in the Democratic masses. The nominations for state offices were also divided between Republicans and "War Democrats." The platform avoided all issues which might have stirred up dissension and reaffirmed the fact that war was for the restoration of the Union and not for the abolition of slavery. This idea had also been endorsed by the Democrats. The conservatives were clearly in control and the radical minority had been pushed into the background.

During the campaign of 1862, Governor Morton and other party leaders stressed the idea of non-partisanship. However, the drastic wartime measures which were being passed by the Congress alarmed many of the "War Democrats"

who deserted the Unionist ranks in increasingly large numbers. The Sentinel voiced the popular Democratic sentiment as it pointed out that the Republicans had violated the pledges made in the House on February 11, 1861, when they had resolved that "neither the Federal Government nor the people of governments of the non-slave holding states have a purpose or a constitutional right to legislate upon or interfere with slaveholding in any of the states of the Union; and that they had further resolved that those persons in the North who do not subscribe to the foregoing proposition are too insignificant in number and influence to excite the serious attention or alarm of any portion of the people of this Republic." The editorial concluded bitterly that in "presenting, advocating and voting for legislation to interfere with slavery" the Republican majority had demonstrated their bad faith and lack of integrity. This, the editorial declared, is "neither honesty, sagacity, nor regard for the Constitution."³

Among the most alarming events of 1862 was the President's suspension, in September, of the writ of habeas corpus for all persons charged with disloyal practices and their subjugation to the "arbitrary process of martial law." Even more shocking to Indiana Democrats was the fact that several of their candidates were among those arrested.⁴

Military reverses to Union arms added to the growing spirit of discontent. The failure of General McClellan's campaign against Richmond and the operations of General Stonewall Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley were sources of discouragement. The President's calls for additional troops were met unenthusiastically. Conflict over the Government's policy toward slavery became more bitter. Congressman William M. Dunn warned that the

abolition of slavery would destroy the Union forever and warned that he would "fight the Northern fanatics at every step."⁵

Mr. Lincoln's request for compensated emancipation, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the exclusion of slavery from the territories in June, and the passage of a second Confiscation Act in July by the Congress confirmed the Democratic fears that the radicals were in power in that body. That their constituents might be informed, the Sentinel carried the record of the votes of the Indiana delegation on emancipation in the District of Columbia. It recorded among the "yeas" Colfax, Dunn, Julian, Mitchell, Porter and White. Among the "nays" were Cravens, Law and Voorhees. Holman and Shanks were listed as absent.⁶

A few days later the fears of the conservatives were fanned by the publication in the Sentinel of a list of measures introduced into the Congress for the benefit of the Negro. This list, copied from the Cincinnati Enquirer, included:

1. The recognition of the Negro Empire of Haiti.
2. The abolition of Negro slavery in the District of Columbia.
3. The prohibition of army officers from returning fugitive slaves.
4. A proposal to establish a plantation for free Negroes in South Carolina to be supported by taxation of the North.
5. The proposal to aid states to abolish Negro slavery by taxing the people of the North for funds to compensate the slave owners for their losses.
6. The proposal to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law.
7. The proposal to repeal the law which prevented Negroes from becoming stage drivers for carrying U.S. mail.
8. The proposal to prohibit slave owners from taking their slaves into the Arizona Territory.
9. Other measures of a similar kind not fully matured,

The article actually concluded "that by the time the body gives them full discussion, it will have little leisure to consider the interests of the white man."⁷

The radicals of the Republican party were encouraged by these events to demand general emancipation. George W. Julian continued his battle against the conservatives and radicals renewed their attack on Senator Wright for his opposition to emancipation.⁸ Even Schuyler Colfax put himself on the side of the radicals in announcing his support of abolition and confiscation.⁹ The Indianapolis Sentinel voiced its alarm in an editorial which condemned a speech of Wendell Phillips who was referred to as "the Yankee Abolitionist." This article described the Abolitionist program as one not only of freedom but equality for the Negro which had adopted the slogan "no black, no white, one law impartial over all; an empire stretching from the Lakes to the Gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; every race, every man free." The article concluded: "Are the people of Indiana ready for the Negro feast? We think not! They will sink this abolitionist humbugery so deep the first time they get a chance to strike it, that even the hands of the resurrectionists cannot reach it."¹⁰

The issuance of a preliminary emancipation proclamation by the President on September 22, further decreased the number of "war Democrats" in the Union ranks. The Republicans were then forced to resort to the strategy of accusing the Democrats of disloyalty, a charge which the Democrats vehemently denied. Senator Hendricks frequently announced that it was the duty of all to support the war effort.¹¹

The lagging enlistments for the army caused the President on July 17, authorized by an act of Congress, to call out the militia in the various

states and to apply a draft on them if necessary. Another call for troops went out on August 4. Indiana proceeded with her plans for the execution of the unpopular draft which had been delayed by Governor Morton as long as possible. He was forced to take action on this matter on October 6, in order to draft 3,003 additional men. This was inopportune only a few days before the state election of October 14.

Voters, influenced by the turn of events, ignored the predictions of party spokesmen who said that the defeat of the Republican party would secure the success of the rebellion. They cast their votes which resulted in the election of seven Democrats in the eleven Congressional districts. Republicanism had been repudiated.

Democrats returned to the House were James A. Cravens, Daniel Voorhees, John Law and W.S. Holman. Ebenezer Dumont, Unionist of Democratic antecedents, was also elected. Newly elected Democrats included J.K. Edgerton, Henry W. Harrington and James A. McDowell.

The Republicans elected were Schuyler Colfax, George W. Julian and Godlove Orth who succeeded Albert S. White.

The first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress convened from December 7, 1863, until July 4, 1864. The second session was in progress from December 5, 1864, until March 3, 1865, and a special session of the Senate met from March 4, 1863, until March 4, 1864. The speaker of the House was Schuyler Colfax of Indiana.

On January 14, 1863, the Democratic majority in the state legislature elected Thomas A. Hendricks as Democratic senator from Indiana in the

Thirty-eighth Congress, one of the stalwarts of the party, a man who had a long and varied political career. Mr. Hendricks was born near Zanesville, Ohio, on September 7, 1819. He moved with his parents to Madison, Indiana, and from there in 1832 to Shelby County, Pennsylvania, and was admitted to the bar in 1843. Mr. Hendricks commenced his law practice in Shelbyville, Indiana, and began his political career in 1848, as a member of the state House of Representatives. In 1849 he served in the state Senate and was a member of the state Constitutional Convention of 1851. He was elected as a Democrat to the Thirty-second and Thirty-third Congresses serving from March 4, 1851, until March 3, 1855. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1854 to the Thirty-fourth Congress. He was frankly desirous for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination which was unanimously bestowed upon him by the Democratic State Convention of 1860. The campaign began early with Colonel Henry S. Lane and Mr. Hendricks beginning to canvas the state and engaging in debate before immense crowds. While both men were very effective speakers, their styles were quite dissimilar, Hendricks being the "logician, argumentative, persuasive and generally sarcastic" while Lane was "fluent, fervid, fiery, abounding in anecdote and illustration."¹²

Swept down in a tide of defeat which overwhelmed a Democratic party, weakened by dissension within its ranks, Mr. Hendricks was nevertheless many thousand votes stronger in the state than his party ticket.

The Democratic Convention of 1862 by acclamation made Mr. Hendricks permanent president in which capacity he delivered an address on the policy of the country toward slavery. He expressed himself as being opposed to emancipation as a war measure which could be adopted only as a means to

destroy the South, but not to restore the Union. He also opposed this policy on economic grounds as "the destruction of Southern labor and the ruin of our rich trade and the value of our products."¹³ He believed that Republican policies would destroy the production in the South which had encouraged its business men to buy in Northern markets. He further spoke out against arming Negroes as a danger to stirring up servile insurrection in the South. Ironically these same opinions were held by all except the extreme abolitionist wing of the Republican party. Mr. Hendricks' views were compatible with the planks of the Democratic platform which proclaimed that the Democratic party was "utterly opposed to the twin heresies of Northern sectionalism and Southern secession." The platform had made it clear that every effort would be turned to sustaining the Constitution and the Union under the Constitution but the party would oppose a war for the abolition of slavery and the subjugation of the Southern states.¹⁴

On January 14, 1863, the Democratic legislature chose Thomas A. Hendricks to succeed David Turpie who had completed the remainder of the term of Bright and Wright. Mr. Hendricks succeeded to office on March 4 for the full period of six years. These years were among the most critical of our history with the problems of a Civil War, the restoration of the Union, and the emancipation of slave population. We shall see that Mr. Hendricks' views on such issues as the use of Negro troops, the Thirteenth Amendment and other controversial topics were consistent with those of his party which was opposed to such measures.

The Sixth District sent as its representative to the Thirty-eighth Congress a Unionist, Ebenezer Dumont. Mr. Dumont was born in Vevay, Indiana, on November 20, 1814. He received a classical education at Indiana

University after which he studied law. He was admitted to the bar and began the practice of law at Vevay.

His political career began when he became a member of the state House of Representatives in 1838. After serving as an officer in the Mexican War, his political career was continued when he became a member of the state House of Representatives from 1850 until 1853. In 1852 he was an elector on the Democratic ticket of Pierce and King. Mr. Dumont retained his affiliation with the Democratic party until the Civil War broke out at which time he joined the Union movement and tendered his services to Governor Morton by whom he was accepted.

He was appointed a colonel of the Seventh Indiana Volunteers and participated in the battle of Philippi, West Virginia. Appointed a brigadier-general by President Lincoln he was assigned to command a brigade in Tennessee and was in charge of a brigade at the battle of Murfreesboro. After the battle he was assigned to command troops at Nashville, from whence he led an expedition against John Morgan capturing nearly his whole command.

In 1862 when the men of the Sixth District met in convention they showed their appreciation for Mr. Dumont's devotion to his country by nominating him as their candidate for the Thirty-eighth Congress. He was re-elected to the Thirty-ninth Congress but was not a candidate for renomination in 1866.¹⁵

On the slavery question, Mr. Dumont was one of the more liberal Unionists. He expressed his views on this subject in a lengthy speech on the conduct of the war which he delivered in the House on March 12, 1864. He favored humane treatment of the Negro troops and was highly critical of

of many of the transplanted Southerners who had settled in Indiana and who had brought their prejudices against the Negro with them, prejudices deeply implanted within them by the bitter experiences in a slave system which had kept them on the bottom rung of the economic ladder.¹⁶

Godlove S. Orth, considered one of the more radical Republicans elected in 1862, was born near Lebanon, Pennsylvania, on April 22, 1817, of a Mcravian family. He was educated at Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, and on leaving it, he studied law. He was admitted to the bar in 1839 and began practice in Lafayette, Indiana, where he soon won a reputation for eloquence and ability which placed him in the front rank of his profession. He made his first appearance as a public speaker during the Harrison campaign of 1840. At that time Mr. Orth was an ardent and enthusiastic Whig.

He was elected in 1843 to the Indiana Senate from Tippecanoe County and was reelected in 1846 to a second three-year term. In 1848 he was a candidate for presidential elector on the Taylor and Fillmore ticket. At the close of his second term in the Senate Orth withdrew to private life to engage in the practice of law.

Godlove Orth was president of the Know-Nothing movement and letters written by him in 1854 and 1855 to his close friend, Schuyler Colfax, show the connection of both of these men to the organization. Some letters were written in code as Mr. Colfax, for some reason, was unwilling to have his interest in that movement disclosed. One letter written by Orth to Colfax stresses the importance of the Know-Nothing movement in these words: "We must not lose sight of the fact that while there is a strong anti-slavery feeling in the United States, there is also a strong American feeling--and both must be preserved and united if possible."¹⁷

Orth was deeply interested in the politics of his day and identified himself with the more radical element of his party. He was considered by some as second only to George W. Julian in his radicalism. His opposition to slavery was intense and outspoken, particularly after the period of compromise increased Southern aggressiveness. In 1861 he represented Indiana as one of the five commissioners appointed by Governor Morton to represent Indiana in the Peace Conference at Washington. His observations at the conference convinced him that any effort at compromise would be futile.¹⁸

His hope that the further extension of slavery would be checked was expressed in a speech in which he declared that the nation must stand by the Constitution and the laws of the land, denying that the South had a real grievance. This position, he felt, must be maintained even in the face of a threat of Civil War.¹⁹

From the outbreak of the Civil War, Mr. Orth was committed to the cause of preserving the Union. When sudden invasion threatened Indiana in the summer of 1862 and Governor Morton made the call for volunteers, Orth places his name first among two hundred Lafayette Volunteers. He was elected captain of the group and within twelve hours reported for duty in Indianapolis. Ordered to the Ohio River, he was placed in command of the United States ram "Horner" on which he did duty patrolling the river until his term of service expired.

In the fall of 1862 Mr. Orth was elected to the Thirty-eighth Congress. He replaced Albert S. White who had not accepted the Republican nomination. The Democratic opponent whom he had defeated was John Pettit, formerly senator from Indiana. Orth was assigned in the House by Speaker Colfax to

the committees of Foreign Affairs and the Freedman's Bureau. He was one of those who voted for the Thirteenth Amendment which abolished slavery, having worked diligently for the passage of this legislation. In the Thirty-ninth Congress he voted for District suffrage, the Freedman's Bureau and civil rights.²⁰

One of the Democrats elected in 1862 whose declarations staunchly supported his party's principles was Joseph Ketchum Edgerton who was born in Vincennes, Addison County, Vermont, on February 16, 1818. He attended the public schools of Clinton County, New York, and later studied law at Plattsburg Academy, New York. Admitted to the bar in 1839, he commenced the practice of law in New York City. In 1848 he moved to Fort Wayne, Indiana, where he continued to practice.

Mr. Edgerton was a Whig in politics until he was drawn to the Democratic Party by his belief in the constitutionality and patriotism of Stephen A. Douglas. He supported Mr. Douglas in the 1860 campaign. In 1862 Mr. Edgerton was elected to the Congress on the Democratic ticket from the Tenth District. He received 436 more votes than his Republican opponent, William Mitchell, who had been elected in 1860 by nearly a 3,000 majority. In the Thirty-eighth Congress Mr. Edgerton was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.²¹

Mr. Edgerton's views on the relation of the Federal Government to the slavery question were revealed in a speech made at Fort Wayne on October 30, 1860. In his speech, which criticized the views of Mr. William H. Seward, Edgerton declared that even if slavery were blotted out forever, the doctrine of human equality, on which the Abolitionists based their beliefs,

would not be realized. He declared that realization of such a principle would not be in accord with the will of Providence which opposed such a permanent system of human society. He reviled the Republicans for inaugurating and sustaining a political movement which would inevitably destroy the Union and the Constitution.

He felt that not only was the abolition of slavery inconsistent with the safety and constitutional rights of the slave-holding states but that the millions of Negroes even though granted "free labor, free speech, free soil, equal rights and universal suffrage" could never become equals of their former masters. He expressed his personal desire to see slavery, which he called an evil, eradicated but qualified his statement by saying he did not consider it to be such a great evil that it required political action of the Federal Government. He further declared that he felt that slavery agitation had done more to alienate and embitter the two sections of the country and to arouse the spirit of slavery aggression and extension than it had done to effect emancipation. Mr. Edgerton declared that slavery had existed in all the states of the Union when the Constitution was framed and that no power had been conceded to the Congress even under the Confederation to interfere with it. He maintained that the Jefferson ordinance of 1784, the first act of the United States relating to the territories, had conceded to the inhabitants thereof full powers of internal legislation and had not prohibited slavery. The Ordinance of 1787, he continued, had applied to territory not adapted to Negro slave labor. The Constitution, product of compromise, had given the Congress no express powers to establish, prohibit or abolish slavery in the states. He insisted that if there were precedents in the action of the Congress for prohibiting slavery,

there were also precedents for extending it in that Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Florida and Texas as slave states, gave proof of the fact that slavery had been permitted when the territory was adopted to the Union. Absolute prohibition of slavery, therefore, was in direct conflict with the spirit of the Constitution. He concluded with a condemnation of the Republicans as essentially a slavery prohibition and slavery abolition party and with praise for the Democrats as a truly democratic and national party as opposed to Republican sectionalism.²²

The views expressed by Mr. Edgerton were largely shared by his Democratic colleagues and by the constituents who had supported him.

Another Democrat of not too great importance was Henry William Harrington who was born in Cooperstown, New York, on September 12, 1825. After teaching school for a brief period, he began the practice of law in Numda, New York, from whence he moved to Elliotsville where he remained for seven seasons. Because of domestic troubles with his first wife which culminated in separation, Mr. Harrington in 1856 left for Kansas which was then attracting so much public attention. He did not reach his intended destination as an attack of illness detained him in Indiana. He was persuaded to open an office in Madison and practice there until 1872 when he moved to St. Louis.

Mr. Harrington was a delegate to the Democratic Convention in 1860 in Charleston. After an exciting campaign in 1862, he was elected to Congress from the Third Congressional District, having defeated his Republican opponent, William McKee Dunn.

Mr. Harrington was characterized by his contemporaries as a lawyer of good standing, "a strong man intellectually" although "lacking the discipline which comes from a thorough education." As a speaker he was said to be "earnest and impressive; in conversation incisive and always entertaining."²³

Mr. Harrington's views on the issues of the war were expressed in an attack against the Republican party in a speech before the House on March 26, 1864. This speech reveals that Mr. Harrington was opposed to a war for the abolition of slavery, to the use of Negro troops, and to Negro equality. He proclaimed himself a firm believer in the colonization of the Negro. He was firmly convinced of the inferiority of the Negro and of his essential barbarism.

James Foster McDowell, Democratic Congressman from the Eleventh District, was born in Mifflin County, Pennsylvania, on December 3, 1825. He moved with his parents to Ohio in 1835. His educational advantages were few and at the age of eleven he found a job in a printing office in Greenville, Ohio. By diligent study he was able to overcome most of the deficiencies of his education. He received private lessons from Judge Beers of Greenville and finally began the study of law. He was admitted to the bar in April, 1851. His practice was established in Marion, Indiana, where he also engaged in newspaper work as the publisher of the Marion Journal. Mr. McDowell was a staunch Democrat frequently called upon by his party as a public speaker. Although it was said that he was averse to becoming a candidate for public office, he felt it his patriotic duty to serve when called upon.

In 1852 he was a presidential elector but declined all other official positions until 1862 when he accepted the Democratic nomination for Representative in Congress from the Eleventh District. After a vigorous campaign in which he spoke at numerous political meetings throughout the district, he was elected. He served from March 4, 1863, until March 3, 1865. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1864 to the Thirty-ninth Congress.

Mr. McDowell's state of the Union address delivered before the House on February 23, 1864, presents an interesting insight into his views on the important questions of the day. McDowell too was against a war for the abolition of slavery and deplored the fact that much of the legislation passed by the Congress had dealt with such matters as the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, confiscation, the prohibition of slavery in the territories, and other similar measures. His speech clearly revealed his sympathy for the South which was having its entire social and industrial system upset. He felt that the Negro was a degraded individual and that if caution were not exercised, the white citizens of the country might be reduced to the same low level.²⁴

Again we see that the environmental surroundings played a great part in shaping the opinions of some of these men. Senator Hendricks, at one time a resident of Madison, Indiana, held opinions prevalent among the inhabitants of that Southern Indiana town as did also Representative Harrington. On the other hand, Representative Orth who was born in Pennsylvania, was liberal in this thinking on the slavery questions. Representative Edgerton and Representative McDowell were the exceptions, both having

been born in the East, not representing Southern Indiana, but nevertheless pro-slavery in their views.

These were the men who were to ponder, discuss, and act upon the serious issues of the day during the crucial war time period, when the country was torn asunder by dissension and bloody strife. What they said and felt and how they were regarded by their contemporaries is a story which unfolds before us in the record of their spirited speeches to the Senate and the House on the pages of the newspapers of the day.

CHAPTER V

SPEECHES OF THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO

The Thirty-seventh Congress held tenure from March 4, 1861, until March 3, 1863, its first session continuing from July 4, 1861, until August 6, 1861. The second session began on December 2, 1861, and was concluded on July 17, 1862. During this time many problems of grave importance challenged the members to debate. The fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the matter of colonization of free Negroes, the confiscation of slaves, the position of the Republican party on the slavery issue, compensated emancipation, and the barring of the Negro from the rights enjoyed by other citizens, were the subjects for major speeches. The Indiana delegation to the Congress proved quite vocal on all of these issues expressing a divergence of opinion that reflected the wide diversity of beliefs prevalent among their constituents back home.

One of the problems which arose almost as soon as the war began was what to do about run away slaves who took refuge in Union army camps. Many expressed disapproval of a policy established by Major General Halleck, commander of the Western Department of the Union army who, in section one of General Order No. 3, issued on November 20, 1861, declared that no fugitives were to be thereafter admitted to any camp and that any fugitives then within the lines were to be expelled. Considerable debate on this matter was engaged in by the members of the Congress.¹

As the year 1861 drew to a close the Lovejoy Resolution, jointly supported by House and Senate, which required the Secretary of War to revoke

section one of General Halleck's Order 3, was brought to the floor. Democrats Cravens, Holman, and Law joined by Republican Representative Dunn were in favor of tabling the resolution while Republican Representatives Colfax, Julian, Porter, and Shanks were among those whose votes kept the resolution from being tabled.²

In a speech before the House on December 11, 1861, George W. Julian criticized the policy of the administration with regard to fugitive slaves. He cited as an example of the functioning of the administration's policy the case of a fugitive slave girl who had taken refuge with Colonel Brown of the Twentieth Indiana Regiment stationed at Fortress Monroe. Upon the demand of her master, a Mr. Jessup, for her return, pressure was put upon Colonel Brown through the order of Secretary of War Cameron and his commanding general for the release of the girl to her master. Mr. Julian inferred such action to mean approval of General Halleck's policy of returning fugitive slaves to their masters. He therefore demanded that Congress take action immediately to change that policy.³

Mr. Julian's words were translated into action on December 20, 1861, when he introduced a resolution "that the Judiciary Committee be instructed to report a bill so amending the Fugitive Slave Law enacted in 1850 as to forbid the recapture or return of any fugitive from labor without satisfactory proof first being made that the claimant of such fugitive is loyal to the Government."⁴ The Indiana True Republican on January 2, 1862, in commenting on this resolution concurred with this action and approvingly remarked: "Those who set the authority of the Government of the United States at defiance and the laws of the United States and even seek the

overthrow of the Government should not be allowed to claim the protection of the laws either for themselves or their property." The editorial further expressed the opinion that the passage of such an amendment would probably cool the ardor of hundreds of Border state secessionists who were bound to the Government by their financial interests if not by their affection.⁵

Representative William S. Holman moved that the Julian resolution be tabled or modified, a move in which his fellow Indiana Democrats Cravens, Holman and Law concurred. Republicans Colfax, Mitchell, Porter, Shanks and White supported Julian and the resolution was finally adopted with 78 yeas to 39 nays. The vote of the Indiana delegation again followed party lines on the adoption of the resolution.

On the same day a resolution was offered that the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to report a bill for an article of war prohibiting an officer from returning fugitive slaves and providing punishment for the violation of this order. On this occasion Representative Dunn deserted his fellow Republicans to vote with Democrats Cravens, Holman, and Law to table the resolution.⁶

An amendment to a bill establishing freedom in the territories engaged the attention of the House on June 19, 1862. Democratic Representatives Cravens, Holman and Law were opposed while Republicans Colfax, Dunn, Julian Mitchell and Shanks helped in getting the amendment passed.⁷

George W. Julian was one of the many who expressed his ideas on the cause of the war and who as a radical Republican criticized the administration's conduct of the war. The Indiana True Republican carried the full

text of such a speech made by Mr. Julian in the House in January of 1862. In this speech he declared that the country was involved in war not because of the slavery issue but because of the issue of states rights. Slavery was the problem which had focused attention on the struggle between a strong central government and the states which resented the powers of the federal government. The rebellion had "its source and life in slavery" which had been increasingly important in the cotton kingdom made possible by new labor saving machinery. He was convinced that the founding fathers had abhorred slavery and had expected it to speedily disappear from the American scene. He deplored compromises which had prolonged the existence of slavery. Among these were those made because of the Florida Purchase and the Mexican War as well as the Missouri Compromise. He also expressed regret that the continued existence of the Negro in a state of servitude had engendered a hatred made evident by the passage of the black codes in the free states, fugitive slave acts, and compromises by both state and church.

He condemned the attitude of Republican leaders, orators and editors who wished no interference with slavery in the South and who showed such great moderation and deference to the South's constitutional rights in the slavery issue and who would have prevented the rebellion through conciliation if that had been possible. He lashed out at President Lincoln whom he characterized as a cool, cautious politician of conservative antecedents and kindly disposition whose choice by party leaders had been motivated by the knowledge that "the constitutional rights of the rebels were safe in his hands." Mr. Lincoln had assured them of this in his inaugural address, declared Mr. Julian, and had, in the first six weeks of his administration, continued the humiliating policy of his predecessor. Julian ended this

speech with a plea that the realization of the moral implications of the struggle coupled with the knowledge of the great loss of life attending the struggle would cause all to rise up against slavery.

The Democratic attitude toward the administration and its policies was expressed by Thomas A. Hendricks in a speech on January 8, 1862, before the Democratic state convention in Metropolitan Hall, Indianapolis. He completely rejected the idea that the war was being fought to free the slaves and insisted that the soldiers in the field had been inspired to fight the war only because of the professions of the President that this was a war to restore the Union. He declared that with the Negro slave and his condition the North had nothing to do, the condition of the colored race being solely a matter of state authority completely excluded from Federal jurisdiction. He expressed horror at the idea that the Negroes of the South be stimulated to a spirit of insurrection by being called into the Union army and placed in position to make "indiscriminate war on men, women, and children." He however sanctioned the idea of using the labor of slaves found in the vicinity of Union camps provided that these slaves not be liberated but used as forced workers to free the soldiers of the more exhausting tasks of labor. Mr. Hendricks disagreed with the announcement of the Secretary of War that the government had no power to hold slaves or to restrain a slave from liberty and to exact his service. He expressed concern that the freed slaves, no longer the responsibility of their masters, become a burden upon the Federal government. He deplored the President's intention to free the slaves in the rebel states thus destroying the Southern labor supply and consequently Indiana's trade with the South. He denied the fact that slave labor was in competition with free labor of the North

and asserted that the labor which cultivated rice, sugar, cotton, tobacco and hemp was not in competition with free labor but in aid and support of it as the South was accustomed to purchase northern products with the gold received from the sale of its products.

Another fear expressed by Mr. Hendricks was that large numbers of Negroes would flock to the North, if freed, expecting a "peculiar sympathy." Once there, he declared, they would not work, and would become a public burden, or if employed, would come directly into competition with Northern labor. Since the Negro was of an inferior class, Hendricks reasoned, he would not perform competently thus degrading and cheapening white labor.

A conservative Republican who held somewhat similar views was William McKee Dunn. Representative Dunn was one of the most conservative members on the Republican side of the House. He favored a war for the restoration of the Union, and for that only. While he had long been an opponent of the extension of slavery, he was opposed to making slavery the sole object of the war. He therefore did not always act with his party members and on a few occasions voted in opposition to his party colleagues. His vote against the fugitive slave resolution was evidence of this. He believed that Southern leaders were largely responsible for keeping down a "dormant Union sentiment" in the South and believed that leniency must be used toward Southerners who were not in sympathy with the rebellion.

Mr. Dunn expressed his views on the conduct of the war when he rose to clarify his position in December, 1861.⁹ He declared that while he was no lover of slavery he regarded the "preservation of the Union and the perpetuation of the present form of government as far more important than any

other consideration." If the emancipation of slaves became the object of the war, he felt that the destruction of the Union was inevitable as the property value of its slaves was interwoven with every other interest of the South. He regarded the attempt to blot out the existence of slavery as a "wild and chimerical" scheme. He felt that the abolition of slavery should come only as the result of the war and not as the object or purpose of it. He declared that the compromises of the past and the Chicago platform of the Republican party should be the guiding principles to follow.¹⁰

On April 3, 1862, the debate on another troublesome problem, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, was initiated with the introduction of a resolution in the Senate which declared that no person in the District or hereafter born therein should be held in slavery. A provision was also included for the colonization of slaves who consented. A sum of \$250,000 was to be provided by the Congress for this purpose. We find Lane of Indiana voting in favor of the resolution while Wright voted against it. The resolution was passed but was subsequently amended.¹¹

Senator Lane, in a speech before the Senate on April 21, hailed the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia as one of the most important victories achieved thus far in the course of the war. He declared it to be a "bloodless triumph" and a "wise and beneficent measure." He further praised the wisdom of including a provision for voluntary colonization of slaves. He added however that he did not favor forced emigration or compulsory colonization.¹²

The State Sentinel, in its next issue, criticized the colonization plan of the Senator and referred to his presentation of a petition from the

free colored citizens of the United States requesting that territory be set aside outside the territorial limits of the United States for their colonization and suggesting Central America. It pointed out that apparently Mr. Lane did not believe that colored citizens were entitled to all the rights and privileges of white citizens, but acknowledged their right to present such a petition as either colonization or an apprenticeship system must be adopted.¹³

The Sentinel had occasion, somewhat later, to refer Senator Lane's request to the New Albany Ledger that it reprint the pertinent parts of the speech presenting the petition from certain colored persons of Indiana. He stated that he was making this request because he believed that the Sentinel had misapprehended the tenor and purpose of his speech and in misinterpreting it had unintentionally "placed him in a false position before its readers and his constituents."¹⁴

Senator Joseph Wright voiced his objection to Senate Abolition Bill 108 because of its provision for compensation for the owners of slaves freed in the District of Columbia. He also expressed his disapproval of the action of impetuous legislators who could not see the wisdom of gradual emancipation, an idea previously endorsed by President Lincoln during his term in the House in 1848. Forces at work in the District would bring this gradual emancipation any way, he declared. His principal objection to Bill 108 was, he asserted, its failure to provide for colonization. Indiana's Constitution had clearly revealed the intention of its inhabitants to prevent an influx of Negroes into the state and their determination to raise their children in a population not partly white and partly black as it was apparent to them that equality could never exist between the races. A wave of

Negro immigration could only result in the jails and penitentiaries being filled with free blacks, he predicted. He recommended a bill which he himself had proposed which incorporated the idea of gradual emancipation.¹⁵

Indiana newspapers devoted much space and editorial comment to the Wright speech. The Indianapolis Daily Journal declared that Mr. Wright's bill, amending the Senate bill for abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, was a copy of a bill introduced by President Lincoln during his term in the House some years before and was based on principles expressed by Benjamin Franklin for emancipation of slaves in Pennsylvania and on the theories of John Quincy Adams who favored emancipation in the District of Columbia.¹⁶ The Daily Sentinel quoted the entire text of the Wright bill.¹⁷

A few days later the Daily Journal carried an editorial on the Wright speech in which it agreed in the main with his idea of gradual emancipation as the wise course but voiced the opinion that, as only a few blacks were involved, the objections to immediate emancipation were considerably lessened. A great deal more concern was expressed over Mr. Wright's proposal to submit the question to the vote of the people of the District. This objection was raised because the Journal maintained that the District was at that time filled with traitors and Confederate sympathizers, men who not only should not be allowed to vote but whose slave property should be rightfully confiscated by the Congress.¹⁸

Still later the Daily Sentinel came forth with an editorial "Not Satisfied." Sarcastically this editorial referred to the fact that the Journal had failed to publish the text of the Wright speech and that Republicans who a few weeks before had lauded Mr. Wright's patriotism and non-partyism

and who had called him a Unionist of the right stripe were now noticeably silent. The editorial also quoted the St. Louis Democrat, which it called a radical Republican paper. The editorial, the Sentinel declared, referred to the "Honorable Joseph A. Wright, United States Senator in place of Bright, traitor expelled," as ending his senatorial career with a vehement speech against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. It observed that his speech was remarkable for its intense pro-slavery spirit. The Sentinel quoted still another Republican paper, the Valparaiso Republic, as expressing its bitter disappointment with Mr. Wright by saying that he had certainly in the outset disappointed the expectations of his friends, but that there was some consolation in knowing that his successor would take warning by his fate and avoid the errors into which he had fallen.

The Sentinel article concluded with the scathing remark that such Republican expression belied their "ardent claims to no-partyism sentiment."¹⁹

One of the bitterest denunciations of Mr. Wright is to be found in the Indiana True Republican which declared: "Had Governor Morton appointed some good radical anti-slavery Republican senator in Bright's place the ear of Justice, Grammar and Humanity would not have been insulted. But this demagogue and gas generator, Joseph A. Wright, cannot see any difference between then and now. That's the way however with a pro-slavery old fogy."²⁰

The Indianapolis Journal in its May 2 issue referred to Mr. Wright's states rights stand and expressed its own opinion that particularly border states were to be consulted in matters affecting states rights.²¹

The passage of the bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia prompted a letter from Representative J.P.C. Sparks to the Indianapolis

Journal. In this letter, dated April 16, Mr. Shanks exulted that he had had the chance to participate in the passage of such a bill. He declared that no longer would the Nation's capital be the scene of constant crime where the slave father would be robbed of his earnings and family, and where the slave mother would see the "heartless plunderer of her liberty and virtue coldly calculating his earthly fortune upon the market value of her children, and estimating the contingent value of herself as the bearer of a greater or less number for the auction block." He boasted that the stupor which had so long controlled the minds of public men was being broken now.

Mr. Shanks sanctioned the prompt endorsement of the President's position of emancipation in the border states and the appointment of a committee to consider and advise on the subject. He concluded with an expression of the desire that there must be confiscation of the property of traitors the proceeds from which must be used for the public good and that all slaves of such traitors be declared free.²²

Two other Indiana congressmen who expressed themselves on the matter of abolition of slavery were Republican William McKee Dunn and Democrat William S. Holman. Dunn declared that he was heartily in favor of abolition and was firmly convinced that the Federal Government had the right to act in this matter but felt that it should proceed with the "deliberation becoming so great and glorious an event." He further declared that such action was not a matter of passion or prejudice but a conviction of right and duty, a divorce of the nation from slavery. He expressed, however, the desire to offer an amendment for gradual emancipation believing

that the ties which bound slaves and masters together should not be abruptly sundered. The good of slave and master, he declared, would be better served if preparation were made for the enjoyment of liberty. He would nevertheless vote for the bill in the form in which it had been presented.²³

Democratic Congressman Holman also spoke in favor of abolition asserting that he, for many reasons, felt that it was desirable for slavery to cease to exist in the capital. He stated that he believed that his own constituents would be in favor of the gradual extinction of slavery in the District of Columbia, on terms consistent with the rights of citizens as recognized by the Constitution. He cautiously added that he saw no objection if this could be done "without increasing the national debt and with the consent of the people of the District. He announced that he had a further amendment to propose. He wished it to be stipulated that municipal authorities in Washington and Georgetown within their respective jurisdictional limits be required to provide action and means to arrest and deliver up to their owners all fugitive slaves escaping into the District. He asserted that he thought it desirable that slavery cease to exist in the national capital, but thought that gradual abolition would find greater favor with his constituents and would be more consistent with the rights of citizens as recognized by the Constitution. He doubted that his constituents would favor passage of the original bill.²⁴

The action taken on the District of Columbia gave rise to the charges that the Republican party had violated its 1860 platform pledges. Representative Dunn of Indiana rose in the Congress to refute such a charge. He denied that it was or ever had been the purpose of the Republican party to

interfere with slavery in the slave states by Congressional action. He branded such a charge as "a wicked falsehood" and declared that the reckless statements of political partisans had done much to involve the country in its present troubles. His next statement was a denial of the abolitionists within the party fold. He declared that though there were some who on occasion acted with the Republican party, they were not of it as they favored interfering with slavery in the slave states. One should not judge the doctrines of a party from these individuals, he added. He reminded his colleagues of the party stand in the Chicago convention in 1860 of no interference with slavery where it legally existed and concluded with the statement that present troubles stemmed from the fact that the nation had failed to follow in the footsteps of its fathers with reference to slavery, those founders who evidently regarded slavery as inconsistent with our theory of government and who expected it to be "gradually removed under the beneficent influences of our free institutions." Mr. Dunn's solution was to leave slavery in the slave states to be managed by those who were responsible for its continuance there.

25

The confiscation bill was passed without the amendments proposed by Mr. Dunn and Mr. Holman being included, the vote being 92 to 38, with Colfax, Dunn, Julian, Mitchell, Porter, Shanks and White being included with the yeas and Holman and Voorhees being included among the nays. Mr. Voorhees also asked permission to vote nay for Mr. Cravens who had been called home by illness in his family.

26

Democratic sentiment toward the passage of the abolition bill was expressed in two editorials in the Daily Sentinel, one of which was quoted from the Richmond Broad-Axe. Both editorials ridiculed President Lincoln's

conservatism and compared him to abolitionists Hale, Sumner, Giddings and Julian. The Sentinel declared that Mr. Lincoln was carrying out the principles that Mr. Julian had advocated all his public life.²⁷

The Conservative South Bend Forum voiced criticism also of Schuyler Colfax's support of the abolition bill and accused him of violating his pledge in regard to slavery in the District of Columbia by voting to pay "millions of dollars worth of slaves when every dollar is needed to pay for expenses." The Forum concluded by declaring that Mr. Colfax's political record had given the voters little reason to support him for another term.²⁸

Emancipation in the District of Columbia raised some questions on the status of the free Negroes there. Schuyler Colfax expressed his alarm on the proposal to repeal an 1825 bill which had forbidden any other than free white males to engage in conveying the mails and which threatened any contractor employing any other with a fine. Mr. Colfax offered as one of his reasons for opposing the repeal of the bill the fact that such repeal would open the contracting of mail and postal positions not only to blacks but also to Indian tribes and Chinese who had recently come in such numbers to the Pacific coast and who were not recognized as entitled to the rights and privileges of free white persons.

Mr. Colfax seemed to consider that the most convincing argument against repeal was that since it was often necessary to give testimony against mail depredation and since in some states Indians, Negroes, and Chinese were not allowed to give testimony in courts against white persons, a thief who robbed the mails which a non-white was conveying could thus go free because

of lack of testimony and the security of the mails would thus be destroyed. Mr. Colfax concluded, with an attempt at liberality, that he saw no reason why any person whether he be free, white, or not be employed in a place of less responsibility as perhaps a clerk.²⁹

Violation of the personal liberty of Negroes was also a troublesome question. On March 17, 1862, a resolution was introduced into the House for an inquiry to be made into the arrest of two Negroes, Louis Ayers and Washington Walls, who had been seized on the order of a Mr. Biscoe and sent to Baltimore jail in violation of the Fifth Article of the Amendments which stated that no person should be deprived of life or liberty without due process of law.

Indiana Democrats Cravens and Voorhees voted unsuccessfully to have the resolution tabled while Republicans Colfax, Dunn, Porter, Shanks and White aided in passing the resolution.³⁰

The introduction of a Senate bill to confiscate the property of and to free the slaves of rebels aroused a storm of debate which occupied both House and Senate for a considerable period of time. The joint resolution to adopt this bill was supported by votes of Republican Congressmen Colfax, Dunn, Julian, Mitchell, Porter, Shanks and White while Democrats Cravens, Law and Voorhees voted against it.³¹ A vote on a confiscation resolution on April 24, 1862, in the House found the Indiana delegation voting the same way.³² A committee on conference which included Joseph A. Wright among the three representatives from the Senate who conferred with two members from the House produced confiscation bill 471. The report of the joint committee was adopted in the House with the assent of all the members

of the Indiana Republican delegation over the negative votes of Democrats Cravens, Law and Voorhees. Senators Lane and Wright supported the bill in the Senate.³³ Many Indiana Congressmen expressed themselves with fervor and conviction on this matter.

Congressman Albert G. Porter was one of the first to speak out on the issue of confiscation. He approved of the measure to seize and confiscate all property of persons in any way connected with the rebellion and expressed his approval of the liberation of slaves of those in position of officials of the rebellion. Mr. Porter proposed an amendment to this measure which provided that all, who after sixty days should continue in rebellion or give aid and comfort to it, should be rendered incapable of holding an office of trust in the United States. He declared that he considered it only fair as the slave holders in the rebel service were chiefly among the officers. Once the slaves of civil and military officers were freed, he asserted, the institution would cease to be a political issue.³⁴

The Daily Journal referred to this amendment Mr. Porter had offered in the House on June 4 as an addition to House Bill 42 and expressed approval of a measure which would limit the emancipation to the slaves of those who had chiefly fostered and encouraged the rebellion. It observed that the bill in unamended form seemed to inflict excessive punishment on those who had been drawn into the rebellion through "misapprehension and delusion." The Journal was, however, apprehensive regarding the reaction of the loyal border states.³⁵

The Porter amendment prompted an approving expression in a letter from one of his supporters, a reader of the Journal. The letter was entitled:

"Mr. Porter's Scheme for Emancipation--His Renomination--Why He Should Have It."³⁶

Schuyler Colfax voiced the radical Republican viewpoint and concurred in the idea of confiscation, expressing the opinion that at least four-fifths of all slaves held by rebels were property of civil or military officers. He declared that he saw no reason to leave the slaves of rebels to reap and till their farms, to work on rebel fortifications, to perform camp drudgery, or to raise the produce to feed the troops. Mercy to rebels could only result in cruelty to loyal men. Only by striking boldly and fearlessly wherever possible could the power of the rebellion be broken, he asserted. It was on the strength of this belief that he rose in support of the bill known as Senator Sherman's Bill.³⁷

Congressman William McKee Dunn took a more conservative stand as usual in expressing opposition to a sweeping confiscation bill without benefit of amendment. He expressed himself on this issue in the House in his speech of April 23, 1862. He blamed the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scot Case for establishing the principle that slaves were property and could be sold as such thus throwing the great weight of the Court's authority on the side of the pro-slavery element. Thus, he declared, the country became involved in its present struggle and citizens of free states such as Indiana were forced to strike for the rights of free labor and free men. Both the Indianapolis Sentinel and the Daily Journal commented on Dunn's opposition to the confiscation bill because of its failure to make a distinction against the leaders of the rebellion.³⁸

The radical Republican viewpoint was also expressed by Representative George W. Julian in the debate on this subject. He declared it to be a "shame and reproach" that the Congress had not promptly enacted an efficient confiscation bill which could have done much to supplement military force in conquering the rebellion. He declared that he regarded lightly the clamor about the violation of the Constitution by pro-slavery fanatics with poorly disguised rebel sympathies. He maintained that all thinking men were aware that slavery alone was responsible for "the present bloody strife" and that but for the curse of slavery a revolt against liberty could not have occurred. He proclaimed the leaders of the rebellion to be the most atrocious scoundrels of the Nineteenth century or any century or age of the world, having been forced to such degradation by the barbarism of slavery. Julian spoke approvingly of the action of the Congress in abolishing slavery in the District, prohibiting it in all national territory and enacting an article of war prohibiting the army from aiding in the recapture of fugitives. He added a fervent plea for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 or at least its suspension. He commended the action of General John C. Fremont in giving freedom to the slaves of rebels in Missouri, a deed which he declared gave more prestige to his name than all the military glory of war. He concluded with a scathing denunciation of the anti-abolitionists and predicted the inevitable triumph of anti-slavery forces. He rejoiced that abolitionist sentiment once opposed by public opinion, by the press, by religious organizations, and by the great political parties which it had finally divided had now come into its own influencing the President and the Cabinet alike. "Even those slimy dough-faces and creeping things which continue to hiss at abolitionism betray a tormenting apprehension that their day and generation are passing away,"

Julian exulted.³⁹ Needless to say this speech brought praise from abolitionist quarters and bitter condemnation from conservative sources.

The Daily Sentinel attacked Mr. Julian for his remark, in the Congress, that "cases may arise in which patriotism itself may demand that we trample under our feet the most vital principles of the Constitution." "What is this," demanded the Sentinel, "but an acknowledgment that our government, that Republicanism, is a failure?" They accused Julian of wishing to trample under foot some of the most vital principles of the Constitution in an effort to make the Negro free and the equal of the white man. Such governmental disregard for constitutional rights and then constitutional liberty could not but result in a rule as "despotic and arbitrary as either Austria, Russia or France," the Sentinel declared.⁴⁰

Other expressions of both approval and condemnation followed with the Indiana True Republican, Mr. Julian's paper bearing the burden of his defense.⁴¹

The Democratic view of confiscation was expressed by the Honorable W. S. Holman who denied the necessity for an act of confiscation. He felt that the abolition of slavery was not within the power of Congress and its abolition would only add to the inhumanity of war and affect the rights of loyal citizens. He expressed his personal approval of emancipation and colonization but declared such a move constitutionally impossible.⁴²

Another Democratic Congressman who shared the same opinion of confiscation was John S. Law who declared that the government could not confiscate the property of loyal citizens without making itself similar to the "governments of a Nero or a Caligula." He dismissed all talk of military necessity.

He declared that slavery must exist and would exist in every state where it was then allowed under the provisions of the Constitution. Until the Constitution could be amended, he maintained that the right to hold slaves was clear and defined as the holding of any other species of property. He then launched into an attack against the Abolition party (The Republicans) which he accused of attempting "the overthrow of the finest fabric of government the world ever saw" and of attempting to put the black race on an equality with the white to raise the Negro to the condition of a white man with equal rights and equal privileges. He spoke at length of the tax problems involved in the liberation of so many slaves, problems which, he said, would involve Northern and border states. If the South were deprived of much of its taxable property, he predicted that the amount of taxation which would have been collected in the slave holding states would then of necessity have to be apportioned among the free states as the premium the abolitionist was willing to pay for the abolition of slavery. Of this amount, he insisted, the western states would not pay one dollar.⁴³

In a most impassioned plea for the confiscation bill, Representative John P.S. Shanks presented a totally different point of view. He deplored the fact that slave power had been allowed to become a "public as it had long been a private criminal against four millions of wretched captives to its power, and against the laboring masses who were compelled to compete with this system of unpaid toil." He accused this system of involving in its toils presidents, cabinets, Senates and Houses of Representatives and of gathering the Supreme Court within its meshes, while it boldly sought the lives of free white men who opposed its march of power. Finally its efforts were directed to an attempt to crush the National Government so

that it might build on the foundation laid by the sons of freedom, a government the chief cornerstone of which is slavery," Mr. Shanks declared. He affirmed that it was the people's demand that a confiscation act be passed. He added that all patriots should see that such a measure was aimed at the individuals who had committed treason. He accused the opponents of the confiscation measure of having stronger prejudice against the Negro and interest in men as slaves than love "for the convenience and safety of the defenders of their country or of their families neglected in their absence in the army of the nation."

Mr. Shanks then spoke out of his personal experience as a former resident of a slave state and as a soldier of the army in Virginia and Missouri. He declared that he knew what slavery was, both in peace and war. He asserted that he had taken care to notice the temper and integrity of the slaves and could give assurance that they were as anxious to gain their liberty as anyone would be, similarly situated. He mentioned their hopes for the freedom of the government to which they were true and loyal. He characterized their patriotism as "unconditional and pure." From a practical standpoint, he added, informed slaves would make good guides and informants in the country around their masters' homes.

Congressman Shanks declared that now was the time to release the slaves of rebels. He predicted that these slaves would be a powerful force in the hands of their deliverers. Rome defended herself against Carthage and General Andrew Jackson defended New Orleans with freemen and slaves whom he made free. The friendship and assistance of four million people would be gained with the simple act of confiscation. If such action were not taken,

he foresaw the loss of the confidence and sympathy of the civilized world. In support of his statements Mr. Shanks read a letter which had come into his hands. The letter was written by J.P. Benjamin, Secretary of War to Jefferson Davis, and was addressed to the Governor of Virginia. It urgently requested advice as to the disposition of certain Negro women and children whose husbands had deserted to the Union army and who were themselves apparently in communication with the Union forces. Their presence composed a hazard to the safety of the Confederate troops even though they had been removed to the rear of the line as a precaution.

Mr. Shanks denied with vehemence that the slave had benefited from the slave system as compared with the lot of the African tribes in their own country. He deplored the fact that some were convinced that the slave masters had a "right to wrong honest laboring men and women and their unoffending helpless children forever dooming them to ignorance, separation, unpaid labor and brutish sale." He pleaded that "these oppressed and long-wronged people, humble and poor though they be," be given the opportunity to be true to the troubled government and that none turn from them influenced by senseless prejudice.

Mr. Shanks next attacked the Christianity of slave owning masters who in his opinion set such a poor example as professing Christians that the "slaves could not find any Christian meekness in their faces." He attacked slave owners as traitors who plundered their slaves of their deserved daily wages.

Continuing, he commented that it was much more praiseworthy that the slaves, never protected from the auction block or the lash by their government, should be more loyal than the free white men of the border states who

had always "enjoyed the rich harvest of blessings bestowed upon them by that same government." He marvelled that the "robbed and wretched slaves and free blacks who had long been denounced by government and people as national vagabonds" were now in the hour of the nation's peril patriotically true to the flag and Union while their pampered masters had openly betrayed the government.⁴⁴

In the Senate Mr. Wright added his voice on the subject of confiscation and expressed himself as being "in favor of some measure for the confiscation of the property of those in rebellion against the government." He declared that such a proceeding was absolutely necessary and would strike a heavier blow against the rebellion than an army with banners."

Mr. Wright continued that he was tired of having those who brought on the war called "our brethren." He concluded that he considered the confiscation bill as one of the series of acts essential to put down the rebellion.⁴⁵

The Daily Journal of July 22 carried a brief comment on Senator Wright's confirmation of the confiscation idea adding that men in rebellion are not entitled to the protection of the government.⁴⁶ The July 24 issue of the Journal also made mention of Senator Wright's speech of July 15, 1862, in which he had declared that, in his belief, the President had the right to authorize the use of rebel property and the employment of Negroes in military labor without the benefit of a bill providing him with such authority and that any general in the army who would not employ every Negro coming within his lines to work, should be turned out instantly.⁴⁷

Perhaps Mr. Wright was trying to be both conservative and radical as the St. Joseph Daily Forum had suggested.

Senator Wright had more to say on the subject of confiscation in a speech delivered in Governor's Circle on Saturday night, August 2. He reminded his listeners that the confiscation bill would not touch the slave property real or personal of a single individual in the South with the "exception of persons beginning with Jeff Davis and ending with Lieutenants in the rebel army."

Senator Wright then launched into a criticism of Mr. Voorhees, Congressman from Indiana, who, in Mr. Wright's opinion, carried the Negro question too far. He referred to the occasion of the 24th of April when a vote had to be taken whether a Negro man named Small, who had captured a vessel and seven guns below Charleston and brought his prize into a loyal port, should receive compensation for his action. Mr. Wright estimated that, as a white man, Small would have received \$13,000 salvage money for his \$40,000 prize. Voorhees' refusal to vote on the matter provoked Mr. Wright's censure of Voorhees' common sense.

He continued that he ventured that not a solitary man running for the Congress in the state of Indiana would stand up before the people and say that he was not willing to have black men taken to do the labor Union soldiers would otherwise have to perform. Mr. Wright declared that, in his opinion, every man should be made use of in order to save the Union. He thereupon explained his own vote against the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia by saying that he had at the time been convinced that "If slavery were just let alone, it would die a natural death without one

red cent being spent for it." He concluded with an expression of his approval of the emancipation of slaves provided colonization outside the country be provided for them.⁴⁸

Even Republican Congressman Albert S. White, who seldom rose to speak in the House, was prompted on May 26 to deliver a speech in favor of confiscation. He expressed his surprise that "so just and condign a measure as this should meet with any opposition." He added that in such tense and critical times popular sentiment should sanction the confiscation of rebel property above all other measures.⁴⁹

The third session of the Thirty-seventh Congress lasted from December 1, 1862, until March 3, 1862. The debates of this session were concerned with the conduct of the war, Missouri emancipation, the Negro soldier, compensated emancipation and indemnification.

Shortly after the opening of this session J. A. Cravens, Democratic Representative from Indiana, gave his views on the conduct of the war. He maintained that the hundreds of thousands of Indiana's brave men who had left their comfortable homes and firesides to undergo the hardships and toils of war believed that they were fighting a war not characterized by fanaticism, but one prosecuted for the maintenance of the Constitution and the restoration of the Union. These soldiers as they fought had pleaded with President Lincoln "not to let the war, at the persuasion of the abolitionist, degenerate into a miserable crusade against the institution of slavery." Mr. Cravens reminded his fellow congressmen of Mr. Lincoln's emphatic pledge in his inaugural address, not to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it existed. Mr. Cravens also recalled the President's action in removing General Fremont from his Missouri

command when his anti-slavery proclamation there came into direct conflict with the policy of the administration. Union victories, charged the Representative, had brought renewed agitation for the extinction of slavery. He declared that there was no military necessity for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and he was opposed to the abolition of slavery in the Territories as not being action essential to the suppression of the rebellion. He asserted that the proof of the fact that his constituents felt as he did was exhibited at the largest Democratic meeting in Indiana held on July 30, 1862, in Indianapolis. At that time the assembled Democrats went on record with resolutions for the preservation of the Union and the suppression of the rebellion, against "a war of conquest or subjugation and against interfering with the rights or of overthrowing the established institutions of states." A resolution was also adopted protesting the "mischievous measure of Negro emancipation and payment for this out of the national treasury." The party supported the Negro exclusion provision of the Indiana State Constitution as a deterrent to the impending influx of Free Negroes and mulattoes from the border states. This resolution had urged state authorities to see the Constitution and laws on this subject properly enforced.⁵⁰

Representative Cravens' speech made it apparent to all that he disapproved of President's Emancipation Proclamation which gave freedom to the slaves of those states in rebellion against the Union and which became effective on January 1, 1863.

The pro-Democratic New Albany Ledger praised the speech of Representative Cravens and declared in quoting the text of his speech "we have laid before our readers a product of which the General's friends might well be

proud. In it he speaks the sentiment of a vast majority of his constituents." It concluded that the Honorable Mr. Cravens, as all conservative men, was disgusted at the imbecility and abolitionism of the administration.⁵¹

The Indianapolis Daily Journal also commented on Cravens' speech by simply saying that Mr. Cravens was "opposed to the Emancipation Proclamation, was for Union and Constitution and in favor of leaving the Negroes where they were."⁵²

The Indianapolis Daily Gazette which did not concur with the sentiments of Mr. Cravens, observed that "although we expect no sudden and marked effect upon the rebellion from the Emancipation Proclamation, the new policy of the government toward slavery in the rebellious states will have this good result. It will withdraw from the institution the protection and recognizance hitherto extended it by our military authorities and commanders."⁵³

Other typical newspaper comment which was in harmony with the views of Mr. Cravens on emancipation was found in the New Albany Ledger of January 5, 1863. The Ledger, in editorializing on the Emancipation Proclamation, commented that the President had launched "his bull against the comet" and declared, "We are now to see what effect this awful bull is going to have on the slavery comet--whether it will whisk its long tail for a moment and then subside, or continue in its regularly appointed course in the firmament till time shall come for it to glide away from the vision of men." In the opinion of the Ledger the emancipation action could have but one effect and that to still further "distract the Northern and Border States and to thoroughly unite the people of the rebel states." The editorial

questioned the President's right to receive the liberated Negroes into the army and the navy as part of that "mysterious war power" by virtue of which, it complained, "the Constitution is trampled underfoot, the writ of habeas corpus suspended, men arrested and incarcerated without warrant of law, and edicts of emancipation issued." The Ledger in the same issue also caustically remarked that "abolitionists of Albany, Pittsburg and other towns have been shooting off gun powder in honor of the President's Proclamation. If these gentlemen have a surplus of ammunition, why don't they go down into Virginia or Tennessee and shoot rebels instead of firing it off in the air?"⁵⁴

Democrats were also much opposed to emancipation in the border states and compensated emancipation. In February 1863 David Turpie before the Senate expressed his views on emancipation in Missouri. He declared that if the preservation of the Union involved the purchase of Negro slaves, the support of fugitive contrabands, the feeding and clothing of these escapees and the restoration of national authority throughout the nation, he was opposed to it. He acidly commented that the Federal government seemed to have exclusively confined its charities "to Africans in servitude and the wants of the Negro race." He pleaded that the Congress postpone the abolition measures which had already dishonored and ruined the country to so great an extent and give up plans to buy Negroes with money from the public treasury.⁵⁵

Both Republican Senator Lane and Democratic Senator Turpie voted against a bill giving twenty millions of dollars for the purpose of buying and emancipating the slaves of Missouri. The New Albany Ledger applauded saying, "Our Senators unquestionably carried out the wishes of their constituents, who do not care about being taxed to buy Negroes in Missouri."

The article concluded, "Colonel Lane will receive the thanks of the people of Indiana for breaking loose from party trammels in a matter which so closely affects their interests."⁵⁶

Daniel Voorhees reemphasized opinions he had expressed earlier in a speech quoted by the Indianapolis Sentinel. Mr. Voorhees declared before the House that a policy of universal emancipation or abolition could not be carried out without an exhibition of bad faith to Union men of North or South. He referred to Mr. Lincoln's pledge in his inaugural address not to interfere with slavery in the states, a policy which was supplemented by General McClellan's proclamation on entering Virginia, that the army would abstain from all interference with slavery.⁵⁷

He now reproached the Republicans, "You started in this with pledges I have spoken of. You have broken them all." "You have cried out 'no party' in this Hall ever since the war commenced and in the name of 'no party' you have liberated slaves and abolished slavery wherever you can get at it; you have recognized Negro governments, you have taxed white men to pay for black...you propose to put the black man alongside the loyal white soldiers. You propose to buy Negroes, steal Negroes, fight for Negroes, obtain Negroes in any way, and then humiliate and disgrace the white soldiers by his presence and contacts in the ranks."⁵⁸

On the subject of compensated emancipation, Mt. Voorhees expressed himself as being opposed to the states assuming an additional tax burden for the purchase of slaves in the border states. He declared that both he and his constituents were willing to recognize and respect the legal rights of slave holders, but were opposed to the slave trade and to the

free states "lavishing their all for the Union and the Constitution," by assuming an additional burden to compensate the slave holder of the border states.⁵⁹

On another occasion Mr. Voorhees spoke out on the same subject. He declared that the people of Indiana had not wanted the war, preferring compromise and peace. They wanted no four millions set free nor did they have the money with which to purchase territories "for vast schemes of colonization," he complained. They were also opposed to "gigantic standing armies with which to hold degraded states in subjugation," he concluded.⁶⁰

Mr. Voorhees maintained the same position in the third session when he criticized compensated emancipation in the border states. He protested, "I say here, now, that not one dollar, not one cent will the people I represent ever pay to Missouri, to Maryland or to any other state to purchase their slaves. If you propose to tax the people to an unlimited extent, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars--for the purpose of flooding the free states with free Negroes then you may make up your minds for trouble."⁶¹

The views of George W. Julian were in direct contrast with those of Representative Voorhees. In a speech in the House in 1863 he declared the triumph of the Republican party in 1860 had been the triumph of freedom over slavery. He further declared that he realized that not all who supported Lincoln were abolitionists or even anti-slavery men or that all who opposed him were advocates of slavery, nevertheless hostility to slavery was the sentiment which had motivated the convictions and goals of many thus making the formation of the Republican party a necessity.

He accused the Democrats of being the party which had espoused slavery and which was inspired by it. He declared that the war had been the result of a government policy, being influenced by a slave breeding democracy, which had been drifting away from the principles laid down by Republican fathers in the Philadelphia and Chicago platforms. Mr. Julian continued that he realized the mistakes of Republican policy since the beginning of the war. Not only had many of its trusted leaders lost the way but also the administration had not been thoroughly Republican in policy.

Mr. Julian also accused the Republican party of being to a "fearful extent" permeated with Democratic ideas and Democratic policy. Such weakness, he felt, was demonstrated in the inclination toward acceptance of the Crittenden Compromise, by the refusal of the help of Negroes in the armies as laborers, teamsters, cooks, nurses, scouts and soldiers, and in the condemnation of those whom they referred to as abolitionists. He alleged that it was Democratic policy in 1861 which gave the country McClellan, Halleck and Buell "whose military administrations so terribly cursed the country." He predicted that Republican principles would save the Union in spite of Democratic defeatism.⁶²

Another Republican Congressman who advocated the use of Negro troops was Representative Dunn who said that he could not see why any man of any color who was able to raise his arm in defense of his country should not be permitted to do so. However, Mr. Dunn expressed concern that black men should be associated with white men in the ranks or that a colored officer should command white troops. He heartily endorsed the amendment proposed by Representative Porter of Indiana to the effect that no person of African descent should be admitted as a private or officer of any regiment in

in which white men were in the ranks nor should any person of African descent in any case be placed in command of white soldiers.⁶³ He held no objection, however, to a company wholly composed of Negroes with Negro officers "including the captain if he is qualified to command."⁶⁴

An editorial in the Indianapolis Daily Gazette praised Mr. Dunn for favoring the use of Negro troops and the editorialist declared "a black man who fights for my country is better than a white man who fights against it." "I have a son in this war, and I am entirely willing that black men shall help him subdue the white rebels."⁶⁵

Thus went the arguments praising and condemning the administration, the Republicans essentially approving and the Democrats critically disapproving. As the war continued, the tenseness grew. The Thirty-eighth Congress was also to be the scene of many bitter debates.

CHAPTER VI

SPEECHES OF THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO

The Thirty-eighth Congress was to see the victories of Union arms which would bring this fratricidal war to a close. It was also to consider the problem of dealing with the freed Negro and some of the problems of reconstruction. Heated debates were engaged in over confiscation, the state of the Union, the Negro soldier, the Negro's right to hold civil jobs, Negro equality and amalgamation, amnesty, the Thirteenth Amendment, the Freedmen's Bureau, and similar topics. The Indiana delegation frequently and forcefully expressed its opinions, opinions which as always showed wide divergence of viewpoint reflecting both the speaker's party affiliation and his individual convictions.

There was increasing apprehension that an influx of freed Negroes would overwhelm the North and would furnish competition for Northern white laboring men. This feeling particularly created excitement in Southern Indiana towns along the Ohio River, the towns which bordered on Kentucky. Feelings of prejudice and hatred of the Negro mounted and this attitude of their constituents was reflected in the speeches of the members of the Congress and became the prevailing attitude of representatives of Indiana Democracy.

There was also determined opposition to the use of Negro troops as Negroes sought to enlist in the Union army. Indiana Democrats were particularly opposed to the idea and many Republicans were also lukewarm on the subject. When the opposition to the use of Negro troops was finally

overcome, another problem which arose, the matter of unequal pay for these troops, was the subject for debate. Indiana Democrats not only continued to condemn the use of Negro troops but maintained that since their services were less valuable, they should be paid less.

The Indiana Democratic delegation to the Thirty-eighth Congress also expressed great disapproval of confiscation and the idea of amending the Constitution to abolish slavery. It was their feeling that this would only open the door to other and greater problems such as Negro equality and racial amalgamation. The New Albany Daily Ledger was typical of the Democratic press as it over and over again voiced its fears of amalgamation and made derogatory comments about the use of Negro troops.

The Democratic party was the fold in which white supremacists found haven and through the party's representatives it gave utterance to its deep seated convictions about Negro inferiority. The Republicans, while of varying shade of opinion, were much more inclined to express liberal views on the Negro question.

The Thirty-eighth Congress was in session from March 4, 1863, to March 3, 1865. The first session convened from December 7, 1863, to July 4, 1864, and the second session from December 5, 1864, until March 3, 1865. Schuyler Colfax was speaker of the House. A special session of the Senate was also held from March 4, 1863, to March 14, 1863.

In January, 1864, the Confiscation Act which had been passed by the Congress and sent to the President was again considered. The bill was now proposed for amendment to remove the President's objection to its provision to take away more than a life estate as part of punishment for treason,

which he considered unconstitutional. Consequently the House passed an explanatory resolution which was approved by the President.¹ Republicans Orth and Julian supported the resolution while Democrats Cravens, Edgerton, Harrington, Holman and Voorhees opposed.² The Indianapolis Journal reported that opposition had also been expressed in the Senate by a resolution which declared that forfeiting the property of rebels beyond life estate was unconstitutional.³ The Senate Judiciary Committee had reported against the bill's passage. If this resolution were not incorporated the Confiscation bill was considered "an act to suppress insurrection and to punish treason and rebellion, to seize and confiscate the property of rebels and for other purposes."⁴

Among the Indiana Democrats who voiced his views on confiscation was Joseph K. Edgerton. He bitterly assailed Representative Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania and those of his ilk who he charged had determined that the Southern states should become free soil where whites and Negroes should share in common ownership and hold equality in all rights political and social. Mr. Edgerton declared that such a Negro Utopia would be impossible being made so by the racial solidarity existing among white men. He maintained that the rights of states to make their constitutions and own local laws was being threatened by the advocates of Negro emancipation and elevation. Mr. Edgerton voiced the suspicion that such efforts sprang from "a fanatical spirit of revenge or from mean cupidity and were motivated by greed of personal gain or of low political ambition." These base motives compelled some of the loyal men to urge forward "this grand scheme to subjugate, impoverish, expatriate or exterminate millions of a kindred race of white men," the descendents of illustrious patriots, all of this for the assumed benefit of a race of black men.

He asserted that there were two classes of men in the Republican party, the conservatives, in which group he placed President Lincoln, and the radicals led by Mr. Stevens, whose confiscation amendment Mr. Edgerton had risen to protest. He deplored the fact that the President seemed to vacillate in his opinions being pressured by the expediency of the moment to support whichever group seemed strongest. He criticized the President's claim that confiscation was not a punishment for treason but was a belligerent right of conqueror over the conquered. He concluded his remarks with the expression of the opinion that it would be better to win the rebels to the Union cause "by words of peace than to destroy and subdue them by the power of war."⁵

Representative McDowell of Indiana was also critical of the administration. His views also epitomized the attitude of Democratic white supremacists. He felt that the war had arisen only because of the "unwise and fanatical agitation on the subject of domestic slavery." He charged that the President, his generals, the Secretary of State and the Congress had with almost complete unanimity, proclaimed that this was a war of conquest or subjugation or a war to interfere with the domestic rights of states but not a war to preserve the Union and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution.

He assailed the proponents of the doctrine that the "nation could not exist half slave and half free and that this was an irrepressible conflict ...that there was a higher law than human constitutions."

He accused the Congress of responding to the wildest and most visionary schemes of the radical enthusiasts who disregarded the true interests

of the country and the welfare of those who were sacrificing their lives in defense of the Republic. He charged that the Congress had become the theater where the abolitionists were vying with each other in their zeal for the Negro and his welfare and in their efforts to place him on equality with white men.

As proof of his contention that the Negro was being overemphasized Mr. McDowell listed the causes which the abolitionists had espoused in their harangues: the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; the law permitting Negroes in certain cases to testify against whites; the repeal of the law against transportation of the mails by Negroes; the amendment of the articles of war to make it a high offense for an officer of the army to return a runaway slave to his owner; the refusal to make it an offense of like character for an officer to entice away a slave; the passage of a law recognizing as equals of the United States the Negro governments of Liberia and Haiti; the passage of the Confiscation bill; the admission of the state of West Virginia on the condition of abolishing slavery; the prohibition of slavery in all the territories of the United States; the passage of a law prohibiting any person connected with the rebellion from holding any office of honor or profit; the compensatory emancipation schemes of the President; and the passage of an act indemnifying the President and his subordinates against prosecution for the commission of illegal and unconstitutional acts.

He deplored the fact that the President had "with one sweep of his pen" undermined the entire social and industrial systems of the South, as they had existed for more than a century, in proclaiming that three million Negro slaves should forever be free.

He direly predicted that the result of such action would be the increased unification and hostility of the South. The proposed repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, he thought, would alienate Kentucky and other border states. The confiscation of southern property he considered not only a violation of the Constitution but as an act which would render the restoration of the Union almost hopeless. He regarded the proposal to establish a Bureau of Emancipation as beyond the authority of Congress and of being in complete disregard of proper compensation of Union soldiers, their widows and orphans. He felt that this would result in neglect of the interests of white men and in a "blind policy which would emphasize Negro welfare" to the exclusion of all else. He referred to the propositions pending in the Senate which he alleged would repeal all laws "which would make a distinction between the races--between white and black."

This, he declared, was the culmination of the hopes of all radical fanatics who had directed their efforts toward the goal of debasing white men to the degraded level of the African Negro.

He denied the charges of disloyalty and of rebel sympathy which he was sure that his Republican colleagues would bring against him, saying that he was the spokesman for the Democratic conservative masses of the country who would continue in the future "to solemnly and earnestly protest against such an unwise and ruinous policy."⁶

Democrat Daniel Voorhees supported similar sentiments in his speech in the House on March 5, 1864, when he attacked the administration's policies and charged that "four millions of annual producers were to become idle and worthless consumers and a vast bureau was about to be erected by

which the government would support the Negro, instead of the Negro as heretofore assisting to support the government." He predicted that time would show that emancipation was the costliest failure of this war.

He bitterly commented that the Negro could not much be blamed for accepting this easy life offered him by "an insane party" which was determined to lay the burden of labor from which the Negro was liberated on the neck of the white man. He foresaw, he said, a totally ruined and impoverished South, her property destroyed and her slaves set free, which could only result in the annihilation of so many sources of national revenue and the consequent enormously increased taxation in the North.⁷

Mr. Voorhees was always a prime target for the attack of the Republican press which frequently assailed him along with his Democratic colleagues. His loyalty was frequently questioned. An editorial, "The Position of the So-Called Democracy," appeared in the Indianapolis Journal on February 23, 1864. It charged that while many Democrats acknowledged slavery as a dead issue and declared themselves in favor of the vigorous prosecution of the war, Voorhees, Edgerton and others of the same school provided the "melancholy sight of fanatical politicians, one-idea's men hugging the corpse of slavery and bearing the carrion about as they'd send up their worn out cries of Abolitionism, Negro Equality, States Rights, and so on ad Nauseam!"⁸

The disturbing problem of social and political equality for the Negro provoked much debate in both Senate and House. Senator Thomas A. Hendricks, a supporter of the typically Democratic viewpoint, rose to protest the proposed law introduced by Senator Charles Sumner which would have prevented

the exclusion of colored persons from the equal enjoyment of railroad privileges in the District of Columbia. Mr. Sumner had taken such action in outrage because a Negro major in the uniform of the United States had been pushed off a car on Pennsylvania Avenue because of his color. Mr. Hendricks expressed his opinion that the outraged parties were the white persons upon whom the Negro major had tried to force his presence. He declared that the Negro should have availed himself of the transportation provided for the colored population of the District. The fact that he insisted on riding in accommodations provided for whites was indicative of the fact, so Mr. Hendricks thought, that the Federal Government was about to force social and political equality of the Negro on the white race. He reminded the Senators of Indiana's 1851 exclusion act which had made it illegal for Negroes to come into the state and affirmed that since its passage and until 1860, the Negro population had increased only one and a half per cent while the adjoining state of Ohio, which had not such exclusion act, had had an increase of 41% in its Negro population.⁹

From the outbreak of the war, efforts were made by the Northern Negroes to enlist in the Union army. Their right to take active part in this struggle against the Confederacy was defended at first only by the abolitionists. On April 29, 1861, a few days after Fort Sumter, a free Negro of Washington, D.C., offered his services and those of three hundred other Negroes for the Union army, but his offer was refused. Another Negro, a physician in Battle Creek, Michigan, G.P. Miller, made a similar offer which was also rejected. Negroes such as Frederick Douglass were an important instrument in recruiting their own people. Appeals from Douglas and from white leaders such as Wendell Phillips finally prevailed upon the

administration in August 1862 to initiate the enlistment of Negro soldiers. The Federal government had been brought to the point of acquiescence as it began to realize the importance of this untapped source of manpower. In consequence of the government's action ultimately one hundred and twenty-five thousand Negroes from the slave states served in the Federal armies and with eighty thousand from the North they fought in four hundred and fifty battles.¹⁰

Negro soldiers were forced to serve under numerous discriminations and disadvantages, one of which was discrimination in pay. Until July 4, 1864, Negro soldiers received only ten dollars a month while white soldiers were receiving thirteen dollars. In July of 1864, the pay was equalized retroactively until January 1, 1864. Negroes enlisting in the Union armies received no enlistment bounties such as were offered to attract whites, until June 15, 1864, and there was a generally accepted policy of excluding Negroes from the ranks of commissioned officers. The Confederacy was particularly hard in its policy of treating captured Negro soldiers not recognizing them as soldiers, if they had been slaves. They were either killed, returned to slavery, or confined at hard labor.¹¹ An Enrollment Act of March, 1863, made all male citizens between certain age brackets subject to the draft and the War Department interpreted this to include Negroes. An act of February 24, 1864, specifically stated that the male Negroes between the ages of twenty and forty-five were subject to conscription.¹²

As late as August, 1863, Governor Oliver P. Morton of Indiana showed his reluctance to use Negro troops by refusing the services of ninety-two Negroes who had volunteered for the Home Guard for the city of Indianapolis and the state of Indiana.¹³ A powerful factor in changing public opinion

about the use of Negro troops was the difficulty Indiana experienced in filling the quota of troops required of her and the apprehension of a possible draft. In November, 1863, Governor Morton consented to raise Negro troops to complete Indiana's quota.¹⁴ The New Albany Ledger in January, 1864, announced the presence in Camp Fremont in Indianapolis of four hundred seventy Negro soldiers or nearly five full companies and estimated enlistments to average one hundred per week.¹⁵

On February 1, 1864, a resolution was introduced into the House which advocated "the more extended employment and enlistment of colored persons" as a relief to Northern soldiers who were "unacclimated and unused to manual labor." The resolution was offered in view of the "invaluable service" previously rendered to the army by free colored men already employed as soldiers and laborers. The resolution also called attention to the fact that such use of colored troops would lessen the number of white men to be taken from their homes and industrial pursuits. The resolution was adopted with the support of Republicans Julian and Orth and over the disapproval of Democrats Cravens, Edgerton, Harrington, Holman and Iaw.¹⁶

On February 23, an Indianapolis Journal article quoted a Chicago Tribune editorial, "Copperheads Losing Their Fangs," which commented on the significance of the vote on the Conscription bill which it had declared was more stringent than the conscription bill of 1863, doing away with classifications, reducing the cause for exemptions and enrolling "every black man in the United States, free or slave, with the national militia." The Tribune observed that such action made the Negro a subject of the government, a citizen, and a man whose uniform conferred upon him the badge of manhood and who now had the opportunity to prove his title by his musket.

The editorial concluded that henceforth the Negro could stand on "the same footing with the white soldier, a free man fighting for the integrity of his country."

The effort to equalize the pay of Negro troops met with much opposition also. The New Albany Ledger commented on the Senate action of March 15, in passing the House bill "defining the rank, pay and emoluments of officers of the army."¹⁷ Subsequently the President Pro-Tem of the Senate announced a committee of conference on the bill which had been returned to the House by the Senate with the amendments not acceptable to the House.¹⁸ Differences having been ironed out in the committee conference, the bill passed.

One of those who expressed his disapproval in the Senate debate on this bill was Senator Hendricks who declared that every million dollars paid out to support Negro troops was so much money lost, money which the people had been unnecessarily and wrongfully taxed to raise. He asserted however that he would support the bill although he could not cheerfully agree to all of its provisions.¹⁹

Mr. Hendricks' views were echoed in the House by W. S. Holman of Indiana who rose to say that he could not believe that anyone under the sound of his voice could contend that there was any moral or intellectual equality between the races or that the physical courage or endurance of white and Negro could be compared. On this premise Mr. Holman based his conclusion that it would be most unwise to legalize the use of Negro troops. He felt it utterly impossible to make a soldier of one whose ancestors had been subjected to "ages of servitude." He declared that the Negro was the pawn of those eager to equalize the races for their own

unworthy political ends and who wanted to break down barriers actual and real.²⁰

Senator Henry S. Lane, although a Republican, was another who regarded Negro troops as the inferior of the whites. On February 10, 1864, he expressed his disapproval of the proposed pay raise of three dollars per month for Negro troops. This raise which would increase their monthly stipend to thirteen dollars, was an amount of which Mr. Lane judged them undeserving. He contended that they, unlike white soldiers, had not been forced to leave profitable businesses behind to be neglected during the period of their army services. The Negro was fighting for his freedom. Mr. Lane felt, too, that the raise would place Negro troops on an equality with white troops even though, in his opinion, their services were not worth as much nor were they as good soldiers.²¹

Two weeks later Mr. Lane again expressed conservative disapproval of Negroes carrying the mail. He referred to the fact that he had voted against such a proposal at the previous session of the Senate and was prepared to do so again. He maintained that the law in Indiana and in many other states which prevented Negroes from testifying in courts where anyone other than colored persons was involved, would of necessity stand as a bar to a Negro fulfilling his duties as a carrier of the mails. While proclaiming his anti-slavery sentiments, Mr. Lane proclaimed his opposition to the views of the radicals in his party and voiced his approval of the provision made by the railroads of the District of Columbia for accommodating white and colored passengers separately.²²

On the same day Mr. Hendricks announced his objection to the same bill affirming that such legislation would meet with the disapproval of the citizens of his state. He too felt that the law against Negro witnesses testifying was a barrier to the efficient performance of Negroes carrying the mails. With sarcasm he continued that if a Negro was to be used as a witness, why not elevate him to the role of juror? He voiced the fear that the next step to permitting a Negro in the same cars as a white man would be forcing him into social equality with the white man. "Nothing," he darkly predicted, "would endow the Negro with the qualities which inspired confidence among white men toward each other."²³

A few days later Mr. Hendricks again resumed his tirade, in the Senate, against Negro equality stating that, "This is a proposition based upon the idea that the Negro is the equal in law, socially and politically of the white man. I say it is an unfortunate slip." He maintained that legislation might attempt to force such equality but would not make the Negro equal nor his services worth as much. It was with this belief, he declared, that he had voted against the bill for equal pay for Negro soldiers. He asserted that the Negro race had gone downward and downward for a thousand years and only when brought in contact with the white race had it made some steps upward.²⁴ His views were clearly consistent with those of his party.

Representative W.S. Holman also expressed the Democratic viewpoint on the conduct of the war. He urged the abandonment of the administration's attempt to equalize the African as a soldier whose efforts were no match for the "steady courage of the white race." He cautioned against the attempt to establish political equality for the Negro or of forcing the

abolition of slavery by requiring one-tenth of the voters in the states in rebellion to agree to abolition before being restored to the Union. He declared that such action could only be of uncertain benefit to the Negro as such an attempt to change the old landmarks of state and national government could only be upheld by the maintenance of a standing army. Laws not sanctioned by public opinion could only be sustained by military force, he asserted. Such a force would also be needed to protect the Negro from the "cupidity and domineering spirit of the white man!" He proclaimed that while he, personally, had always abhorred slavery and was opposed to injustice toward and oppression of Negroes, he had always opposed making slavery the object of the war, an action which imperiled the freedom of millions of the white race.

He rejected also the idea of a Bureau of Freedmen's affairs with its "countless hordes of civil officers" as idle philanthropy. As the Negro race had not the inherent force of character, in Mr. Holman's opinion, to maintain its own freedom, the only solution which remained was to colonize him beyond "the reach of the rapacity of the white man."²⁵

Another and more tolerant point of view was expressed by Ebenezer Dumont, a Unionist who had deserted the Democratic party because of its pro-slavery attitude. He spoke out in defense of President Lincoln's statement which had called all Negroes "American citizens of African descent." He lashed out at the critics of this remark who had charged that the President was bringing the nation into contempt and that the Negro was to be "a nigger no longer but an American citizen of African descent." Such men, Mr. Dumont charged, were of a class found in all free states, Indiana included, a group not numerous but quite vocal in declaring the war to be a

war of abolition and of accusing anyone who uttered a "manly statement" of being an abolitionist. These individuals, he continued, manifested much hatred toward those who were opposed to slavery and who did not look upon it as a "sanctified institution." These men he described as "spiteful, vindictive and sometimes wantonly cruel and ferocious toward the Negro, quick to lead the slave hunter to the escaping slave." It was these men, said Mr. Dumont, "who had never owned a slave or had their fathers before them," who before emigrating to a free state, had been kept down from generation to generation by a vicious system. They had been condescendingly referred to in the slave states as "poor white trash" and were denied their rights in that they were only allowed to go through a form of voting in which they had to vote only for the whiteman in whose cabin or on whose plantation they lived. They were unable to express any public opinion or to participate in public affairs. Such men, he charged, felt the Negro the cause of their degradation and therefore their anger fell upon the Negro as being the cause of evils for which he was not to blame. When these grievances had become so intolerable that they no longer could bear them, they put all their goods and chattels "on the back of a poor old horse or into a rickety wagon" and migrated with their wives and children to a free state with hatred of the Negro grounded into their innermost souls too deep to be eradicated by the small amount of reason at their command. These men, having settled on free soil and having prospered under free institutions, ceased to be underlings but continued to hate the Negro holding fast to "the delusion that holding men in bondage is proof of respectability." These men continued to be vengeful and were incapable of drawing a distinction and seeing clearly that it was slavery and not the Negro that had kept them down, Mr. Dumont charged.

He called attention to the fact that his beliefs were not without precedent in our history, as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson had favored the abolition of slavery while John Jay and Alexander Hamilton had favored the use of Negro troops, an opinion shared by Andrew Jackson who had used Negro soldiers in the battle of New Orleans. He cited Cox's Buck-eyes Abroad which described an eloquent sermon in Latin delivered at the Pope's Court in the Sistene Chapel by an Abyssinian. He declared that a sad commentary on American prejudice was the liberality of the Catholic Church of Rome in barring no man from the priesthood, black or white.

Representative Dumont concluded by saying that he was not pleading for social equality for the Negro nor for an admixture of the races but was attempting to show that men freed from "the slavish shackles of party and guided by the better impulses" of their nature could speak kindly of all men, the Negro included, and could believe that "we are all children of a common Father."²⁶

A speech generally critical of administration policies was the speech of Democratic Representative Harrington before the House on March 26, 1864, in which he declared that he was of the opinion that the administration had no intention of restoring the Union, and that its principal object was the slave, and that the "mal-administration of the government had changed a legitimate war into an insane crusade having for its object the remodeling of the mental, moral, social and physical condition of three or four million African slaves." He further accused the President of prolonging the war and destroying the most valuable rights of a loyal people to the end of abolishing slavery. He condemned the action which had placed the Negro slave in the field as a soldier. He denied that the election of

1863 had endorsed the President's policy of emancipation. He declared that the order for the use of the Negro soldier had merely opened a "safe mode of escape and transportation to some quiet nook where the orgies of abolitionism might confer a new order of knighthood on the sable transcendental hero." He predicted the Negro would turn the arms, put into his hands, against the people and that the efforts to equalize the Negro and to depress the whites would be futile. He denounced those who opposed colonization of the emancipated Negro. The continued proximity of the races, he felt, would result in the slave's insolence toward his former master while the white man, on his part, would be unable to forget that the Negro had been his slave and inferior. Nor would the white man fail to find a source of annoyance in the sudden legal and political equality of the races. This would foster a feeling of jealousy and hatred for the inferior, he prophesied. The Negro's struggle for a practical equality would be resisted and would bring about the contempt and anger of his "superior." The process of civilizing the Negro was sure to be slow, he thought, as he could not be raised by the workings of his own will, but only by his contacts with his superior. Removed from the influence of his white superiors, the Negro, "a child of indolence," would revert to barbarism, he thought. "We cannot remodel mankind by legislation," he concluded.²⁷

On December 14, 1863, Representative George W. Julian introduced a resolution that the House Committee on Judiciary be instructed to report a bill to repeal the third and fourth sections of an act "respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of masters" which had been approved on February 12, 1793, and an act to amend and supplementary

to the aforesaid act approved on September 18, 1850.²⁸ The bill, after much debate and amendment, was finally passed on June 14, 1864, with Indiana Representatives Julian and Orth included among the "yeas" while Democrats Cravens, Edgerton, Harrington, Law and McDowell voted "nay." Dumont and Voorhees were among those not voting.²⁹

On April 19, 1864, Mr. Hendricks rose in the Senate to express his opposition to the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act. He based his objection to such action on the fact that every department of government had conceded the legality of the law, in some form, for securing the return of the slave to his master upon proper claim. In Indiana the 1850 Constitution upheld it. Until such time then as the joint resolution, which the Senate had just passed, for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery, had been passed by the House and been approved by a sufficient number of the state legislatures, there would be no propriety for repealing the act, he declared.³⁰

The Indianapolis Journal of April 21 was critical of Senate action during the course of debate on this measure. They censured the action of Senator Sherman of Ohio in moving for an amendment of the 1793 act and declared that "the people want no half way action in this matter but demanded total abolition of all laws that would make them slave catchers." The article added that this was an inopportune time for such a consideration since the abolition of slavery was being considered. It exclaimed in conclusion, "Out upon such legislation! Let us have a free country!"³¹

On June 23, 1864, Senator Lane of Indiana voted in favor of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law while Senator Hendricks, although having previously expressed his disapproval, was absent.³²

On June 21, 1864, Mr. Hendricks sharply criticized the amount of time spent by the Senate on considerations dealing with the Negro. He charged that for some months scarcely a bill had been considered at all "that did not have some connection with the colored race." He acidly remarked that if the Republicans would stand "the exclusion of every other business for the consideration of that which relates to the colored people, I think I can try and endure." He concluded that it was his opinion that there were subjects more gratifying to his tastes, subjects more important to the machinery of government and to the benefit of the army.³³

Representative James Cravens also expressed the typically Democratic view of administration policy. He reproached the Federal government for not adhering to the policy it had announced at the beginning of the war when it had declared its intention to put down the armed rebellion and to restore the Union under the Constitution leaving all the states in full possession of their constitutional rights. He regretfully recalled that the President had earlier resisted those who had wanted the Emancipation Proclamation and had removed generals who had attempted to liberate slaves in "contravention of his avowed war policy." He recalled the appeal to ignore party prejudices. If such restoration was really the goal of the administration, why, he demanded, was far more importance given "to the interest of the African race than to the interest of the white race?" He accused the administration of constantly having before the Congress some legislation pertaining to the Negro. Mr. Cravens also referred to the ejection of the Negro officer from a Washington street car which had occasioned so much debate in the Senate and censured Senator Grimes for declaring that it was a greater disgrace for the Negro to be put out of

the cars than it would have been to have done the same by Senator Hendricks. Scathingly Mr. Cravens enumerated and denounced each of the bills laid before the Congress which dealt with the Negro. He deplored the laudatory remarks delivered by his colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Kelly, who had eulogized the death of a Negro friend. Mr. Cravens proclaimed himself as being "sick and tired of this constant agitation of the Negro subject." "The agitation of that question," he declared, "is the Pandora's box from which has come only evil." He said that he had yet to learn of one substantial advantage or benefit which had been conferred on the Negroes "who had been taken from happy homes and sent to wander as vagabonds and outcasts to die of starvation or to huddle like sheep in contraband camps, there to be fed at public expense from the sweat and toil of white people."

He also questioned the wisdom of some proposals made for the disposition of the freed Negroes and declared that the people of the North would not receive them as their equals politically or socially, even though he charged that the doctrine of miscegenation was beginning to be popular with the abolitionists.

"The Negro," he prophesied, "would be in a short time reduced to the position of a vassal, a serf, or peon." He concluded that his chief desire was to see the Union restored to such principles as the South would be satisfied with if such a thing was possible.³⁴

Mr. Craven's Democratic colleague, John Law, also expressed his doubt that any conciliation was possible as it was his considered opinion that his Republican colleagues would not receive the seceded states, even if they offered to come back, unless they agreed to accept the abolition of

slavery within their borders. He deplored the fact that the Crittenden Resolution had not been accepted and accused the Republicans of being as revolutionary in their character and designs as the rebels. The existence of slavery was both acknowledged and provided for in the Constitution, he maintained. The Republicans, he alleged, had interfered with the rights of the South in this particular and had thus brought about "a destruction of life, a treasury bankrupt, a nation ruined." This is the price, he declared, that they had been willing to pay for the freedom of four million blacks who, he maintained, were now worse off in freedom than they had been in bondage. This statement, he asserted, was substantiated by reports from the Freedmen's Bureau, reports of alleged mistreatment of Negroes which Mr. Law proceeded to quote. This, he continued, was the grand result of the "political philanthropy" of the Republican party in giving freedom to the black man, "a boon they never asked." He predicted that the freedman's hardships would never be less or their wrongs redressed any more by a new fangled Bureau of Freedmen. He concluded that the people, in his opinion, were in favor not of reconstruction but of restoration.³⁵

On the Republican side of the question George W. Julian declared that he was opposed to the restoration of slavery as it was when "the Democratic party, in the evil days of the past ruled the government absolutely in the interest of slavery." He asserted that he was instead for the Union as "it will be when this rebellion shall have wrought out its Providential lesson in these states and scourged the slave breeding Democracy from our land forever." He expressed his desire to see a Union of regenerated states resting upon the basis of free labor, and the rights of man.

Mr. Julian asserted that he did not find it strange that the rebels of the South should defy humanity in their treatment of Negroes but could not understand the attitude of those of the North who opposed the measure on which he rose to speak. He exclaimed that he could not see why they should be unwilling to permit Negro soldiers to have a homestead of their own, men who had enlisted in the services of their country and who were sharing the perils and hardships of war and helping with their valor to achieve victories. These same Negro soldiers had covered themselves with glory under General Grant, he declared. "Why should they not then," he demanded, "have a homestead at the end of the war, in the land of their oppressors" who had enslaved their race for more than two hundred years? Mr. Julian proceeded to suggest that homesteads of eight to forty acres should be carved from land confiscated from rebels. The freedman would thus be able to enjoy an equality of rights in the ownership of land in the rebellious states.

Mr. Julian's speech referred to a bill which he had introduced in the House in February, 1864, a bill designed "to secure to persons in military and naval service homesteads in confiscated and forfeited estates within insurrectionary districts. This bill was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.³⁶

In the same speech Representative Julian chose to give his answer to those who accused Republicans of abolitionist sentiments of wanting Negro equality. He declared that he believed that the Negro would work out that problem for himself under the new dispensation which the military and legislative power of the government had inaugurated. He said that he

believed in doing justice to the Negro in guarding his rights and in giving him fair play in fighting his own battles leaving his social position to be determined by his own conduct and the conditions of life, in which he might be placed.³⁷

Mr. Julian next touched on the matter of Negro suffrage. He declared himself as being in favor of leaving the matter of suffrage to the "rebaptized" states to deal with on just principle. He recalled that the state of North Carolina had once allowed Negroes to vote, and that several of the slave states and nearly all of the non-slave holding states had permitted colored men to vote upon the question of accepting the Constitution.

Then with barbed sarcasm Mr. Julian attacked his colleague from Kentucky, Mr. Mallory, thus:

"As respects the question of Negro equality, let me say to the gentleman that I do not think he ought to press it, considering his relation to his brethren in the South. I think the subject is a somewhat delicate one for Democratic gentlemen to deal with." When Mr. Mallory demanded an explanation of this remark, Mr. Julian continued, "We who are known as Republicans and unconditional Union men sometimes associate with Negroes. They live among us and of course we have dealings with them. But no such intimate relations exist between them and us as we find existing between them and the Democrats of the South. Continually, habitually, and as a result of a well recognized law of social order, the slave mothers and slave masters of the South are brought to a level of social equality in its most loathesome form. In some of the rebel states I believe the number of mulattoes is nearly equal to the number of Democratic voters. In the state

of Mississippi, if I am not mistaken, wherever you find an orthodox modern Democrat, you will find a mulatto not very far off. The gentleman cannot deny this, unless he can show that these mulattoes sprouted up from the soil or were rained down from the clouds or reported their presence through some other miracle. This social equality between Negro women and Anglo-Saxon Democrats is the natural consequence and necessary fruit of the institution which has proved itself to be the mother of treason and of all lesser abominations." Mr. Julian's retort to Mr. Mallory's statement that one-sixth of the colored population of the North had white blood in their veins, while only one-ninth of the slave population had white blood, was that he had not examined the census but believed that the figure might well be true for he believed that mulattoes more generally moved into the Northern states than those of darker color. "The gentleman," he continued, "is not at all relieved however by the white blood in the veins of these Negroes in the North, for they have migrated from the South bringing with them perhaps the blood of the gentleman from Kentucky or other distinguished leaders of his party." In consequence of these remarks, Mr. Julian was accused by Mr. Mallory of violating the rules of good breeding.

Mr. Julian continued his speech with a defense of the confiscation of lands for the use of freedmen which he declared was necessary to prevent "the establishment of a remorseless system of serfdom over the blacks." "Land monopoly is slavery in disguise." "If you seize these lands," he insisted, "and allot them in small homesteads, you destroy this monopoly and establish liberty and equality on the ruins of a system which has repined in this war." The question of land monopoly involves the whole problem of reconstruction. If not decided wisely, what will the President's

proclamation be worth?" he demanded. "Of what avail would be an act of Congress abolishing slavery or an amendment to the Constitution forever forbidding it if the old agricultural basis for aristocratic power shall remain?" he queried.³⁸

The question of abolition and the Thirteenth Amendment was another subject for heated debate as the first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress drew to a close.

On February 8, 1864, Senator Sumner offered a resolution "to supplant the guarantees stipulated by the Congress in its work of restoration and reconstruction." He proposed that the Constitution "be so amended as to prohibit slavery everywhere within the limits of the Republic."³⁹

On February 15, 1864, a similar resolution was offered in the House by Representative Arnold. The resolution was adopted with Republicans Julian, Orth and Dumont supporting it and Democrats Cravens, Edgerton, Harrington and Holman opposing it.⁴⁰ On April 13, 1864, the Indianapolis Journal recorded the vote of Indiana's senators in the passing of the abolition amendment on February 8. Republican Senator Lane voted for the measure while Senator Hendricks, Democrat, voted "nay."⁴¹

A few days later an editorial in the Journal entitled "The Death of Slavery" declared that destiny had wrought many changes in connection with the rebellion and now the marvel of all, the Constitution which had protected slavery was about to give it its death stroke. It exclaimed that the amendment was "not only right but is a necessity." The editorial continued: "Whether the conflict between freedom and slavery was irrepressible

before the outbreak of war, it was certainly irreconcilable after." It concluded that the constitutional amendment was the only valid way of making a "universal and permanent end of slavery." It urged the Democratic party to take this occasion to abandon the institution of slavery for which it had already "suffered so terribly and unavailingly" and further advocated the concurrence of both parties in the amendment so that it might be ratified "with one accord by all loyal states and loyal men of the land."¹²

On March 28 Representative Stevens offered a resolution of House and Senate that "slavery and involuntary servitude except for punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted be forever prohibited in the United States and its territories." Although Mr. Holman moved to table this, it was passed.¹³

On June 14 in the ensuing debate in the House Congressman W.S. Holman expressed doubt that the times were propitious for considering an amendment to the Constitution. He felt that it was not a time to weaken the public mind, already in a state of revolution, or to challenge "the authority of established principles by invention and change." He asserted that the bitter experiences of three and one-half years of uninterrupted misfortune should have taught the Republican party that their judgment was not infallible. The Act of Confiscation, the Emancipation Proclamation had served, in his opinion, only to unite a divided South and to divide the public opinion of the North. The arming of the Negro as a soldier and every other measure of the administration had been mistakes. The amendment of the Constitution would simply render it hostile to the institutions of the South and would fail to restore the Union, he declared. He termed such

action "a suicidal act" and a "mere party measure" which would invade the domestic policy of the states which had been guaranteed them by the Constitution. Declaring himself neither "an advocate for nor an apologist of slavery," he asserted that he would not have slavery "weigh a feather against the progress of our arms." He charged that the amendment conferred on the Congress the power to invade any state in order to enforce the freedom of the Negro. He also accused the Republican party of directing its main purpose to the enfranchisement of a people who had been indifferent to the struggle and who had given their strength to the enemies. Now the party was mistakingly asking the constitutional power to force them into freedom and citizenship. He warned that the Republican policy would not save but would ruin the country.

Another Democrat who expressed his disapproval of the Thirteenth Amendment was Joseph K. Edgerton. He announced his respect for the anti-slavery sentiment existing in the United States which was based on sincere moral and political convictions and agreed that few candid men could hesitate to believe that it would have been better if Negro slavery had never existed. It was his opinion, however, that the abolition of slavery should have come through the constitutional action of the people of the slave holding states as manifested through their own constitution and laws. He refused however to permit his opinions against slavery to lead him into hatred against slave owners and into "a lawless zeal" to violate rights conceded to them by the Constitution. The Constitution, he said, had recognized slavery and had provided in substance if not words the surrender to owner or master any slave escaping from one state to another. He pointed also to the fact that territory had been organized as slaveholding

territory and new states admitted as slave holding states, action which could not have been taken if the Constitution had not sanctioned it. He referred also to the resolution of the Chicago Republican Convention of 1860, the resolution of February 11, 1861, adopted by the Thirty-Sixth Congress, and the Lincoln inaugural address on March 3, 1861, all of which had supported the premise that slavery should not be interfered with where it already existed. He protested the administration's reversal of policy which now made the abolition of slavery the object of its supreme effort. He criticized Republican party action taken in the Union Convention in Baltimore on June 8, 1864, which announced approval and endorsement of the measures the President had adopted, the Emancipation Proclamation and the employment of Negro troops. He called attention to the amendment approved on March 2, 1861, which had declared that no amendment should be made to the Constitution giving Congress the power to abolish or interfere with any state and its domestic institutions including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of the state. Mr. Edgerton based his objection to the Thirteenth Amendment on four things. It was objectionable because:

1. It proposed "revolutionary change in government and sought to "draw within the authority of the Federal Constitution and Federal Congress a question of internal policy belonging exclusively to the slave holding states."
2. It proposed to change the Constitutional basis of representation and taxation and would increase Southern representation based on the Negro population thus making the Negro not merely a passive but an active basis of representation in the federal

government. The implications of this would be the Negro a free voting citizen of the United States protected everywhere in defiance of state constitutions and laws, the Negro having been admitted to elective franchise in all states. Negroes would next speak in the Congress as representatives of all the Southern if not Northern states.

3. The effect of the amendment would also be "to turn loose at once without preparation or education, without property or means whereby to live, and without guidance restraint and protection of superior intelligence and forethought of their masters and owners, three and a half to four million persons." This sudden freedom to the Negro, "without the capacity to appreciate and improve, has proved not a blessing but a care." As proof of this he called attention to "the tens of thousands homeless, diseased, demoralized, starving naked, helpless contrabands."
4. The proposed amendment would be the "crowning effort of that stupendous system of confiscation or legalized plunder by which the party in power proposes to restore the Union." The amendment would operate upon friend and foe, union man and rebel alike in the "appropriation to public use, without compensation of the entire slave property of the United States. Such confiscation would amount to a violation of the provision of the Constitution that private property can not be taken for public use without compensation.

Mr. Edgerton continued his speech with the question, "What matters it that the white man of the South perhaps born to affluence, educated should be driven from inheritance, become homeless wanderers and mendicants so long as the Negro without intelligence, without education, without capacity for self-government can be installed as owner of the soil from which his master and protector have been driven." In conclusion Mr. Edgerton exclaimed, "Better sir, for our country, better for men, that Negro slavery exist a thousand years than that American white men lose their constitutional liberty in the extinction of the constitutional sovereignty of the federal states of the union. If the states wherein slavery still lives a mangled, bleeding, prostrate form, see fit to give it the final blow that shall make it a thing of the past, let them do it in their own time and way."⁴⁵

The second session of the Thirty-eighth Congress continued the debate on the proposed Thirteenth Amendment and the problems of reconstruction.

The radical Republican viewpoint of the amendment was expressed by Godlove Orth who said, "In my humble opinion, we cannot hope for complete success until slavery, the universally acknowledged cause of rebellion shall be extinguished." He continued, "slavery is dying; it raised its arm to destroy this government and the American people have decreed that it is unfit to live...but while we are witnessing its death agony, let us take care to provide by amendment of the Constitution that under no circumstances hereafter shall slavery exist in any of these states." Mr. Orth felt that the effect of such an amendment would be a practical application of the self-evident truth that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life,

liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The submission of the amendment to the people for ratification simply provided them with the opportunity to ratify or reject it. "Is slavery then too sacred to be subjected to the ordeal and judgment of our people?" he demanded. He maintained that the institution of slavery was a system of fraud, of injustice, of crime and tyranny, which trampled on every moral precept, setting at defiance every divine law, and destroying every natural right of man. "It had debased the social circle, polluted the sanctuary, defiled the judicial ermine and corrupted every department of the government," he declared.

Mr. Orth charged that for eighty years slavery had been the "deadly enemy of republican institutions, crippling the power of an otherwise free people, muzzling free speech and free press, poisoning public opinion, making the American name "a hissing byword among the nations of the earth," robbing the American people of their rights under the Constitution; and ruthlessly trampling upon every principle of the Declaration of Independence." He marvelled that there should be anyone within the walls of Congress who would hesitate to strike this last blow which would exterminate slavery forever.

Mr. Voorhees, Democratic Representative from Indiana, in speaking to the House on the same subject declared that it was his opinion that the enactment of the proposed amendment was not linked in any way with the existence of slavery. He expressed disapproval of the President's announcement that no proposition of peace would be entertained until slavery was destroyed, by which action he committed "the blood and treasure of the country to the overthrow of the institution of slavery." He darkly conjectured that should the rebellion become a success and southern

independence emerge from the desolation of war, slavery would be beyond the reach of the Union and the Constitution would have to be amended to apply to a foreign power. Continuing in a more optimistic tone, he predicted the relinquishment of slavery by action of the South itself. The fact that General Lee was asking for Negro troops to recruit his diminished armies was indicative, he thought, of the "consequent and inevitable abolition of slavery." Mr. Voorhees declared that he would not stop to question whether it was worth the terrible sacrifice required to secure the "doubtful blessing" of freedom for four million Negroes. He predicted that other vital issues would grow out of the destruction of slavery which would divide the country in the future. He further predicted that the Republicans would seek to enfranchise the liberated Negro, to make him a voter, juror, and a future office holder, a thing which had already been done in many states.

He concluded that if such an amendment could "divest the citizens of the Southern states of the rights of holding private property guaranteed by the Constitution, the same authority could be exercised to destroy other rights by similar usurpations of power."⁴⁷

Democratic Representative James Cravens also rose to challenge the acceptance of the Thirteenth Amendment. He declared that he wished to correct the impression given by his Republican colleagues that all those voting against the amendment were influenced to do so by a desire to "protect and perpetuate" the institution of slavery. He declared that no such desire would influence his vote but that he would vote against the amendment because, in his opinion, it was not the proper time to make any

fundamental changes in the law. He also asserted that he believed that the passage of the amendment would multiply rather than diminish troubles upon the subject. This would be true, he believed, because the deportation of the slaves would be prevented by the abolitionists and they must either remain where they were or be diffused throughout the free states, a move which would no doubt be opposed by these states. The adoption of the amendment would impose upon the government the moral obligation to provide for the support of those who otherwise would become "mendicants or wandering outcasts." Mr. Cravens asserted that he for one had no desire to assume such "fearful responsibilities." It was his view that slavery was dying and in view of the surrounding circumstances it would be wiser to leave the question where the Constitution had left it to be dealt with by the states.

He concluded that the time and events were rapidly doing their work in the minds of the Southern people and therefore rendered unnecessary the immediate forced abolition of slavery which would involve a destruction or even a weakening of the federal system of government.⁴⁸

The Daily Journal of February 2, 1865, commented that the big struggle in Congress over the anti-slavery amendment had ended with its adoption with a two-thirds vote of each house and now the measure would go to the states to be ratified by a vote of three-fourths of them. It observed that every state in rebellion would have to abolish slavery before being readmitted to the Union. The article recorded Republicans Colfax, Dumont, Julian and Orth as voting in favor of the measure while Democrats Edgerton, Law, Cravens, Harrington and Holman voted against it. Democrats McDowell and Voorhees were absent.⁴⁹

On February 7, 1865, the two Houses of Congress met jointly to consider the President's State of the Union message. One of those who rose to speak on this occasion was George W. Julian. He declared that in the beginning the government had not recognized the war as a war of ideas, a conflict between two forms of civilization each wrestling for the mastery of the country nor had it been willing to acknowledge slavery as the cause of the war. Thus followed the revocation of the Emancipation Proclamation in Missouri and General Halleck's "Order number 3" which remained in force more than a year turning away countless scores of contrabands who came into the Union lines offering information and labor. Mr. Julian struck at the President's former preoccupation with "chimerical projects for the colonization of Negroes coupled with the policy of gradual and compensated emancipation which would take place some time before the year 1900 if the slave holders should be willing." He asserted that the government's purpose to crush slavery and spare the rebellion was found to be "utterly suicidal" to the Union cause. By wiping out the code of national slave laws, acknowledging the manhood of the Negro and recognizing slavery as the enemy of peace, Congress had emphatically revoked the policy which had sought to ignore slavery and to shield it from the destruction of a war instigated by itself. At the same time he declared it had opened the way for further inevitable measures of justice which were forerunners of complete emancipation of the Negro from the dominion of Anglo-Saxon prejudice. A foundation was laid for the repeal of all special legislation intended for the freedman's injury, and the way paved for his enjoyment of equal rights with the white man as a citizen as well as a soldier, exulted Mr. Julian. Even the President, after giving the situation sober thought, had gradually

admitted that slavery was an obstacle to peace and the cause of the war. He thereupon resolved to save the Union without slavery and by its destruction. No longer did he entertain the country "with projects of gradual and distant emancipation conditional upon the compensation of the master and the colonization of freedmen, but he himself finally launched the policy of immediate and unconditional liberation and strongly advocated a constitutional amendment to abolish slavery." "Abolitionism and loyalty were now accepted as convertible terms as were treason and slavery," he continued.

Mr. Julian remarked that the people had not chosen the President for another term through any secondary or merely personal considerations. They had had little faith in General McClellan and his party leaders just as they had had little faith in Mr. Lincoln's early policy "when Democratic ideas ruled his administration and the power of slavery held him in its grasp." Mr. Julian felt that in voting for a second term for Mr. Lincoln the people had voted for "liberating and arming the slaves of the South to crush out a slave holder's rebellion." He added as he brought his speech to a conclusion, that he agreed that slavery had done much to "drug the conscience of the country with insidious poison" and that having so long "made our bed with slave holders kicking them out was rather an awkward business."⁵⁰

On February 20, 1865, the House had as its special order of business a bill dealing with reconstruction.⁵¹ On this occasion the Honorable J.K. Edgerton of Indiana rose to express his views. He proclaimed himself an anti-slavery man not opposed to the bill as an anti-slavery measure per se but because he believed it would establish a dangerous theory in the federal

system, one which invaded state sovereignty and ignored the rights of states. He denied that either he or his party, the Democratic party, had ever been a party in the interests of slavery and maintained that their opposition to anti-slavery legislation by the Federal government had been based upon the desire not to extend or perpetuate slavery but to subordinate the issue in the effort to preserve the Union and the Constitution.

Mr. Edgerton then bitterly attacked the Reconstruction bill which he said proposed to disregard all laws and usages of the state in favor of slavery and to extend to whites and Negroes criminal laws of the state and qualifications as jurors. Further, it proposed to confirm to all persons and their posterity in all states and parts of states, covered by the Emancipation Proclamation the extension of the writ of habeas corpus by United States courts to discharge such persons when held as slaves and making it a crime to attempt to enslave any person thus declared free. This offense would be punishable by fine and imprisonment. It was to be considered a high crime for a slave holder to hold slaves. The bill also provided disfranchisement as citizens of the United States of all military personnel from colonel up and civil officers of the Confederacy. In the formation of new state constitutions and governments and in the election of delegates suffrage was to be extended to Negroes who could read the Constitution of the United States. In view of these provisions, Mr. Edgerton commented that it was clear to him that the two cardinal ideas of the party in power, the Republicans, were Negro suffrage and Negro equality.⁵²

Another controversial measure considered by the Thirty-eighth Congress was the proposal to establish a Freedmen's Bureau. This measure met with

much opposition, especially from the representatives of the Democracy. Democratic newspapers were also filled with critical comment. The New Albany Ledger quoted an editorial from the Boston Post which sarcastically condemned Senator Sumner's efforts in behalf of the Bureau. The editorial declared that Mr. Sumner wished to be a pioneer in all things relating to slavery and would if he succeeded in processing the establishing of a Freedmen's Bureau, "secure a number of hungry officials to eat up our substance and new sycophants to fawn that thrift may follow." Thus, predicted the editorial, the country would be weakened, radicalism elevated, and the country depressed by a still greater burden of taxation." The article exclaimed in conclusion that already the army of officials was unprecedentedly great and the present corruption alarming.⁵³

On June 28, 1864, House Bill No. 51 to establish a Bureau of Freedmen passed the Senate with Senator Lane voting for its passage.⁵⁴ Senator Hendricks opposed having previously offered an amendment which was not accepted. The Hendricks amendment would have placed the Bureau under the Department of Interior instead the Department of the Treasury. He commented in offering his amendment that he was not in favor of the bill but thought it could be improved with his amendment as the Bureau contemplated supervision over a class of people of the country.⁵⁵

On December 20, 1864, the regular business of the House was the consideration of House Bill 51 with its Senate amendments. The bill now proposed the appointment of commissioners to have authority under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury to create departments of freedmen within rebel states not to exceed two within a state. The commissioners were to have general superintendency of freedmen throughout special departments to

watch over execution of the laws, proclamations, and military orders of emancipation and "by careful regulation to protect the freedmen in the enjoyment of their rights, to promote the welfare and secure to them and their posterity the blessings of liberty."⁵⁶

It was this bill which Senator Hendricks made the object of his attack in the Senate on February 21, 1865. He declared that the effect of the bill would be to make colored people of the South not freedmen but slaves under the control of officers whose interest it might be to make money out of their labor while having control and custody of them. These officers would be supported by the taxes of a "burdened people." The purpose of such officers was ostensibly "to make provision, with humane and suitable purposes at a just compensation for the employment of the freedmen." Since such employment would depend on the willingness of the colored persons involved to be employed, Mr. Hendricks asserted that he saw no purpose of a government officer to make a bargain for him. "If he is free," exclaimed Mr. Hendricks, "he makes his own contracts. If he is a slave, I prefer that he should be a slave under the control of a person who is interested to look after him." Commissioners appointed on the assumption of their honesty might be honest but there would be no guarantee that all of their officers were honest, the Senator pointed out. He called attention to the danger of appointing a dishonest official who sought only to make gains for himself or perhaps for his relatives, his friends, or men whom he wished to make rich. If the officer should hire out the colored people under his supervision to the men whom he wished to enrich and accommodate, in that way the most odious system of slavery that was possible could spring up, predicted Mr. Hendricks.⁵⁷

Senator Lane also by this time had decided to oppose the Freedmen's Bureau. He announced that he would be constrained to vote against the bill which proposed to establish a permanent Department of Freedmen with a vast machinery to take charge of the freedmen not temporarily but as it seemed for all time to come. He announced that he was in favor of temporary relief and temporary support of both poor colored persons and white refugees. He declared that he was opposed to the measure supported by the committee of conference which he said went upon the assumption that the Negro was wholly incompetent to take care of himself. He asserted that he objected to the appointment of commissioners who had a right to take possession of farms, lease them to whomever they pleased and then hire out the Negroes at any price they should agree on between themselves and the lessees of the lands. He continued that it would introduce a system of swindling "unheard of in the history of the world." He declared, "You give these poor creatures to the kind protection of broken down politicians and adventurers and decayed ministers of the gospel and make them overseers to make fortunes out of these poor creatures and they will treat the Negroes, in my opinion, far more cruelly than did their masters under the old slave system."

He asserted that he was opposed to the whole theory of a Freedmen's Bureau, believing that the Negroes should be free under the law and protected in the courts. He proposed also, if necessary, giving them the right of suffrage and letting the loyal slaves vote their rebel masters down in reconstructing the seceded states. He declared that he was firmly opposed to a system of guardianship and pupilage and oversight over the freedmen.

Mr. Lane's final objection to the report on the bill was that it made no provision for the white refugees or for the fifteen to twenty thousand Negroes in the District of Columbia. He concluded by saying that despite his anti-slavery record, he could not vote for this proposal.⁵⁸

The Confiscation bill was considered again in the closing days of the Congress, the particular bill under consideration being House Bill 579, which provided for the forfeiture of fee of rebel landholding. The forfeiture was prohibited beyond the natural life of the said land holder. The bill was passed with Republican Congressmen Dumont and Orth voting "yea." Democrats Cravens, Edgerton, Holman, Law and Voorhees voted "nay" while Representatives Harrington and Julian were reported as not voting.⁵⁹

The last bill dealing with the problems of the Negro on which this Congress took action was the Disqualifications of Color, Senate Bill 62, which was passed with support of Indiana Republicans and over the negative votes of Indiana Democrats. This bill removed restrictions against colored persons carrying the mails and the exclusion of witnesses because of color. At the same session a resolution to remove the "odious discrimination" which required colored men, leaving Washington and going North, to carry a pass was passed. Representatives Cravens and Voorhees, as could be expected, voted against the resolution while not voting were Democrats Edgerton, Harrington, Holman, Law and McDowell and Republicans Julian and Dumont.⁶⁰ Senator Lane had previously voted in support of this bill.⁶¹

CONCLUSION

In considering the foregoing speeches of Indiana senators and representatives one needs to be little surprised at the conservative tone of most of them with regard to slavery and the Negro question. Their utterances were a reflection of the thinking of the large majority of Indiana citizens many of whom were of Southern antecedents, having migrated to Indiana from slave holding states. This was particularly true of those persons living on the Ohio River on the Kentucky border. It was these individuals who felt that their welfare and prosperity were more closely tied to that of the agrarian South than that of the industrial North. Steeped in the prejudices of their Southern heritage it was people of such tradition who had, in the early history of the state, enacted legislation for the indenture of servants whose services were merely legalized slavery. These were the same people whose state legislators in 1851 had excluded Negroes and mulattoes from the state and who voiced constant fears that free Negroes might become a threat to free white labor. Clinging to their traditional belief in Negro inferiority, they advocated non-interference with slavery and denied the Negro in the state the right of suffrage, the right to serve as a witness in court or to serve in the state militia, to inter-marry with white persons or to enjoy the advantages of public schooling. The Negro was kept fully aware of his position as a social inferior.

We have seen that, during the war years, there was bitter opposition to Negro troops and an increasing fear of imminent Negro immigration into the State. At this time it was apparent that only the more radical

Republicans such as George W. Julian were willing to admit that slavery was the cause of the war. Most Hoosiers were anxious to avoid the subject of slavery lest their border state neighbors might be offended and break off their Union allegiance. The Republican policy became one then of compromise and appeasement, a thing reflected in conservative administration policies in the early war years. The effort to form a Union party by an appeal to non-partisanship was another outgrowth of this same attitude.

In the Thirty-seventh Congress there were eight Republicans and six Democrats. Not all were born in Indiana. Senators Bright, Democrat, and Wright, Unionist, claimed New York and Pennsylvania respectively as the states of their birth while Republican Representatives Colfax, Mitchell and White and Democrat Law were also easterners by birth. Only Republican Senator Lane and Republican Representative Shanks were natives of slave states and in this instance we have seen that the former was a conservative while the latter was extremely liberal in his thinking on the Negro question. Conservative Democratic Senator Turpie was a product of Ohio as was Democrat extremist David Voorhees. All others represented in this Congress were natives of Indiana.

Senator Bright's residence in Kentucky and Southern Indiana was possibly an influence on his attitude on the slavery question. Senator Wright's conservatism cannot be easily explained, as he was a resident of Rockville, Indiana, in the western part of the state. Senator Turpie upheld the beliefs of the Democratic party but was less vehement than some of his colleagues.

Republicans whose views were more liberal and a probable reflection of their constituents' views in Northern Indiana communities where less prejudice existed, were Representative Colfax from South Bend, Mitchell from Kendallville, Julian from Wayne County, a Quaker community, and White from Lafayette. The conservatism of Republican Representatives Dunn and Porter was no doubt inspired by their desire to express sentiments of their constituents in the Southern Indiana communities of Hanover and Lawrenceburg respectively. Representatives Cravens, Holman, and Law were also representative spokesmen of their Southern Indiana communities. Voorhees represented the Terre Haute district but was noted for his intense race prejudice.

The Thirty-eighth Congress Indiana delegation was made up of eight Democrats and five Republicans. The only new Republican representative, Godlove S. Orth, can be said to have held views which were consistent with the eastern origin of one born in Pennsylvania. On the other hand, Senator Hendricks and Representative Harrington did not reflect any influences of their respective birth places of Ohio and New York as both were hostile to Negro interests.

Ebenezer Dumont is an interesting exception. Although a product of Vevay, in Indiana, he was a Unionist who was somewhat liberal in his views. Representative McDowell is another exception whose birthplace and Marion, Indiana, residency cannot explain his conservatism on the Negro question. On the other hand, Representative Edgerton's views were completely consistent with those of the majority of citizens of his Vincennes birthplace.

We have seen that there were marked differences within the Republican Party, ranging from the cautious conservatism of Senators Lane and Wright and Representatives White, Dunn and Porter, to the liberalism of Representatives Shanks, Colfax and Julian. Among the Democrats, Representatives Holman and Law might be said to have been less vehement on the Negro question than Voorhees or Cravens, although they too followed the party line.

The fortunes of war exerted a powerful influence in bringing a modification in the conservatism of some Republicans. An excellent example of such a change was Senator Lane who finally laid aside his conservatism to support such administration measures as the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the establishment of a Freedmen's Bureau. Another example is Representative Dunn, who retreated from his conservative stand, as the events of 1862 showed the need for extreme measures, and who began to advocate confiscation and the enlistment of Negro troops. On the other hand, Democrats like Hendricks and Voorhees did not retreat from their established positions.

The disapproval of Indiana voters of the administration's increasing emphasis on the slavery issue was made apparent by their actions at the polls in the election of 1862 which vanquished many Republican political aspirants. This gave evidence that the average citizen was greatly concerned that the status of the Negro might be changed by the war and that he might be thrust upon the white man as an equal or competitor. The dire predictions of spokesmen such as Daniel Voorhees who predicted that the inevitable result of Negro emancipation would be Negro equality, racial

amalgamation, and the eventual degradation of the white race, fell on receptive ears. The intense race prejudice of most Indiana citizens triumphed and consequently the effort at Unionism failed.

The Thirty-seventh Congress began the work of emancipation but the Thirty-eighth Congress was to see the beginning of some of the problems to be tackled during the period of reconstruction. The Republicans could not know how prophetic were the words of their Democratic colleagues who predicted many of the unsolved problems which would arise in the settling of the Negro question.

NOTES

CHAPTER I THE STATUS OF THE NEGRO IN INDIANA BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR,
pp. 1-10.

¹Emma Lou Thornbrough, The Negro in Indiana Before 1900, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1957, pp. 1-5.

²Ibid., p. 6.

³J. P. Dunn, Indiana, A Redemption from Slavery (New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1888), p. 252.

⁴Thornbrough, The Negro in Indiana, p. 9.

⁵Ibid., p. 16.

⁶Ibid., p. 23.

⁷Ibid., p. 23.

⁸Ibid., pp. 31-47.

⁹Ibid., pp. 48-52.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 55-62.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 73-89.

¹²Ibid., pp. 114, 115.

¹³Ibid., pp. 120-127.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 121.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 151-160.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 161-169.

CHAPTER II THE SLAVERY ISSUE IN POLITICS, pp. 11-26.

¹Roger VanBolt, "Hoosiers and the Eternal Agitation 1848-1850," Indiana Magazine of History, XLVIII (number 4), pp. 340-341.

²Ibid., p. 335.

³Ibid., pp. 342-344.

⁴Ibid., p. 344.

- ⁵Ibid., p. 345.
- ⁶Ibid., p. 345.
- ⁷George W. Julian, Political Recollections of 1840-1872, (Chicago, Jensen McClurg and Co., 1895), pp. 64-68.
- ⁸VanBolt, "Hoosiers and the Eternal Agitation," p. 351.
- ⁹Ibid., p. 351.
- ¹⁰Ibid., p. 356.
- ¹¹Ibid., pp. 361, 362.
- ¹²Ibid., pp. 363-365.
- ¹³Ibid., p. 368.
- ¹⁴Charles Zimmerman, "The Republican Party," Indiana Magazine of History, XIII, pp. 3, 28.
- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 266.
- ¹⁶Kenneth M. Stamp, Indiana Politics During the Civil War, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949, p. 39.
- ¹⁷Ibid., p. 39.
- ¹⁸Charles Roll, "Indiana's Part in the Nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President in 1860," Indiana Magazine of History, XXV, March 1929, p. 11.
- ¹⁹Ibid., p. 11.
- ²⁰Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 41.
- ²¹Ibid., p. 44.
- ²²Ibid., p. 46.

CHAPTER III INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, pp. 27-62.

- ¹Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 73.
- ²Ibid., p. 72.
- ³W.H. Goddard, Biographical Sketches of the Indiana Congressional Delegation to the Thirty-Ninth Congress, Washington, D.C., 1866, p. 11 et. seq.

⁴ Russel M. Seeds, A History of the Republican Party in Indiana,
(Indianapolis, The Indiana History Co., 1899), I, p. 109.

⁵ W.H. Goddard, Biographical Sketches, p. 12.

⁶ Charles Murphy, Political Career of Jesse D. Bright (Indianapolis,
Indiana Historical Society Publications, 1931), X No. 3, p. 105.

⁷ Ibid., p. 116.

⁸ Ibid., p. 123.

⁹ Ibid., p. 138.

Evidence of Bright's treason was furnished in a letter dated March 1, 1861, which read:

"Dear Sir:

Allow me to introduce to your acquaintance my friend, Thomas B. Lincoln, of Texas. He visits your capital mostly to dispose of what he regards as a great improvement in fire arms. I recommend him to your favorable consideration as a gentleman of first respectability and reliable in every respect.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Jesse D. Bright

To His Excellency Jefferson Davis
President of the Confederation of States."

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 144.

¹¹ Seeds, Republican Party in Indiana, p. 248.

¹² Ibid., p. 248.

¹³ David Turpie, Sketches of My Own Times (Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrill Co., 1903), p. 10 et seq.

¹⁴ Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 168.

¹⁵ Willard H. Smith, Schuyler Colfax, the Changing Fortunes of a Political Idol, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949, p. 19.

¹⁶ Seeds, Republican Party in Indiana, p. 337.

¹⁷ Smith, Schuyler Colfax, pp. 32-34.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 153.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 54.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 160, 179, 181.

- 21 Ibid., p. 198.
- 22 Ibid., p. 204.
- 23 St. Joseph Valley Register, March 31, 1861.
 The Daily Journal, August 7, 1865, also expressed approval of Representatives Colfax and Shanks in an editorial which commented:
 "Indiana starts with the right policy: those patriotic and stout-hearted men, Colfax and Shanks, have been renominated. We rejoice in this. Colfax wields a power no less than anyone in the American Congress."
- 24 Wesley William Woollen, William McKee Dunn, a Memoir, (Hoicherbocker Press, G.P. Putnam Sons), p. 147.
- 25 Ibid., p. 150.
- 26 Ibid., pp. 47, 50.
- 27 Julian, Political Recollections, pp. 242, 243.
- 28 Woollen, William McKee Dunn, p. 54.
- 29 Ibid., p. 56.
- 30 W.S. Haywood, An Illustrated History of Indiana (Indianapolis, S.L. Morrow and Co., 1879), p. 702.
- 31 Dunn, A Redemption from Slavery, p. 47.
- 32 Albert G. Porter, Speech in the House of Representatives, February 19, 1861 (Washington, D.C., Polk Printer, 1861) Indiana State Library Pamphlet, et seq.
- 33 Ibid., p. 6.
- 34 Representative Men of Indiana, A Biographical History of the Eminent and Self Made Men of the State of Indiana (Cincinnati, Ohio, Western Biographical Publishing Co., 1880)
- 35 Ibid., p. 59.
- 36 Ibid., p. 59.
- 37 Ibid., p. 59.
- 38 Goddard, Biographical Sketches, p. 21.
- 39 Julian, Political Recollections, p. 48.

- 40 Ibid., p. 122.
- 41 Ibid., p. 181.
- 42 Julian, Political Recollections, p. 219.
- 43 Indiana True Republican, January 2, 1862.
- 44 Julian, Political Recollections, p. 243.
- 45 Ibid., p. 243.
- 46 Burton Dorr Myers (ed.) Trustees and Officers of Indiana University 1820-1850 (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1951), p. 161.
- 47 Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950).
- 48 Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 56.
- 49 Ibid., p. 210, as quoted from the Allen Hamilton M.S.S.
- 50 Israel George Blake, The Holmans of Veraestau (Oxford, Ohio, Mississippi Valley Press, 1943), p. 55.
- 51 Ibid., p. 101.
- 52 Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 164.
- 53 The Daily Evening Gazette, February 18, 1863.
- 54 A revealing account in the Indianapolis Journal entitled "Mr. Voorhees and His Muscle" furnishes the proof of the violence of Mr. Voorhees' temper. The article recounts that Voorhees, while eating in a Washington restaurant, overheard Senator Chandler, at a nearby table, discussing politics in general and "Copperheads" in particular. Mr. Voorhees, thinking that he had heard his name mentioned, jumped to his feet and rushed to the Senator's table to challenge him to combat. He in his anger ignored the Senator's companion, another gentleman, a Dr. Clark, a lady and her two children. The first blow was struck by Voorhees, but Senator Chandler gave a good account of himself and Mr. Voorhees was getting the worst of it when his companion, a Mr. Hannegan, also of Indiana, rushed to his aid carrying a large pitcher of milk which he brought down on Senator Chandler's head. While Senator Chandler was still stunned, Mr. Hannegan rushing in again, brought down a chair on his head. At this point spectators parted the combatants. Spectators insisted that Senator Chandler had not mentioned Mr. Voorhees by name. Sarcastically the Journal concluded, "Chivalrous David, Valorous Voorhees!"
- Indianapolis Daily Journal, May 28, 1864, as quoted from the Cincinnati Gazette's Washington dispatch.

55 Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 164.

56 Ibid., p. 211.

57 Charles Denby, Judge John Law (Indianapolis, Indiana Historical Society Publications, 1897), Vol. I, No. 3, p. 212.

58 Charles W. Voorhees (ed.), Speeches of Daniel W. Voorhees with a Short Biographical Sketch (Cincinnati, Robert Clarke and Co., 1875), p. 502.

CHAPTER IV INDIANA'S DELEGATION TO THE THIRTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, pp. 63-80.

¹ Winfred A. Harbinson, "Indiana Republicans and the Re-election of President Lincoln," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XXXIV, No. 1, March, 1938, p. 278.

² Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, May 3, 1862.

³ Ibid., May 3, 1862.

⁴ Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 140.

⁵ Ibid., p. 145.

⁶ Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, March 17, 1862.

⁷ Ibid., March 22, 1862.

⁸ Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 140.

⁹ Ibid., p. 185.

¹⁰ Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, April 24, 1862.

¹¹ Stamp, Indiana Politics, p. 152

¹² J.S. Holcombe and H.M. Skinner, Life and Public Services of Thomas A. Hendricks with Selected Speeches and Writings (Indianapolis, Carlin and Hollenbech, 1886), p. 209.

¹³ Ibid., p. 241.

¹⁴ Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, April 2, 1862.

¹⁵ Goddard, Biographical Sketches, p. 25.

¹⁶ The disapproval felt for Mr. Dumont's views are revealed in newspaper comment in the New Albany Daily Ledger which in commenting on General Morgan's escape from an Ohio penitentiary expressed regret that General Dumont was not in the army to follow him again as

everybody in that part of the state had had a distinct recollection that when General Dumont had chased after Morgan, he was able to keep about twenty-five miles behind him.

New Albany Daily Ledger, March 13, 1864.

- 17 Smith, Schuyler Colfax, p. 57.
- 18 Goddard, Biographical Sketches, p. 29.
- 19 Ibid., p. 29.
- 20 Ibid., p. 29.
- 21 Representative Men of Indiana, Vol. I, p. 24.
- 22 Joseph K. Edgerton, The Relations of the Federal Government to Slavery, Speech published by Fort Wayne Weekly Times, October 30, 1860, (Fort Wayne, Dawson's Weekly Times Print, 1861), p. 12.
- 23 George S. Cottman, Scrapbook, Indiana State Library, pp. 76-78. Also see Representative Men of Indiana, Vol. I, pp. 76-78.
- 24 Ibid., Vol. I, p. 32.

CHAPTER V THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO, pp. 81-112.

- 1 Congressional Globe, December 11, 1861, p. 59.
- 2 Ibid., December 11, 1861, p. 33.
- 3 Ibid., December 11, 1861, p. 51.
- 4 Ibid., December 20, 1861, p. 158.
- 5 Indiana True Republican, January 2, 1862.
- 6 Congressional Globe, December 20, 1861, p. 158.
- 7 Ibid., June 19, 1862, p. 2769.
- 8 Indiana True Republican, January 30, 1862.
- 9 Holcombe and Skinner, Life and Public Services, p. 456.
- 10 Woollen, McKee Dunn, A Memoir, pp. 47, 48, 51.
- 11 Congressional Globe, April 3, 1862, p. 1522.
- 12 Ibid., April 21, 1862, pp. 1730, 1731.
- 13 Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, April 22, 1862.

- 14 Ibid., May 7, 1862.
- 15 Congressional Globe, April 1, 1862, p. 1467.
- 16 Indianapolis Daily Journal, April 2, 1862.
- 17 Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, April 2, 1862.
- 18 Indianapolis Daily Journal, April 4, 1862.
- 19 Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, April 9, 1862.
- 20 Indiana True Republican, April 10, 1862.
- 21 Indianapolis Daily Journal, May 2, 1862.
- 22 Ibid., April 30, 1862.
- 23 Congressional Globe, April 11, 1862, p. 1646.
- 24 Ibid., April 11, 1862, p. 1647.
- 25 Ibid., April 11, 1862, pp. 1647, 1648.
- 26 Ibid., April 11, 1862, p. 1648.
- 27 Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, May 9, 1862.
- 28 The South Bend Forum, October 4, 1862.
- 29 Congressional Globe, May 20, 1862, p. 2232.
- 30 Ibid., March 17, 1862, p. 1252.
- 31 Ibid., March 11, 1862, p. 1179.
- 32 Ibid., April 24, 1862, p. 1820.
- 33 Ibid., July 11, 1862, p. 3266.
- 34 Ibid., April 22, 1862, p. 1769.
- 35 Indianapolis Daily Journal, June 27, 1862.
- 36 The letter dated Washington, D.C., July 7, 1862, expressed hearty accord with Mr. Porter's plan, although the writer who signed himself R.M.H., felt that the reception of the plan among the people of the border states was doubtful as they would presume that war upon leaders of the rebellion would strike a blow at their interests and at the institution of slavery.
Indianapolis Daily Journal, July 11, 1862.

³⁷Congressional Globe, April 23, 1862, p. 1790.

³⁸Ibid., April 23, 1862, p. 1792.

³⁹Congressional Globe, May 23, 1862, p. 184.

⁴⁰Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, May 23, 1862.

⁴¹Indiana True Republic, June 12, 1862.

Leonidas' letter endorsing Julian as a "friend of Freedom" to succeed himself in the next Congress. Also June 19, 1862, a letter from a Washington reader commending Julian for being a credit to his constituents. Also October 30, 1861, an attack by the True Republic on the Crawfordsville Journal for listing Julian not as a Republican but as an Abolitionist.

⁴²Congressional Globe, May 23, 1862, p. 151.

⁴³Ibid., May 26, 1862, p. 271.

⁴⁴Ibid., May 23, 1862, p. 196.

⁴⁵Ibid., April 30, 1862, p. 896.

⁴⁶Indianapolis Daily Journal, July 22, 1862.

⁴⁷Ibid., July 24, 1862.

⁴⁸Indianapolis Daily Journal, August 7, 1862.

⁴⁹Congressional Globe, May 26, 1862, Appendix, p. 237.

⁵⁰Ibid., December 18, 1862, p. 41.

⁵¹New Albany Ledger, January 5, 1863.

⁵²Indianapolis Daily Journal, December 19, 1862.

⁵³Indianapolis Daily Gazette, January 3, 1863.

⁵⁴New Albany Ledger, January 5, 1863.

⁵⁵Congressional Globe, February 7, 1863, p. 783.

⁵⁶New Albany Ledger, February 17, 1863.

⁵⁷Indianapolis Daily Sentinel, February 26, 1863.

⁵⁸Congressional Globe, February 25, 1863, p. 1233.

⁵⁹Ibid., February 19, 1863, p. 1057.

- ⁶⁰Ibid., March 10, 1862, p. 1150.
- ⁶¹Ibid., February 2, 1863, p. 1231.
- ⁶²Ibid., February 18, 1860, p. 1065.
- ⁶³Ibid., January 29, 1863, p. 633.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., January 29, 1863, p. 600.
- ⁶⁵Indianapolis Daily Gazette, February 11, 1863.

CHAPTER VI SPEECHES OF THE INDIANA DELEGATION IN THE THIRTY-EIGHTH
CONGRESS ON SLAVERY AND THE NEGRO, pp. 113-152.

- ¹Congressional Globe, January 13, 1864, p. 185.
- ²Ibid., February 5, 1864, p. 519.
- ³Indianapolis Daily Journal, February 17, 1864.
- ⁴Congressional Globe, January 13, 1864, p. 185.
- ⁵Ibid., January 28, 1864, p. 408.
- ⁶Ibid., February 23, 1863, p. 783.
- ⁷Ibid., March 5, 1864, p. 127.
- ⁸Indianapolis Daily Journal, February 23, 1864.
Ibid., April 7, 1864.

The Journal referred to an editorial in the Cincinnati Commercial which told of a letter written by Daniel Voorhees to deny that he had visited Governor Seymour of New York to urge him to defy the Conscription Act. The Commercial concluded that Voorhees was "unfit to live in this government whether guilty of this particular offense or not" and that the Confederacy was the right place for him unless his duty to the Confederacy required him to stay where he could do it the most service. On June 11, 1864, the Daily Journal quoted an article from the Memphis Appeal to the effect that the efforts of Voorhees were of acknowledged benefit to the cause of the Confederacy. It further declared: "Every successful blow we strike is so much bone and muscle to the arm which under the training of Voorhees, Vallandigham, etc. is preparing to strike the North."

⁹Congressional Globe, February 10, 1864, p. 554.

Although it is a generally accepted fact that there was little opportunity in the ranks of commissioned officers for Negroes, we have this mention in the Globe of a Negro major. Herbert Aptheker in The Negro in the Civil War, New York: International Publishers, 1938, p. 39, gives an account of the seige of Port Hudson, Louisiana, in May, 1863, in which he describes the heroism of a black lieutenant who mounted the enemies works three or four times. George W. Williams, History of the Negro Race in America from 1619 to 1880, Vol. II, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1883, p. 287. An account is given that General Butler, on the 24th of August, 1862, appealed to the free colored men of New Orleans to take up arms in defense of the Union. For the one thousand negroes who enlisted a regiment was organized for which all the line officers were colored and the staff officers white. Another regiment was raised and officered like the first with only two white men in it; while the third was officered without regard to nationality. Williams also tells us (pp. 320, 321) that in the battle of Port Hudson the 1st Louisiana Native Guards had colored field officers and that Capt. Callioux of the first Louisiana died as a hero leading his men into the thickest of the fight. Apparently then, there were a few Negroes who rose to command of Negro troops, as exceptional cases, in spite of the generally accepted policy.

¹⁰Herbert Aptheker, The Negro in the Civil War (New York, International Publishers, 1938), p. 9.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 34, 35.

¹²Thornbrough, Negro in Indiana, p. 192.

¹³Ibid., p. 194.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 195, 196.

¹⁵New Albany Ledger, January 14, 1864.

¹⁶Congressional Globe, February 1, 1864, p. 427.

¹⁷New Albany Ledger, March 16, 1864.

¹⁸Congressional Globe, January 15, 1864, p. 2963.

¹⁹Ibid., May 17, 1864, p. 2307.

²⁰Ibid., April 30, 1864, p. 1994.

²¹Ibid., February 10, 1864, p. 564.

²²Ibid., February 26, 1867, p. 837.

- 23 Ibid., February 26, 1864, p. 839.
- 24 Ibid., February 26, 1864, p. 839.
- 25 Ibid., March 12, 1864, p. 1065.
- 26 Ibid., March 12, 1864, p. 1072.
- 27 Ibid., March 26, 1864, p. 1302.
- 28 Ibid., December 11, 1863, p. 22.
- 29 Ibid., June 11, 1864, p. 2963.
- 30 Ibid., April 19, 1864, pp. 1709, 1710.
- 31 Indianapolis Daily Journal, April 21, 1864.
- 32 Congressional Globe, June 23, 1864, p. 3191.
- 33 Ibid., June 21, 1864, p. 3126.
- 34 Ibid., May 2, 1864, p. 2045.
- 35 Ibid., July 1, 1864, p. 3474.
- 36 New Albany Ledger, February 29, 1864.
- 37 Congressional Globe, May 12, 1864, p. 2258.
- 38 Ibid., May 12, 1864, p. 2249.
- 39 Ibid., February 8, 1864, p. 523.
- 40 Ibid., February 15, 1864, p. 659.
- 41 Indianapolis Daily Journal, April 13, 1864.
- 42 Ibid., April 18, 1864.
- 43 Congressional Globe, March 28, 1864, p. 1325.
- 44 Ibid., June 11, 1864, p. 2961.
- 45 Ibid., June 15, 1864, p. 2985.
- 46 Ibid., January 6, 1865, p. 142.
- 47 Ibid., January 9, 1865, p. 180.
- 48 Ibid., January 11, 1865, p. 219.
- 49 Indianapolis Daily Journal, February 2, 1865.

- ⁵⁰ Congressional Globe, Appendix, February 7, 1865, p. 66.
- ⁵¹ The Congress had proposed in 1864 the Wade-Davis bill which the Republican majority preferred to the President's milder proposals for reconstruction. The bill passed both houses of the Congress but when it came to President Lincoln at the end of the Congressional session, he killed the bill by taking no action upon it.
- ⁵² The Congressional Globe, February 20, 1865, p. 75.
- ⁵³ New Albany Ledger, April 8, 1864.
- ⁵⁴ Congressional Globe, June 28, 1864, p. 3350.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., June 14, 1864, p. 2931.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., December 20, 1864, p. 79.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., February 21, 1865, p. 963.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., February 22, 1865, p. 875.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., February 24, 1865, p. 1025.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., March 3, 1865, p. 1418.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., December 19, 1864, p. 63.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Materials

Dunn, William McKee, A Speech Delivered in Independence Square, Philadelphia, May 26, 1860, before a Mass Meeting to Ratify the Nomination of Abraham Lincoln, published by the Republican Congressional Committee, Washington, D.C.: Buell and Blanchard Printers, 1860.

Edgerton, Joseph K., Speech, The Relations of the Federal Government to Slavery, delivered at Fort Wayne, October 30, 1860, Fort Wayne: Dawson's Weekly Times Print, 1861.

Julian, George W., Political Recollections of 1840-1872, Chicago: Jensen, McClurg and Co., 1884.

Porter, Albert S., Speech in the House of Representatives, February 19, 1861, Washington, D.C.: Polk Printer, 1861.

Rives, John C., (ed.) The Congressional Globe Containing the Debates and Proceedings of the Thirty-seventh Congress, March 4, 1861-March 3, 1863, First Session 1862, and Second Session, March 3, 1863.

Also the Debates and Proceedings of the Thirty-eighth Congress 1863-1864, the First and Second Sessions and also the Special Session of the Senate, 1865.

Turpie, David, Sketches of My Own Times, Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1903.

Voorhees, Charles S. Speeches of Daniel W. Voorhees with a Short Biographical Sketch, Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Co., 1875.

Woollen, William Wesley, William McKee Dunn, a Memoir, printed by the Hoicherbocker Press, G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Secondary Materials

Aptheker, Herbert, The Negro in the Civil War, New York: International Publishers, 1938.

Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950.

Blake, Israel George, The Holmans of Veraestau, Oxford, Ohio: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943.

Canfield, L.E. and Wilder, H.H., The Making of Modern America, Geneva, Illinois: The Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1958.

- Denby, Charles, Judge John Law, Indiana Historical Society Publications, Vol. I, No. 7, Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1897.
- Dunn, J.P., Indiana, A Redemption from Slavery, American Commonwealth, Boston, N.Y.: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1888, 1892.
- Esarey, Logan, A History of Indiana from 1850 to the Present, Vol. II, Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen and Co., 1918.
- Goddard, W.H., Biographical Sketches of the Indiana Congressional Delegation of the Thirty-ninth Congress with a Brief Review of the Political Issues of the Day, Washington: W.H. Moore, 1866.
- Harbinson, Winfred A., "Lincoln and Indiana Republicans 1861-1862," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XXXIII, No. 3, September, 1937.
- Haywood, W.S., An Illustrated History of Indiana, Indianapolis: S.L. Morrow and Co., 1879.
- Holcombe, John W. and Skinner, Hubert M., Life and Public Services of Thomas A. Hendricks with Selected Speeches and Writings, Indianapolis: Carlin and Hollenbeck, 1886.
- Holiday, John H., Indianapolis and the Civil War, Indiana Historical Society Publications, Vol. IV, No. 9, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1895.
- Kettleborough, Charles, Indiana on the Eve of the Civil War, Indiana Historical Society Publications, Vol. VI, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1919.
- Martin, Edward Winslow, The Life and Public Services of Schuyler Colfax Together with His Most Important Speeches, San Francisco: H.H. Bancroft and Co., 1868.
- Murphy, Charles B., The Political Career of Jesse D. Bright, Indiana Historical Society Publications, Vol. X, No. 3, Printed for the Society, Indianapolis, 1931.
- Myers, Burton Dorr (ed.) Trustees and Officers of Indiana University 1820-1850: Published by the Indiana University Press.
- Randall, J.G., The Civil War and Reconstruction, Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1937.
- Randall, J.G., Lincoln the President, Volumes I and II, New York: Mead and Co., 1945.
- Representative Men of Indiana, A Biographical History of the Eminent and Self Made Men of the State of Indiana, Volumes I and II, Cincinnati, Ohio: Western Biographical Publishing Co., 1880.

- Roll, Charles, "Indiana's Part in the Nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President in 1860," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XXV, No. 1, March 1929.
- Schauinger, J. Herman, "The Letters of Godlove S. Orth, Hoosier American," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XI, No. 1, March 1914.
- Seeds, Russel M. (ed.), History of the Republican Party of Indiana, Vol. I, Indianapolis: The Indiana History Co., 1899.
- Smith, Willard H., Schuyler Colfax, The Changing Fortunes of a Political Idol, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1919.
- Stampf, Kenneth M., Indiana Politics During the Civil War, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1919.
- Stewart, D. James Harvey, Early Settlement of Carroll County, Indiana, Cincinnati: Hatchcock and Walden, 1872.
- Thornbrough, Emma Lou, The Negro in Indiana, A Study of a Minority, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1951.
- Thornbrough, Emma Lou, "The Race Issue in Indiana Politics," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XLVII, 1951.
- VanBolt, Roger, "The Hoosier and the Eternal Agitation," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4.
- Williams, George W., History of the Negro Race in America From 1619 to 1880, Vol. II, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1883.
- Zimmerman, Charles, "The Origin and the Rise of the Republican Party in Indiana from 1854-1860," Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. XIII, No. 3, September, 1917.

Newspapers

- Centreville, Indiana True Republican, 1861-1865.
- Indianapolis Daily Journal, 1861-1865.
- Indianapolis Daily State Sentinel, 1861-1865.
- The St. Joseph Valley Register, 1862-1864.
- The South Bend County Forum, 1861-1862.
- The Daily Evening Gazette, 1862-1863.
- The New Albany Register, 1863-1864.

Miscellaneous

Cottman, George S., Scrapbook Containing Clippings about Henry S.
Harrington, Indiana State Library.