

5-2012

A Family Affair: The Pre-Kansas Saga of James Henry Lane

James Robert Bird
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



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

Recommended Citation

Bird, James Robert, "A Family Affair: The Pre-Kansas Saga of James Henry Lane" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 399.
<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/399>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

A FAMILY AFFAIR: THE PRE-KANSAS SAGA
OF JAMES HENRY LANE

A FAMILY AFFAIR: THE PRE-KANSAS SAGA
OF JAMES HENRY LANE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History

By

James Robert Bird
Pittsburg State University
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, 1969
Pittsburg State University
Master of Science in Political Science, 1970
Pittsburg State University
Master of Arts in History, 2003

May 2012
University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

Historian Craig Miner suggests that territorial Kansas between 1854 and 1861 was “a nursery of weird and manic figures.” Foremost among the weird and manic figures of Kansas history stands James Henry Lane, formerly a U.S. congressman from Indiana, and destined to become one of Kansas’ first pair of senators. Writing at the midpoint of the twentieth century, Albert Castel pronounced Jim Lane “the most colorful and fascinating personality in the history of Kansas,” adding that “Very likely, too, he was mentally unbalanced and paranoid.”

Yet, James H. Lane never set foot on Kansas soil until he was well into his fortieth year of life. Thus, the individual who by 1860 earned a national reputation as “the Grim Chieftain of Kansas” hardly sprang full-blown from the prairies of his adopted state. He was, rather, haunted by a tragic past that has been largely overlooked by historians. So traumatic were the events that predated Jim Lane’s arrival in Kansas that they arguably determined his behavior after he settled in the territory, and ultimately became part of the mix of variables that led to his suicide shortly after the Civil War. In 1854, Lane’s mother, Mary Foote Howse Lane, warned her son, “What a man is at forty, he will continue to be through the remainder of his life.” The present study aspires to shed light on what made Jim Lane the man he was as he celebrated his fortieth birthday, just under a year before he immigrated to Kansas.

Lane biographer Ian Spurgeon recently noted “the habit of historians to focus almost solely on Lane in Kansas,” as well as a need “to interpret Lane’s actions in the broader context of the collapse of the second-party system and the sectional conflict.” Aspiring to help fill that gap, the present study suggests that a leitmotif of the Lane story involves the inception, as much as the collapse, of America’s second two-party system. Moreover, the saga of Jim Lane before Kansas was essentially a family affair. Enablers so far largely neglected by historians inspired and helped him along the way.

This dissertation is approved for recommendation
to the Graduate Council.

Dissertation Director:

Dr. Daniel E. Sutherland

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Elliott West

Dr. Patrick G. Williams

DISSERTATION DUPLICATION RELEASE

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed

_____ *James R. Bird*

Refused

_____ *James R. Bird*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTERS	
1. Historiography	9
2. North Country Origins	23
3. Starting Over on the Ohio	39
4. 1812 and Beyond: Continuity, Contingency, and Opportunity	58
5. The Political Transition of Amos Lane, 1824-1828	76
6. 1824 to 1828: John Lane's West Point Years	93
7. Old and New Enemies, the Green-eyed Monster, and the Coronation	114
8. An Election, a Wedding, and a Wagon Stuck in the Slough	144
9. Congress, a New Assignment, and a Honeymoon on the Ohio	169
10. Hubris and Nemesis: Wages of the Gentleman's Code	200
11. The Great Transition: 1836 – 1845	233
12. “As if Fighting Had Been Their Trade from Childhood Up:” Jim Lane and the Mexican War, 1846 – 1847	256
13. Beyond Buena Vista: Western Phoenix Rising, 1847-1854	282
14. “Ho, For Kansas!:" Jim Lane's Move to the Territory, 1854-1855	310
CONCLUSION	344
NOTES	358
BIBLIOGRAPHY	442

INTRODUCTION

“At the Heart of the Matter Stands the Issue of Consistency”¹

Mary Foote Howse Lane went to her grave in the waning days of 1854 unmindful that within less than a decade her son, James Henry Lane, would be known throughout the country as a U.S. senator from the new state of Kansas. Throughout most of her seventy-five-years Mary had embodied personal self-effacement. For that reason a suggestion from anyone that details of her life should be included in a chronicle of her famous son quite probably would have met with a response similar to that given by Thomas Wentworth Higginson more than a half-century later when Katherine Mayo asked to interview him for a soon-to-be-published work on John Brown.²

Higginson formerly numbered among a half-dozen men—popularly dubbed “the Secret Six”—who provided Brown with funding and logistical support for his famous raid on Harper’s Ferry. Higginson asked Mayo in 1909, “why do you want to know of *us*? Did any historian ever bother to write down the name of the man who bought the donkey on which Christ rode into Jerusalem? We of the Six were not—are not—great men. We do not deserve remembering.”³ However nondescript Higginson felt his own life to be in comparison with John Brown’s, Oswald Garrison Villard’s seminal biography of Brown would have been remiss had it failed to acknowledge the role of the Six.

A similar consideration should inform any contemplated study of Jim Lane. To the extent that individuals who shaped Lane’s personality during his formative years remain invisible to history, scholars lack some essential tools prerequisite for gauging his rightful place in the pantheon of memorable American politicians. Perhaps that partly explains why twenty-first century historian Nicole Etcheson and a number of her colleagues can still ask, “What did James H. Lane represent? We expect biographies of leading historical figures to show us what

they stood for, but Jim Lane's chameleonlike blending into shifting political backgrounds challenges the biographer's ability to categorize."⁴ In part the present study aspires to achieve a better grasp of formerly undiscovered complexities that viscerally affected James Henry Lane's character. Selectively examining Lane's pre-Kansas life renders his behavior less mysterious, and perhaps also less chameleon-like, than previously thought.

Without question, James Henry Lane was and remains one of Kansas' leading historical figures. A difficulty arises, though, when a journalist or historian asserts, as Daniel Webster Wilder and Noble L. Prentis both did in the late nineteenth century, that Jim Lane was so uniquely Kansan as to be "one of our own things." To argue that Lane "was the most original, and the most interesting human being who has figured in Kansas affairs" unavoidably focuses exclusive attention on a historical period that only began in May, 1854, and ended in July, 1866 with Lane's suicide. Thus, what Ian Spurgeon says of his own recently-published work incidentally holds true for virtually all Lane biographies: they mainly concern "the last twelve years of his life, from 1854, when he served as a freshman congressman from Indiana, to 1866, when he died while serving as a senator from Kansas."⁵

Jim Lane's demonstrated penchant for acting bizarrely after he reached Kansas predictably raises questions about what most affected him during the four decades that preceded his emigration to the territory. With good cause Spurgeon observes that "we have little knowledge of Lane's personality as a young man." Students of James Henry Lane have always contended with a paucity of primary source material. In the 1950s, the venerable Albert Castel remarked, "unfortunately only a few of the letters of...James Henry Lane, have survived or been collected." That no marked improvement in this situation has occurred over the past fifty years is suggested by Spurgeon's description of the quest for primary Lane sources to a "scavenger

hunt.” Yet neglected documents in the Tennessee State Library and Archives and scattered among other repositories can help us understand the environmental stresses and influences that shaped Lane during his formative years. The present study argues, as Mary Lane did in 1853, that “what a man is at forty he will continue to be through the remainder of his life.” As Mary Lane penned those words she had barely a year left to live. Her son turned forty the following June, and less than a year after that he, with family in tow, arrived in territorial Kansas.⁶

A modest cache of family letters and a diary kept by Mary Foote Lane, all in the safe keeping of the aforementioned Tennessee State Library in Nashville, provide important clues to the trials and successes that James H. Lane experienced before leaving Indiana. That Jim Lane’s brother George resided intermittently in their native state until his death in 1891 brings a measure of continuity and context to the family story. Besides surviving his more famous brother by more than a quarter-century, George apparently saw to it that a local history reserved ample space for fairly detailed biographical sketches of Lane family members and others belonging to their extended kinship network. *A History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, published in 1885, contains the following acknowledgement: “The printed papers and manuscripts of Geo. W. Lane, who has long taken a deep interest in the pioneer history of Dearborn County, have been freely placed at the disposal of the publishers.”⁷

Over time, this modest collection pointed the way to still others. The window they provide for viewing the first forty years of Jim Lane’s life reveals an image that differs markedly from those produced by earlier scholars who labored without micrographics, the Internet, and other modern wizardry now considered standard tools of the historian’s trade. In his introduction to Wendell Holmes Stephenson’s Depression Era biography of Lane, Kansas historian William Elsey Connelley commended Stephenson for producing a “balanced” work on Lane. “He has

avoided the controversies of Lane's day and has even ignored the bitter malice with which he was bitterly attacked in life and death," Connelley observed. "A plain statement of fact was all that the establishment of Lane's position and power required." It turns out, however, that public and private spheres sometimes melded in an uncanny way to complicate the facts of Lane's life at the very times when the controversies of his day enveloped him. The grim coincidence of a territorial legislature convening almost immediately after the Lanes tragically lost one of their two daughters provides a case in point. Finally, histories already written obviate any further need to prove that Lane successfully sought position and power while pursuing his Kansas career.⁸

Alternatively, this study analyzes and restates what we know about Jim Lane in order to help frame an answer to Etcheson's question. Its goal is to achieve a better understanding of the entirety of his life, while rejecting Higginson's notion that unless people garner a certain measure of public notoriety they "do not deserve remembering." The study emphatically concurs with historian E.B. Long's contention that "history is all events, all time, all people, everywhere....The leaders must be heard...[but] where possible, the people must be heard as well."⁹

Several important voices in Lane's life, besides that of his mother, have yet to be heard. Immediate family members, the extended kinship network, and family friends influenced his career both before and after he immigrated to Kansas. Though largely unnoticed by historians, these enablers affected Lane as he charged through the successive stages of his brief and volatile existence. On some occasions, their examples and guidance laid a foundation for his public success. Conversely, their misfortunes and tragedies occasionally found lodgment in a psyche prone to such profound bouts of depression that they bordered on insanity.¹⁰

Contrary to W. H. Stephenson's assertion that "there is little in Lane's activities in Indiana which foreshadows his famous and spectacular career after 1855," this study finds many parallels when comparing his pre-emigration life in Indiana to the course he pursued in Kansas. "At the heart of the matter," Ian Spurgeon observes, "stands the issue of consistency." Spurgeon aptly points to "the failure of most writers to analyze Lane's recorded words before he moved to Kansas and [a corresponding] failure to compare his actions with those of others within his political environment. Ironically, these historians project greater power and authority onto Lane than he actually had." Extending the study of Lane backwards in time to his formative years goes far in validating Spurgeon's assessment and also in explaining what the latter termed "the man's troubled personality."¹¹

To employ contemporary jargon, so similar are the conclusions drawn by the present study to Spurgeon's work that in certain respects it may be regarded a "prequel." Still, the conclusions are not identical. To explore Jim Lane's purported transition over time to free-state radicalism is to enter a scholarly quagmire. W. H. Stephenson averred in the 1930s that he sought to "explain Lane's transition from Indiana conservatism to Kansas radicalism, to reveal him as a leader of the 'intense radical loyalty' of the United States during the Civil War, and to explain his motives for reverting to conservatism." Nicole Etcheson's scholarly essay, "James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical" demonstrates that his supposed radicalization still compels the attention of twenty first-century historians.¹²

Spurgeon views Lane's relation to the Democratic party as an evolving estrangement that climaxed in 1856 when the U.S. Senate, under the leadership of Stephen Douglas, rejected the admission of Kansas to the Union under the Topeka Constitution. Although James Henry Lane began supporting Republican political candidates shortly thereafter, gradual alienation

culminating in a change of party allegiance falls short of substantiating radicalism. The present study argues, in contrast to both Stephenson and Spurgeon, that in the context of the 1850s national discourse on slavery, Lane's radicalization was largely mythical. Little evidence exists to suggest that he experienced anything resembling an epiphany or fundamental change of consciousness. Still, rapid and seismic changes on the Kansas political scene frequently led Lane to advocate extreme strategies. Such expedients, common among professional politicians, hardly reflected a shift in his core values.¹³

Lane embodied staunch Unionism in the Andrew Jackson mold on the one hand, and on the other, the entrenched racism characteristic of his time. The ephemeral controversy over Lane's perceived "radicalization" arises from a tendency among historians to conflate his demonstrated proclivity for extremism and hyperbole with the mid-1850s lexicon of anti-slavery ideology. That no universal standard prevails for defining precisely what American radicalism meant in that age further complicates the picture. This study embraces a definition that Eric Foner attributes to Salmon P. Chase:

"He who believes slavery to be a great wrong," wrote ...Chase in 1853, "and desires to promote its abolition by political action, is a political abolitionist." Chase's dictum is a useful definition of radical Republicanism, for during the 1840s and 1850s, the radicals developed a comprehensive program of political action against slavery . . .¹⁴

After a fashion, Jim Lane did go through a gradual radicalization process that by 1860 finally landed him, however reluctantly, in the ranks of the Republican party. In this, he differed little from other former Democratic politicians of his day. Yet never did he meet the standard for radicalism articulated by Chase during the national slavery debate. This fact ultimately made it easy for Lane to align himself with the reconstruction program that President Andrew Johnson

espoused after the Civil War, once the twin specters of disunion and treason no longer threatened the country.¹⁵

If the present study has unearthed anything original, it relates to the rediscovery of a long overlooked extended kinship network that kept Jim Lane bound fast not only to his native state of Indiana, but also to relatives who resided east of the Adirondacks. John Speer, in his late nineteenth-century hagiography of Lane, briefly mentioned this familial connection to the St. Lawrence River valley, but provided little elaboration. The dynamics of this kinship network reveal the outlines of a dual history: a personal narrative that predates the 1806 marriage of Lane's parents, and a civil-military narrative that begins in Ogdensburg, New York during the War of 1812 with the chance "discovery" of Lane's first cousin, Charles Davies, by the U.S. army's chief engineer, General Joseph Gardner Swift. After eventually becoming chair of West Point's mathematics department, Davies mentored Jim's iconic older brother, John, during and after the latter's tenure as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy. Davies, who survived both of them, worked diligently without fanfare to wield a benevolent influence on their behalf.¹⁶

Carl Sandburg's epic biography of Abraham Lincoln contains insights for studying the life of Jim Lane. Before beginning his work, Sandburg pondered whether any purpose could be served by:

a life of Lincoln stressing the fifty-two years previous to his Presidency. Such a book would imply that if he was what he was during those first fifty-two years of his life it was nearly inevitable that he would be what he proved to be in the last four. Then, too, the vortex in which he stood during the last four years...was forming in the years he was growing.¹⁷

When Lincoln died in the spring of 1865, he was Jim Lane's senior by several years. When Lane committed suicide in July 1866, he was the same age as Lincoln when the latter

became president. Like Lincoln, Lane operated within a political and military vortex during the last phase of his life. To paraphrase Sandburg, if Lane was what he was during his first forty years before immigrating to Kansas, it was nearly inevitable that he would be what he proved to be after arriving in the territory.¹⁸ Although the scavenger hunt for Lane sources continues, the story of his turbulent formative years merits additional study by historians.

CHAPTER ONE

Historiography

The time is ripe for scholars to take a new critical look at the historiography of James Henry Lane relative to his role in Kansas history. Much of what has been written to date hardly rises above the level of stereotype, which sometimes contains a kernel of truth, but by definition falls far short of accurate description. Once a contemporary popular perception of a notable public figure makes its way into print, it can potentially acquire a capability to cascade unchallenged through generations of historians. Such is the case with Jim Lane. Craig Miner has observed that in the years following Lane's death in 1866, "some of the best phrasemakers in the business made oratorical hay at [Lane's] expense." When that happens, averred Miner, students of territorial Kansas are left with "eloquence of expression tending to fix a false impression."¹

The phenomenon that skewed the way historians still tend to think about Jim Lane was perhaps best described by J.G. Randall in the 1940s. "What happens over and over," explained Randall, "is that a certain idea gets started in association with an event or figure. It is repeated by speakers and editors. It soon becomes a part of that superficial aggregation of concepts that goes under the heading of 'what everybody knows.' It may take decades before a stock picture is even questioned as to its validity." The stock picture that historians now possess of James Henry Lane needs to be drawn into much sharper focus, since what they already have in-hand is too often woefully lacking in solid evidence, and grounded in sources tainted by personal bias if not outright speculation. This is the case for Lane admirers and critics alike.²

In the absence of any existing framework for situating James H. Lane history within the larger rubric of Kansas territorial history, Ian Spurgeon built one of his own. He posited four

basic historiographical categories that collectively encompass works published to date on Jim Lane. These four schools include Critic-Contemporaries, Defender-Contemporaries, Moderates, and Critic-Consensus. “The Critic-Contemporaries,” explained Spurgeon, “surfaced around the 1880s, but really developed in the 1890s.” Observations made by Charles Robinson, Kansas’ first governor, and Lane’s arch-enemy, tells us much about the genesis of the stock picture of Lane. In a final pronouncement on the respective contributions of John Brown and James H. Lane to Kansas history, Robinson opined, “One of these men, not receiving the punishment due for his crime in Kansas, sought to inaugurate a servile war...and suffered the penalty prescribed by law. Another was overtaken in his crimes and executed himself.” Although Robinson viewed Jim Lane’s crimes as legion, his commentary published in *The Kansas Conflict* alluded to alleged improprieties involving government contracts that probably contributed to a final depression that ended with Lane’s suicide in July 1866.³

Writing in the 1940s, Kansas historian James Malin identified a school of thought that closely resembled, if it did not foreshadow, Spurgeon’s later categories. A theory advanced by Eli Thayer, according to Malin, “emphasized a peace group and a military group with Lane and John Brown in the latter role.” Thayer ignited what later became known as the Kansas history wars, Malin opined, when “he charged Lane in particular with a plan to rescue [free-state] prisoners from United States troops early in September 1856, insisting that the man who prevented that act [namely, Charles Robinson] was the real savior of Kansas.” Thus Thayer’s recollection of the Kansas territorial period cast Lane and Brown as a duo bent on inciting hostilities in opposition to calmer heads led by Robinson, who preferred what was frequently called a “Fabian policy” of nonviolent resistance. Those who came to the defense of Lane and Brown in the Kansas history wars Spurgeon later categorized as “Defender Contemporaries.”⁴

The perennial late nineteenth-century back-and-forth over the perceived merits of Lane and Brown on the one hand, and the Thayer/Robinson faction on the other, eventually became a Kansas historiographical tradition. Historian Julie Courtwright opined that “because James Lane committed suicide in 1866...Robinson won the [free-state] factional war of the nineteenth century by default.” Miner’s position resembled that taken by Courtwright. In an article that compared the personalities of Lane and Abraham Lincoln, Miner averred, “Early writers on Kansas history tended to be partisans of Brown and Lane, while those coming after the publication of Robinson’s *The Kansas Conflict* (1892) and the subsequent Libby Custer-like campaign of his widow, Sara, with her wealth and influence, on behalf of her husband’s reputation, switched to Robinson as hero.”⁵

Among those who cast James Henry Lane as a hero was late-nineteenth-century journalist Noble Prentis, who devoted an entire chapter of his *Kansas Miscellanies* to the deceased senator. Prentis came close to suggesting that Lane’s personality was so unique as to make historical inquiry into his life an exercise in futility. “He who would resurrect the ‘Grim Chieftain’ from the books, newspapers, and manuscripts of the State Historical Society,” declared Prentis, “will fail. He will obtain nothing more satisfactory there than a dry and eyeless mummy.” While conceding that Prentis contributed much to Lane lore that was catchy and amusing, Malin aptly observed that “Prentis’ reputation as a humorist and literary artist betrayed him in several ways. People [expected] him to be funny...and he felt obliged not to disappoint his public.” Thus, concluded Malin, Prentis’ “over emphasis on literary form” caused him to lose sight of “the primary importance of accuracy in facts and interpretation.”⁶

Spurgeon argued that “traditional views of Lane have done a disservice to the man, to Kansas history, and ultimately to the history of mid-nineteenth-century American politics.”

Prentis' adulation of Lane is a reminder that if Spurgeon's contention is correct, the fault lies as much with Lane's admirers as with his detractors. Certainly this fault reflects no personal shortcoming on the part of Lane biographers and historians, but indicates that they labored within a historiographical and literary climate heavily influenced by Frederick Jackson Turner and Thomas Carlyle, both of whom wrote during the heyday of social Darwinism.⁷

William Elsey Connelley, whose tenure as secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society lasted from 1914 until his death in July 1930, though not a contemporary of James H. Lane, knew someone who was, at least in a literal sense. Milton W. Reynolds, born in Elmira, New York on May 23, 1823, was Lane's junior by nine years. During the Kansas territorial period he graduated with honors from the University of Michigan before moving to Nebraska Territory, where he later edited the *Nebraska City News*. Connelley later liberally quoted Reynolds in a biography of Lane, published in 1899.⁸

William Connelley and Milton Reynolds were essentially of one mind with regard to the subject of James Henry Lane. "There were giants in those days," crowed Connelley in his hagiography, "and in the 'imminent, deadly breach' towered the form of James Henry Lane above them all." Connelley cast Jim Lane, in other words, as a giant among giants. In a lengthy epigram to the same volume, Connelley wrote, "Kansas will stamp upon the age... a hundred years of history before another parallel is produced to that weird, mysterious, and partially insane, and partially inspired, and poetic character, James H. Lane."⁹

Laudatory as Connelley's remarks were of Jim Lane, much of the credit (or blame) for convincing the late-nineteenth-century reading public of the latter's purported wild-eyed radicalism must go to Reynolds. It was Reynolds who declared that after August 1855, "no one ever afterward doubted where Lane stood. He crossed with a leap the Rubicon of radical politics

and burned all his bridges behind him. He was not baptized—he was immersed in the foaming floods of radicalism.”¹⁰ Ensuing chapters will show, however, that James Henry Lane still maintained a relatively conservative position while residing in Lawrence through the summer of 1855.

Depression era historian W. H. Stephenson, a protégé of Connelley’s, predictably drew extensively upon the latter’s sources in the late 1920s, while researching his own scholarly and highly respected biography of Lane. Yet, a close reading of Stephenson’s work reveals that he entertained some doubt regarding the veracity of Reynolds’ account. Although Stephenson described Reynolds as “a contemporary of Lane,” he noted that “the writer has evidently woven into his story [of Lane’s Lawrence debut] much that occurred later.” Moreover, continued Stephenson, “Reynolds told the story as it had taken shape in his mind through the years, but his memory was very faulty.” The journalist who told of Jim Lane’s August 14, 1855 immersion in the foaming tides of radicalism was probably not an eyewitness to the event, since on that date Reynolds continued to study classical literature at the University of Michigan. After moving to Lawrence in 1865, he later relocated to the Indian Territory, where he died in 1890, several years before his friend, Connelley, gave Reynolds’ interpretation of Lane’s “radicalization” wide circulation in *James Henry Lane, the “Grim Chieftain” of Kansas*.¹¹

Recent works by Nicole Etcheson and Don Gilmore attest that Jim Lane continues to pique the interest of modern historians, and that the negative stock picture of Lane has persisted well into the twenty-first century. That Etcheson penned a chapter on Lane published in Virgil Dean’s *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* confirmed the “Grim Chieftain” as a power to be reckoned with in mid-nineteenth-century Kansas politics. Still, in asserting that “Lane’s chameleonlike blending into shifting political backgrounds challenges the

biographer's ability to categorize," Etcheson came very close to recreating a word-picture of Lane first painted by Jacob Stringfellow (Nicholas Venes Smith) in 1870, four years after Lane's death. The main difference was that Stringfellow used a turtle rather than a lizard as a vehicle for his sketch. Lane's "unconscious power of adjustability to his surroundings was marvelous," wrote Stringfellow. "Like that versatile Chelonian, the mud-turtle of...superstition, he contained within his shell the flavor of every creature dear to the palate of man—fish, flesh or fowl. In the midst of Christians, he had been carefully educated for the Church: among scoffers, religion was but a cloak for hypocrisy."¹²

Donald L. Gilmore's rendition of the modern stock picture of Lane varied little from characterizations by writers Spurgeon grouped within his Critic-Contemporary historiographical category. "Lane," averred Gilmore, "was amoral, totally pragmatic, and shifted his political sails to suit the time, place, and his need for money and political support. He was pugnacious, ruthless—both politically and personally—sometimes crooked, and indifferent to human suffering." Undeniably, after arriving in Kansas Lane indulged in excesses that won him enemies, as well as the sobriquet, "Grim Chieftain." Still, Gilmore's assessment begs the question of whether Jim Lane's behavior was really so different from that of other colleagues of his day, who became deranged by the exigencies of the territorial struggle and the Civil War.¹³

Ian Spurgeon complained, "One of the most persistent problems in the historiography of James Lane [is] an overemphasis on his personality and a lack of attention to the context of his actions. Lane's controversial behavior must not be ignored, but it cannot be a template for which to interpret all of his actions." Still, the scholarly fixation on Lane's character is unlikely to go away until an answer is found to the fundamental question posed by Nicole Etcheson: "What did James H. Lane represent?" Almost a century-and-a-half after Lane's death he remains an

enigma to historians. Ironically, Spurgeon mentioned two variables that may suggest an avenue for approaching the problem. His recent biography of Lane, like the few others that preceded it, focused almost exclusively on the last fifteen years of Lane's life, which included Kansas' territorial period and early statehood. "Unfortunately," noted Spurgeon, "we have little knowledge of Lane's personality as a young man." Acquiring details of Lane's pre-Kansas past should prove helpful for better understanding his behavior in later years.¹⁴

The task is easier said than done. The introduction to this study already mentioned the paucity of primary source material on James H. Lane. A demonstrated proclivity on Lane's part to keep his activities concealed from public view only compounds the challenge of sources. On more than one occasion, according to Kansas historian Todd Mildfelt, Lane confided to Polish-born Charles F.W. Leonhardt, a fellow "Jayhawker," that "there was much the public didn't know about the 'unwritten history' of Kansas. Accordingly, making sense of Lane's earlier life requires correlating a variety of sources. Fortunately, not everyone with whom Lane associated was as secretive as he was. A close examination of his mother's diary, for example, reveals her to be a virtually guileless person. Similarly, a modest cache of letters that circulated among family members during the years that encompassed Andrew Jackson's presidency reflects remarkable candor. Clearly, much of the material was never intended for public viewing.¹⁵

Existing biographies of Jim Lane, when compared with public documents and the above-mentioned diary and family letters, reveal details of his pre-Kansas years that previously remained hidden from view. At times, these sources underscore the historiographical conundrum, even as they bring the entirety of his life into sharper contextual focus.¹⁶ Because the slavery issue was so viscerally important to the course of American and Kansas history,

historians seemingly have done their best to make the slavery issue a central feature in Jim Lane's life as well.

The process has not gone smoothly. Lane neither read nor approved the historiographical script. There are occasions when hindsight can be a disadvantage in understanding the contingencies faced by the people who had no choice but to live in an age that subsequently aroused great interest among historians. Stephen Aron rightly observed, "Although historical narratives typically move forward in time, their analytical tracks follow backward-looking reflections." This is the heart of the problem in rendering Jim Lane compatible with historiographical preconceptions related to the Civil War and Reconstruction. At one level, because he lived through those periods, or at least a major part of them, he can be made to fit the categories. However, the heroic slant earlier biographies give to Lane's life robs his story of much of its contingency.¹⁷

Ian Spurgeon's musings on Lane historiography, though perhaps "backwards looking" to some degree, came close to hitting the mark. He observed:

The habit of historians to focus almost solely on Lane in Kansas places a disproportionate amount of attention on the nasty political infighting of the Republican Party there and the bitter rivalries. His time in Indiana and his work in Washington on national matters are too often ignored...no historian until now has tried to interpret Lane's actions in the broader context of the collapse of the second-party system and the sectional conflict.¹⁸

Indeed, the trajectory of Lane's life needs to be interpreted in an historiographical context that is much broader than the twin subjects of territorial Kansas and the Civil War. As a corollary to Spurgeon's observation, however, the present study regards the *inception* of America's second two-party system, as much its collapse, a major part of the Lane family saga.¹⁹

The story, in order to be complete, must be broadened sufficiently to illuminate the personalities of several family members. Existing biographies are both helpful and problematic in this regard. If they provide far too little detail relative to Lane's life before Kansas, they at least contain important clues pointing backwards in time to geographical locations, kin, and situations that affected the future "Grim Chieftain" in his formative years. This is especially the case with John Speer's *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, 'The Liberator' of Kansas*. Speer was a contemporary of Lane's who, incidentally, suffered the loss of two sons during William Clark Quantrill's infamous August 21, 1863 Civil War raid on Lawrence, Kansas.²⁰

According to Speer's account, he was acquainted with the Lanes in the early 1840s, while the family center of gravity yet remained Lawrenceburg, Indiana, on the banks of the Ohio River. Although Speer furnished little if any elaboration, his 1897 biography did mention "Connecticut kindred," and that Jim Lane's parents were married in Ogdensburg, New York. Entries in Mary Lane's diary, which she began recording in 1829 suggest that details relevant to her son's life, though left out of Speer's biography, could fill volumes.²¹

Ensuing chapters will show that the Lanes were related by marriage to the Davies family, which moved from Litchfield, Connecticut to Ogdensburg, New York during the winter of 1800-1801. Charles Davies, Jim Lane's maternal cousin, chaired the mathematics department of the U.S. military academy for fourteen years, from 1824 until 1836, the same year that Jim Lane's iconic older brother, John, committed suicide while serving in the Second Seminole War. Charles Davies profoundly affected the collective destiny of the Lane family during this period, even to the extent of helping secure John Lane's appointment as a cadet at West Point. Although Speer's biography of Jim Lane eschews mentioning the Davies family by name, he does acknowledge the importance of an extended kinship network that maintained close ties

throughout Jim Lane's lifetime, despite barriers of time and space. Speer clearly falls within the Contemporary-Defender category of Spurgeon's historiographical model.²²

Jim Lane's best known and perhaps most universally respected biographer, Wendell Holmes Stephenson, was, like his subject, a native of Indiana. Still, the few details he possessed about the Lane family's life in the Hoosier state were probably limited to those provided by his Kansas mentor, William Elsey Connelley. Spurgeon situated Stephenson within what he called the Moderate school of Lane historiography. He rightly credited Stephenson with producing "the most comprehensive study of Lane to date," and noted that Stephenson's *Political Career of General James H. Lane* was "the first truly academic book-length study of Lane."²³

Spurgeon's positive assessment of Stephenson's work echoed sentiments expressed by Connelley in the latter's introduction to his protégé's biography. In his capacity as secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society, Connelley commended Stephenson for pursuing what modern critics might consider a one dimensional approach to studying Lane. It was "fine of Doctor Stephenson," wrote Connelley shortly before his death, to provide "a balanced biography of Lane. He has avoided the controversies of Lane's day and has even ignored the bitter malice with which he was constantly attacked in life and in death. [Stephenson] found these things unnecessary to his purpose." Instead, concluded Connelley, substantiating "Lane's position and power" required only "a plain statement of fact."²⁴ Perhaps, although delving into dimensions of Lane's life other than his quest for position and power in Kansas might have spared future historians the need to ponder what he represented.

While recognizing the immense contribution Stephenson's Depression era biography made to the study of James H. Lane, critical examination detracts neither from the author nor his work. Rendering a rather impersonal account may have been the price exacted of Stephenson in

exchange for achieving the kind of “balance” that Connelley discerned. Jim Lane as portrayed by Stephenson, though dynamic if not volatile in the public sphere, lacks a private persona. The present study found that Jim Lane lived within a mental borderland where public and private spheres intermingled to the point of being almost indistinguishable. Moreover, random tragic events that intruded upon Jim Lane’s life during his formative years profoundly affected if they did not entirely unbalance him. This was especially the case within a five-month period in 1836 when Lane suffered the dual loss of his older brother and younger sister. The memory of their untimely deaths and the circumstances surrounding them haunted Jim Lane to his grave.²⁵

These and other contingent events make studying the life of James H. Lane analogous to studying an iceberg. At any given time a major portion of the subject remains concealed beneath the surface. Such Intangibles, though difficult to measure, go far in explaining Lane’s erratic mood swings and aberrant behavior after he reached Kansas. They also amount to an analytical tool historians can use to determine what the entirety of James H. Lane’s life represented.²⁶

Historian Gunja SenGupta, in a review essay on the historiography of Bleeding Kansas, pointed out “the racialized and gendered nature of [Frederick Jackson] Turner’s frontier thesis.” That William Connelley, W. H. Stephenson, and Kendall Bailes composed their respective biographies in an age heavily influenced by Turnerian historiography perhaps rendered their approach to studying Jim Lane inherently self-limiting. It is apparent, for example, that Stephenson had only the vaguest understanding of the feminine members of Lane’s family. With the exception of their mother, Mary Foote Howse Lane, Stephenson mentioned none of them by name, and indicated only that “the three daughters married men of high standing—Arthur St. Clair, George P. Buell, and Judge Huntington.”²⁷

In fact, the Lane women, both individually and collectively, played anything but a passive role in making decisions that affected the professional destinies of male family members. Situated at the epicenter of discourse and plan-making within their households, husbands and brothers often turned to them for counsel and advice. In the early 1830s, for example, when John Foote Lane agonized over deciding whether to remain in the army, or alternatively, take his father's advice and pursue a career in law, he sought the opinion of his older sister, Ann Lane Buell, because he believed she was better qualified than either John or her husband, George, to make such decisions. Personal letters that circulated among kin, in combination with entries Mary Lane recorded in her diary, make such details stand out in sharp relief against the backdrop of Indian removal expeditions, political machinations, and vocational decisions pursued by male siblings, spouses, and in-laws.²⁸

Frederick Jackson Turner's influence on the writings of John Speer, William Elsey Connelley, and W. H. Stephenson contributed toward rendering their visions of James Henry Lane bigger-than-life, and also made his ascendancy in the politics of territorial Kansas seem inevitable, and also perhaps, biologically determined. "By inheritance and association," declared Stephenson in an article about Jim Lane's father, Amos, "the son acquired the political acumen, the manner of speech, and an understanding of frontier influences that made him a dominating personality in the Kansas struggle of a later decade."²⁹

Despite all this, it was never preordained that Jim Lane would become "king" of Kansas, as Connelley described him. He and everyone in his family were ever at the mercy of contingency. Both before and after he immigrated to Kansas, in good times and bad, he relied heavily on enablers both inside and outside the family circle. For too long they have gone unnoticed by historians. Realities that intruded upon Jim Lane's political world often forced him

to be reactive. Spurgeon noted a tendency of some historians to “project greater power and authority onto Lane than he actually had.” Accordingly, concluded Spurgeon, “Lane has been seen as a man pulling the strings rather than as a man struggling to retain his position in a shifting political environment.” Earlier, writing at the midpoint of the twentieth century, Kansas historian James Malin expressed much the same sentiment. From a perspective broadened to include Lane's family Spurgeon might have added that the struggle to retain position in a shifting political environment occurred not only in Kansas, but extended back in time to an era that predated the administration of Andrew Jackson.³⁰

In an introductory article published in a recent reader on Kansas territorial history, Craig Miner called for “responsible clarification.” Declared Miner, “For the same reasons that modern physicians tend to be specialists, today’s historians tend either to drive deep into a piece of the era or some of its personalities, or to swing wider but stick closely to illuminating a single aspect, a stratum of the landscape.” This study readily concedes the flaws in Jim Lane’s character that earned him the sobriquet “Grim Chieftain,” and a prominent place in the line-up of what Miner termed the “weird and manic figures” of Kansas history.³¹ The transcendent issue, however, is how and why Lane came to be the way he was when he immigrated to Kansas.

Answering Nicole Etcheson’s question, “What did James H. Lane represent?” requires, as Miner suggested, driving deep into Lane’s past to search for answers. In the context of time and space, his story really begins on the St. Lawrence River in the days of the Early Republic. Because his saga involved a complex mix of personalities and geographical locations, studying his past necessarily crosses historiographical boundaries. In her review essay on “Bleeding Kansas,” SenGupta enjoined historians to “seize the intellectually versatile moment...to hybridize seemingly insular realms—of Civil War history and social history of the West, of

sectional politics and cultural exchange.” The resulting synthesis, she concluded, “will revitalize and enrich our understanding of old questions and raise a host of new ones.”³² So it is with the saga of James Henry Lane. His is not the story of one man, but an extended kinship network whose members bounded westward, first from the Adirondacks to Indiana, and eventually to Kansas. It was, in other words, a family affair.

CHAPTER TWO

North Country Origins

Most biographies of James H. Lane contain a segment on his early life in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, a town situated on the Ohio River, just twenty-three miles below the bustling metropolis of Cincinnati, Ohio. Here Lane would grow up, become a partner in a pork-packing business, practice law with his father, and eventually get elected to the United States Congress. Yet Jim Lane's story actually begins on the banks of the St. Lawrence River in upstate New York. John Speer was the first biographer to situate the beginnings of the Lane story in New England.¹

Writing in the mid-1890s, the Lawrence, Kansas newspaperman recalled that Lane's parents were married at Ogdensburg, New York. "General Lane's daughter, Annie," he declared, "frequently visits Connecticut kindred, and informs me that the old house [in Ogdensburg] in which her grand-parents were married is still standing in a good state of preservation, where she has been shown the room in which the ceremony was performed." It is very likely that the ceremony occurred on a farm owned by Thomas John Davies who was Jim Lane's uncle, and Mary Lane's brother-in law. It turns out, though, that the fortuitous confluence of events that first brought Amos Lane and the widow Mary Foote Howse together in Ogdensburg began with a pair of catastrophes that unfolded in the late 1790s.²

Historian Carl Becker once averred that "the memory of things said and done is essential to the performance of the simplest acts of daily life." In other words, our personal memory is a large part of what keeps us oriented in the workaday world. Becker regarded this phenomenon as "history functioning at seven-thirty in the morning" in a way that "effectively orient[s] Mr.

Everyman in his little world of endeavor.” When memory becomes sufficiently skewed, people can lose the ability to function effectively in relation to their environment.³

The first in a series of losses to leave their indirect imprint on Jim Lane’s life occurred several years before his mother’s 1806 marriage to Amos Lane. It inoculated the future Mary Lane with a sense of melancholy so debilitating that she passed it on to her children. Painful memories still lingered nearly a half century after the event, when in early 1847 she recalled, “this day 48 years ago I stood by the bedside of the husband of my youth; I witnessed his dying prayer and exhortation that I would so order my life as to meet him in heaven. I saw him sweetly and calmly breathe his life out on the bosom of his Redeemer.” Born in January, 1778, Mary Foote Howse was still a newlywed just on the verge of her twenty-first birthday when Samuel Alfred Howse died. They had been married in April 1798. That Mary gave birth on February 27, 1799 to a son, who bore his father’s name, only compounded the poignancy of her loss.⁴

Thus, life as Mary Foote Howse knew it ended early in 1798. Meanwhile, a parallel tragedy played out in her sister’s life. The two siblings, both daughters of Revolutionary War veteran John Foote, hailed originally, as did Mary’s late husband, from Watertown, Connecticut. Mary’s sister, Ruth, in December, 1792 married Thomas John Davies. A separate series of events whose details lie outside the scope of the present study eventuated in the death of Ruth’s father-in-law in April, 1799, only days after the Howse’s would have celebrated their first wedding anniversary. The tragedies combined to create a set of circumstances that proved catalytic in bringing about a relocation of the extended family to Ogdensburg, New York. The entourage included Thomas John and Ruth Davies, their children, the future Mary Lane, and her infant son, Alfred, named after his deceased father.⁵

It seems hardly surprising that Thomas John Davies, still a young man in his early thirties, and casting about for a new vocation, would be attracted to lucrative opportunities that apparently beckoned from the St. Lawrence River valley on New York's northern frontier. A family memoir recorded that "losing nearly all that he possessed, and having no wealth to expect from inheritance, and his experience having given him a distaste for business, [Thomas John] determined to... find in a new country a home and as he hoped a brighter future than he could expect in Connecticut." Accordingly, Thomas John Davies:

collected the wreck that remained of his property, and purchased as his future residence, a tract of six hundred acres of land, on the shore of Black Lake, in St. Lawrence County, N.Y., about nine miles southwest from the present city of Ogdensburg. He visited the place alone, some time in 1799, and ... [having] built a house and made preparations to receive his family, he returned to Connecticut, and in the winter of 1800[-1801], with his family ... started on [the] journey for their new home, carrying with them household furniture, supplies, and all things required for permanent establishment.⁶

Traveling with them were Ruth's widowed sister, Mary and Mary's infant son roughly a year old. All the sojourners on this trek were badly in need of a new life.

It was best that they traveled during the winter season. In a day before rail and canal transportation evolved to the point of affording at least a modicum of comfort to pilgrims, only in winter "when snow was on the ground, could the heavy loads that accompanied the travelers, be drawn through the wilderness, in which for the greater part of the distance, they were compelled to find their way."⁷ At the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the most plausible route for conveying the Davies from Connecticut to Ogdensburg led by way of Vermont, paralleled the eastern shore of Lake Champlain northward to Montreal, then followed the trace of the St. Lawrence southwestward until reaching Ogdensburg on the southern shore. Other options posed additional risks. Seemingly impenetrable forests intimidated prospective

travelers. As one local history noted, “Plattsburgh, on the east, was the nearest white settlement, with Utica on the south and Oswego on the west. The vast space between these points was a dense forest.”⁸

By the spring of 1801, the Davies, accompanied by Mary Foote Howse and her son, had settled on the property that their family would retain for generations. Although Mary would later remove to another part of the country, her ties to her New York kindred would never be broken. Their move to the up-country over the winter months occurred against a backdrop of portentous political change that roiled the young nation in those days. The previous fall had seen a presidential election. Thomas Jefferson’s party defeated the Federalists, and in early 1801 what some called the Revolution of 1800 was well under way. In some ways it foreshadowed the epic scale of historic change that attended James Henry Lane’s move to Kansas more than a half century later. By then Mary would be deceased; but the bonds that tethered the migrating Lanes to their New York roots continued to hold fast.⁹

Perhaps in one sense the Revolution of 1800 was not all that far removed from the political turmoil of the mid-1850s when Jim Lane went to Kansas. In both instances, embedded in the chaos was opportunity for those who possessed a talent for discernment, and an inclination to act on that knowledge. In future years his family’s connection to this early period in the nation’s history shored up Lane’s claim to a long connection with the Democratic party. His birth in 1814 was nearly a decade-and-a-half in the future as Mary still grieved for her lost spouse. Although James H. Lane’s 1858 newspaper “Autobiography” mentioned political connections that ran only as far back as Andrew Jackson’s presidency, his family’s Democratic credentials actually antedated that period by a number of years.¹⁰

To that point the political preferences of the more well-to-do among Ogdensburg's residents inclined toward the Federalist party. "Prominent and wealthy men from New York, New England, and New Jersey entered heavily into land speculation, and many aristocratic families settled around Ogdensburg....Among these prominent families were the Ogdens, Fords, Parishes, Van Heuvels, Van Rensselaers, and others." Mary Foote Howse and her kin, if somewhat less "prominent," were nonetheless anything but indigent. As a collective family unit, they were politically well situated to portray themselves, at least symbolically, as an alternative to the Federalist rule.¹¹

Jefferson's election as president boded well for his Democratic Republican supporters, a circle that incidentally included the Davies family. A post-Civil War county history confirms that Thomas J. Davies, though not a member of the bar, directed at least some of his time and energy toward public service: "He soon took an active part in public affairs. He was the first acting sheriff, 1803-1806, and 1811-1813; and also held the office of county judge for a time. He was a Democrat in politics." During Thomas John's second tenure as sheriff, a series of serendipitous events connected with the War of 1812 led to his son's appointment as cadet at the United States Military Academy at West Point.¹² This twist of fate was not without its effect on a new family that by that time had removed westward to the banks of the Ohio.

Ogdensburg's founder, Nathan Ford, made several trips to Albany in the early days, in part to help professional associates understand the benefits that attended emigration to the North Country. While there he convinced a newly minted lawyer named Louis Hasbrouck to settle on the St. Lawrence. Shortly thereafter Hasbrouck received an appointment as county clerk. His wife remained in Albany long enough for her husband to establish an office and make living arrangements for his new family. By the time she joined him in 1804, she would be carrying

their first child. Hasbrouck's new duties doubtlessly brought him in contact with the county's first acting sheriff, the same Thomas John Davies who was none other than Mary Foote Howse's brother-in-law. Quite plausibly, a spin-off of the professional relationship that evolved between Thomas John Davies and Louis Hasbrouck created the social channel that enabled Mary to meet Amos Lane, another promising young lawyer who was destined to become her second husband.¹³

Ogdensburg established another precedent in 1802 that garnered no small amount of civic interest; namely, the town's first official Fourth-of-July ceremony. The barracks that formerly housed English soldiers afforded a location suitable for delivering an oration. Providing it was an employee of Ford and Ogden, one John King. He was the father of Hon. Preston King, who occupied a seat in the U.S. Senate during the Civil War while James H. Lane served as his counterpart from Kansas. That Preston King still maintained a family residence in Ogdensburg in the 1860s constituted yet another symbolic strand of continuity that linked the Lane family with the north country.¹⁴ Although no written record survives to substantiate Mary Foot Howse's presence that day, a local celebration of such import probably compelled her attendance. Social events on that scale of magnitude were, after all, few and far between in the remoter reaches of New York's northern frontier. There was little to break the monotony, and opportunities to shop were limited to the Durham boats that occasionally ventured northward from Utica to sell their wares to settlers inhabiting the shoreline of the St. Lawrence.¹⁵

Based on research conducted during the 1930s by the redoubtable Wendell Holmes Stephenson, it appears that Mary Foote Howse's future husband first arrived in Ogdensburg sometime in the latter part of 1805. Although Stephenson thought that the couple wedded the previous year, Mary's diary confirms that their marriage in fact occurred on January 5, 1806.¹⁶ While she continued to languish in widowhood throughout the first half decade of the nineteenth

century, Amos Lane labored to establish his credentials as a lawyer. A native New Yorker, Amos was born in Cayuga county in 1778. Before reaching his mid-teens, he worked alongside his father cultivating the family farm. Then, after serving an apprenticeship as a millwright for about four years, he took up pursuits of a more bookish nature. Stephenson declared,

After trying his hand at school teaching... he began the study of law as a clerk in the office of Joseph L. Richardson at Levanna [New York], a few miles north of Aurora. He remained in that office from September 12, 1803, until February 2, 1805, when he was granted a certificate of good moral character. Lane then entered the law office of Daniel Shepard of Aurora, and there continued his study until August 7 of the same year.¹⁷

It happened that Shepard's brother-in-law, Jacob Brown, was also a lawyer. Like the Davies family, he too resided in St. Lawrence County.

Before long, then, armed with another certificate of character complemented with a letter of introduction furnished by Shepard, Amos Lane left Aurora headed north hoping to obtain employment as a clerk in Jacob Brown's legal office. Stephenson probably had no intention of being humorous when he wrote that "Lane did not find Brown, but tarried until the autumn of 1806 at Ogdensburg." Tarried indeed. Instead of finding Brown, Lane apparently found Mary Foote Howse. A romance blossomed, which soon resulted in their marriage on January 5, 1806.¹⁸

Romance in this particular case may have been assisted by outside parties mutually acquainted with the newlyweds. As already explained, Mary Foote Howse and Amos Lane probably met through the agency of Mary's brother-in-law, Thomas John Davies, and County Clerk William Hasbrouck. Both the Davies family and Hasbrouck arrived in the north country in 1801 and 1802 respectively, several years before Amos Lane first made his appearance St. Lawrence County. Meanwhile by late 1804, Hasbrouck's wife joined him at Ogdensburg.

Though perhaps only a coincidence, the timing of her arrival suggests at least the possibility that she played some matchmaking role in the Lane marriage equation.¹⁹

In any event, not much time elapsed before the widow Mary Howse and Catherine Hasbrouck struck up what was destined to become a lifelong friendship. It would have been only natural for the future Mary Lane to look forward to befriending a couple in her own age group. Although the entire community numbered 138 according to the tally reflected in the 1800 census, the area beside Black Lake, where the Davies resided, then supported only four white families. The year after this second national census was taken, a long awaited overland route to the Mohawk River valley finally opened, although its completion was still a year away when the Hasbroucks made their trek northward from Albany.²⁰

In 1803, the year that the New York state legislature officially sanctioned the locally established St. Lawrence County government, Ogdensburg received a visit from a writer destined to become one of the most renowned literary figures of the early nineteenth century. The record Washington Irving kept of his travels along the St. Lawrence that year fortuitously captured his impressions of the North Country just at the time Mary Foote Howse lived there, but before either the Hasbroucks or Amos Lane—her future second husband—joined her.²¹ Moreover, the challenges encountered by Irving's party of travelers provides an indication of what pilgrims endured before a well-built road connected Ogdensburg to the Mowhawk River:

On Monday, August 9th, [1803] they set out from Utica for the High Falls on Black River in two wagons....The roads were bad and lay either through the thick woods or by fields disfigured with burned stumps and fallen bodies of trees. The next day [conditions] grew worse; the travelers were obliged to get out of their wagon and walk. At High Falls they embarked in a scow on Black River, so called from the dark color of its waters; soon the rain began to descend in torrents, and they sailed the whole afternoon and evening under repeated showers, partially screened by sheets stretched on hoop poles. After a wretched night passed in a hovel and two days more of the same forlorn

travel through deep mud holes and over fallen trees, they came at last in sight of the Oswegatchie.²²

Irving was favorably struck by the contrast between their dismal journey to that point, and the visage presented by the Oswegatchie. “The prospect that opened upon us,” he wrote, “was delightful. After riding through thick woods for several days, the sight of a beautiful and extensive tract of country is inconceivably enlivening.” Finally Ogdensburg came into view. “Close behind the bank on which we rode, the Oswegatchie wound along...And after running for some distance it entered into the St. Lawrence, forming a long point of land on which stood a few houses called the 'Garrison,' which had formerly been a fortified place built by the French to keep the Indians in awe.” From that point, Irving and his companions enjoyed the hospitality of Ogdensburg’s founder, Nathan Ford.²³

Both Mary Lane and Washington Irving made separate return visits to Ogdensburg at mid-century. The details of Mary’s late 1848 travels will be recounted later in this narrative. Following Irving’s second visit in 1853, he wrote, “one of the most interesting circumstances of my tour was the sojourn of a day at Ogdensburg, at the mouth of the Oswegatchie River, where it empties into the St. Lawrence. I had not been there since I visited it fifty years since, in 1803, when I was but twenty years of age.” By 1853, long gone were the pastoral scenes of his first visit, when “everything was so grand and so silent and so solitary.” Gone also was the rustic French fort where Irving and his party had basked in the hospitality of Nathan Ford. Of it Irving could find “not a trace.” They had all been replaced “after a lapse of fifty years [by a] populous city, occupying both banks of the Oswegatchie, connected by bridges.” The town had grown up: “it was the Ogdensburg of which a village plot had been planned at the time of my [first] visit.”²⁴

Religion was the organizing principle of Mary Lane’s life and its most consistent thread of continuity. Although the loss of her first husband traumatized Mary Foote Howse to the

extent that her faith was shaken, she never abandoned it. Years later, during the 1850s, her son became infamous after his arrival in Kansas because of rumors that alleged a distinct insincerity in the beliefs held dear by many New Englanders. A number of his contemporaries thought that Jim Lane made a very poor Methodist. Although the future Mrs. Amos Lane had yet to discover frontier Methodism during the time she resided in Ogdensburg, it is doubtful that anyone would have accused her of harboring flip or disingenuous notions regarding matters of the heart, especially those that touched on life and death issues. She had experienced more than enough of the latter before reaching the age of twenty-one.²⁵

Mary Foote Howse's parents thoroughly imbued their children with a sense of religious piety. They were, her pastor noted, "members of the Presbyterian Church who dedicated their children to God in baptism, and brought them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Family worship was observed evening and morning in her father's house, the children taking part in reading the scriptures." Moreover he continued, "from infancy she had led a life of prayer, and had scarcely passed the [age] of accountability when she experienced a sense of God's pardoning mercy, and was judged a fit person to be received into the Presbyterian Church." Though deemed qualified for full membership, she nonetheless eschewed it at first, perhaps, as she later explained, because of lingering misgivings she had about Calvinist doctrine. Later, though, the tragic loss of her first husband caused her to reconsider. "Not long after [his] death she united with the Presbyterian Church in her native town" of Watertown, Connecticut.²⁶

Mary's behavior with regard to her children's upbringing replicated that of her parents. Her firstborn son, Samuel Alfred Howse, bore his father's name. She speaks in her diary of "offering him up in baptism" before departing on the first leg of her journey to the north country. It would have been out of character for Mary to abide her children growing up in a world devoid

of religious instruction. The need to preclude such a vacuum from developing may well have played on the collective mind of Ogdensburg's small band of Presbyterians in 1805 when they first organized themselves as a formal congregation. One nineteenth-century history records, "The first religious association was formed in 1805, and was called the First Church and Congregation of Christ in the Town of Oswegatchie." Signing the request submitted to the Oneida Presbytery for a full-time minister were Nathan Ford, Louis Hasbrouck, and Mary Foote Howse's brother-in-law, Thomas John Davies. Another account of the same period sheds considerable light on the motivation that fueled the request: "a clergyman should come to baptize the children." This had to be done, "even when it was necessary to send to Canada to find one."²⁷

For Nathan Ford, selecting Ogdensburg's first full-time pastor involved a combination of tact and consensus. In his dual capacity as a town founder and designated agent of its leading proprietor and namesake, Ford wrote a letter of explanation to Samuel Ogden. The former had no desire to interfere with "the feelings and wishes of the settlers," preferring instead to channel in a positive way the selection of a "clergyman of their own persuasion." He explained further:

Finding them determined to get one of the Presbyterian order, and their mind being fully bent upon that object, I concluded it was proper for me not to oppose but fall in with their views, and take such a lead in the business as to prevent their getting some poor character, who would probably be a harm rather than an advantage to the settlement. Under this impression I have united with them in giving a call to a Mr. Younglove, a gentleman of education and abilities, and who has been the first tutor of the college at Schenectady for three years.²⁸

Thus did Nathan Ford wisely choose the role of facilitator rather than obstructionist to the settlers' wishes. Giving them what they wanted and selecting a competent candidate proved to be very compatible priorities. Although Mary Howse's, and perhaps also Catherine Hasbrouck's perspective varied somewhat from Nathan Ford's interest in the premises, events unfolded to the

satisfaction of all concerned parties, incidentally insuring that a minister would be on hand to solemnize impending nuptial vows between Mary and her betrothed at the start of the new year.²⁹

Roughly eighteen months after the former Mary Foote Howse and Amos Lane were married in January 1806, it again became necessary to ensure the presence of a clergyman, this time for an infant baptism. In July 1807 Mrs. Lane gave birth to a daughter who the couple chose to name after her mother. This little girl, though not literally Mary's firstborn child, was nonetheless her first daughter as well as the first child born of the union between Amos Lane and his new bride. Momentous as the blessed event was, news of a more impersonal nature intruded to disturb the new family's quietude and impede the progress of settlement along the shores of the St. Lawrence.³⁰

There locals struggled to maintain a semblance of normalcy despite growing geopolitical strife between the United States and Great Britain. Any resulting military confrontation between the world power and fledgling nation promised to be an uneven match. Trade, meanwhile, was the lifeblood of Ogdensburg, and the hamlet's future hopes hinged on prospects for an ever expanding market up and down the major waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean. If Canada was a variable that factored into this equation, a healthy competition for trade was not the only stressor that roiled its somewhat uneasy relationship with the ragtag collection of former British colonies situated along the trace of its southern border. A much larger game, the Napoleonic Wars, was playing itself out in Europe.³¹

The conflict vastly complicated, if it did not entirely disrupt, the conventions that attended normal peacetime trading patterns between the European continent and the New World. The international situation deteriorated to a point where President Jefferson sought to chart a course aimed at effectively terminating trade with French and British belligerents alike. Toward

that end, Congress, on December 22, 1807, passed the Embargo Act. Despite a gradual build-up of tensions that over time inspired rumors of war, settlers on both sides of the St. Lawrence strove to maintain cordial relations.³²

Although no documents survive to precisely reveal how well the feelings of Amos and Mary Lane aligned with the spirit of the act, they nonetheless left posterity with a record of sorts: they voted with their feet. Just at the time of little Mary's birth, the Ogdensburg rumor mill was spinning out of control. An unbridled panic apparently had worked to seize control of the public mind. In a letter to Samuel Ogden, Nathan Ford wrote,

The sound of war has palsied the land. The unhappy affair will very materially affect our prospects in the money line. Much pains are taken by some people on the other side of the river to inspire a belief that the Indians will be employed by the British government, and their numbers are intensely magnified. This constant theme of fear, originating with the women, puts the [devil] in some men, and some among them are becoming as old-womanish as the women themselves. These men I abuse for cowardice, and the women's fear I soothe, but I fear all my exertions will be in vain; for it is incredible what frightful stories are [making the rounds] upon this subject. I yet hope the whirlwind may pass by without material injury.³³

Unfortunately Ford hoped in vain. We will never know whether the constant theme of fear to which he referred put the devil in Amos Lane and his newly formed family. But certain it was that he had mouths to feed, and the immediate economic future could not have looked very bright to an ambitious, young, freshly minted lawyer from Albany in search of a secure and remunerative practice. The environs of Cincinnati, though, lying contiguous to Henry Clay country on the shores of the Ohio River, was another matter altogether.³⁴

Before the long-sought Oswegatchie road was built running southward from Ogdensburg to the falls of the Black River, Nathan Ford opined to Stephen Van Rensselaer that "the immense flood of people who emigrate to the westward, go there because they have no choice."

In Ford's view, the new road would remove the temptation for westward migration, and alternatively channel prospective settlers in the general direction of upstate New York, with propitious results for the village of Ogdensburg.³⁵

Ford's optimism took into account neither the likelihood that relations between the United States and Great Britain would deteriorate even further, nor the more extreme possibility that the two countries would soon be waging war against each other. Meanwhile, newlyweds Amos and Mary Lanes were hardly as vested in the north country as the Hasbroucks and Davies, who moved to Ogdensburg early in Jefferson's first administration. The new road, if it increased the flow of settlers for a time, failed to silence the siren song of a beckoning westward frontier. By late 1807, an Anglo-European tradition of land hunger, opportunities for lawyers on the frontier, Ogdensburg's dismal short-term economic prospects, and apocalyptic rumors of impending Indian depredations provided all the justification required for deciding to move West. Whatever their reasons, the Lanes selected this option for their new future. The decision required substantial personal sacrifice.³⁶

The Lanes faced choices few families would desire to make. By the end of 1807, the family of Amos and Mary consisted of four souls: the two adults, and one child each by Mary's current and former husbands. Apparently they thought it best that not all of them should venture into an unknown West; someone must stay behind. The new bride could not bear to part with her infant daughter. Perhaps her firstborn son, seven year-old Samuel Alfred Howse, himself preferred to remain with Davies relatives in familiar surroundings. Or, some other circumstance invisible to historians may have dictated that he remain in Ogdensburg. In any event, as late as the 1830s Mary was still pining over her "orphan son" who "sad necessity tore [from] me in his childhood," adding, "but two interviews have I had with him since his seventh year." Meanwhile

he had grown to manhood, started a family of his own, and settled several hundred miles from his mother's location on the Ohio. In the interim they relied on the mails to remain in contact. Still, leaving Samuel behind was a wrenching decision that Mary regretted to her dying day.³⁷

The Lanes delayed their departure, of course, until well after the birth of their daughter, which afforded Mary adequate time in which to recuperate from her recent period of confinement. Amos used the intervening months to scout possible future locations for his new family. In 1806, the process brought him once more to Cayuga County and Aurora, where he had grown to adulthood in the scenic Finger Lakes region of New York. By late 1807, the couple made its final decision to move west. With winter still the preferred time of the year for travel, they began their journey during the first quarter of 1808. Some journal entries related to that period recorded (albeit after the fact) in Mary Lane's diary partially corroborate conclusions later drawn by Wendell Holmes Stephenson in the 1930s. By the end of the first week in March the family had reached Cincinnati, where it soon arranged to rent a farm—or rather a plantation—in Boone County, on Kentucky's southern shore of the Ohio River. This became their first home in the West. They stayed for almost exactly a year, until Mary delivered another addition to the Lane family: a second daughter named Ann.³⁸

Apart from Mary Lane's abiding religious faith, change remained the one constant the inchoate family could rely on beyond a stubborn determination on the part of the newlyweds to overcome the obstacles inherent in their new-found western environment. The array of surviving public and private details that attended their initial challenges and encounters with locals provide an apt starting point for the next chapter. Fortuitously, over a period of years, future additions to this family included one whose political survival in Kansas would be almost wholly dependent on his ability to portray himself as a westerner. While his prospective parents blazed a figurative

trail subsequent to their arrival on the Ohio, ties to New York's north country endured. It seemed to matter little at first that the new culture surrounding them was one that embraced an economic system founded on slave labor.³⁹

CHAPTER THREE

Starting Over on the Ohio

Cincinnati was a long way from the St. Lawrence River Valley. Wherever the Lanes ventured, however, some measure of New England culture and mores traveled with them. “It is well known,” observed historian Eric Foner, “that a steady stream of migrants spread out from New England throughout the nineteenth century, settling along a line almost due westward from their starting places, and bringing with them their churches, schools, and puritan culture. Long after New England itself was deluged by immigrants, who wrested a good portion of political power from native inhabitants, centers of pure New England culture existed in the Northwest.” The family of Amos and Mary Lane embodied an early iteration of that migratory stream.¹

Rivers served as highways. The actual route followed by the Lanes probably originated in Cayuga County, New York. From there, as a member of their extended family later suggested, they would have “started westward, going with teams to Olean, where [they] embarked on a keel boat and went down the Alleghany and Ohio Rivers to Marietta, Ohio.” The final water-borne leg of their journey brought them at length to Cincinnati. The trace of this route essentially matched that taken about 1820 by one Samuel Buell, a New York native and Lane neighbor whose Ohio offspring eventually married into the Lane family.²

Whatever course they followed, Amos and Mary Lane’s final destination lay well within the cultural orbit of Kentucky’s outer Bluegrass, at a time when Bluegrass politician Henry Clay’s sphere of political influence began radiating outward from Lexington. In part for that reason, the environs of Cincinnati, Ohio, and points west, which included Lawrenceburg, in Indiana Territory, would never be islands of pure New England culture. One mid-nineteenth-century Indiana congressman went so far as to declare the region an “outlying province...of the

empire of slavery.” The Lanes remained in Cincinnati only for a week, just long enough to orient themselves to their new surroundings, make arrangements for the coming year’s lodging, and incidentally establish some initial contacts with a few members of the antebellum Ohio River social elite.³

The company they kept on their southwestward journey suggests that if the Lanes were not wealthy by the standards of their time they were far from indigent. As Mrs. Lane recalled, “While we were spending a week in Cincinnati, we became acquainted with Captain John Brown, father of the wife of General Pike—who invited us to occupy an untenanted dwelling of his for a year, until we could suit ourselves in a location and become acquainted with the country... We accepted his offer and spent one month more than a year on his plantation.”⁴

One local history of Dearborn County, Indiana described Cincinnati as “the most important town in the eastern division of the Northwest Territory.” It was good that the Lanes made their living arrangements shortly after arriving there, since by June Mary was already carrying the couple’s second child. Mrs. Lane gave birth to another daughter, Ann Lane, on March 1, 1809. John Brown’s *plantation*, as Mary aptly called it, lay only a short distance downriver from Cincinnati and the comforts that contemporary city life had to offer.

Alternatively, Vincennes, though officially designated Indiana’s territorial capitol, probably seemed a rather dismal option for a new family in the early 1800s. As the local history explained, it was still only sparsely populated, and lay a hundred miles to the west at the end of “a laborious journey through [a] wilderness... unmarked by a vestige of civilization.” Conditions there remained far too Spartan to offer much appeal for a young woman verging on the prolonged confinement that attended childbirth.⁵

In 1801, a half dozen years before the Lanes left Ogdensburg for Cincinnati, Zebulon Pike had married Captain Brown's daughter, Clarissa. The Pikes' daughter, in turn—their only child to reach adulthood—grew up to marry a son of the ninth U.S. president, William Henry Harrison. The Lanes first made their appearance in the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana border region while the future American president still served as Indiana's territorial governor.⁶

Captain Brown's "untenanted dwelling," as Mary Lane called it, afforded temporary accommodations for the thirteen-month period her family lived in North Bend, Kentucky. This settlement was located directly across the river south of a small Ohio community that had taken the same name. In 1840 North Bend, Ohio garnered a measure of national recognition first as President Harrison's home, and thereafter as his final resting place. A nineteenth-century historian explained why settlers along both the north and south banks of the river thought North Bend an apt name for their respective villages. Boone County, Ohio, observed Henry Howe in 1846, "is situated sixteen miles below Cincinnati and four [east of] the Indiana line, at the northernmost point of a bend in the Ohio river." Because the Lanes' rented their home on the *south* side of the river, they were literally Kentucky settlers, at least temporarily.⁷

Decades later this seemingly prosaic detail came to hold special significance for the Kansas career of Mary Lane's youngest son, James Henry. It meant that when addressing Western audiences in the mid-to-late 1850s, especially in Kansas, he could invoke a shared Southern heritage without being disingenuous. The luxury of claiming a common background and set of interests must have lightened the inherently dangerous burden of facing volatile proslavery auditors. Even a shard of common identity grounded in a mutual cultural bond could pay high dividends as a deterrent against the violence that sometimes stalked such gatherings. The luxury of being able to claim both sides of the Ohio as a birthplace had its advantages.⁸

The Lanes' choice of rental properties during their first months in Kentucky suggests that if they suffered any pangs of conscience over slavery, they kept their own counsel regarding it. Although the farm they initially leased from General Pike's father-in-law was unoccupied prior to their arrival, it was almost certainly well-cared-for. The 1810 federal census recorded that both of the Boone County, Kentucky landlords who sequentially rented property to the Lanes between 1809 and 1814 were slave owners. The census taker ascribed ten bondsmen to John Brown, about twice the average number held by an aggregate of 147 local slave-owners throughout the county, yet half that required to establish the Browns as members of the planter class.⁹

The family remained at the North Bend location until 1810, when, still keeping to the Ohio River's southern Kentucky shore, they moved downriver a few miles to the tiny settlement of Tousey Town, directly across the river from Lawrenceburg, Indiana. This second home leased by the Lanes belonged to a local lawyer named Jacob Piatt. Tousey Town's brief history makes the perennial debate over whether the Grim Chieftain hailed originally from Kentucky or Indiana seem superficial. By the mid-nineteenth century the settlement no longer existed. Its foremost *raison d'être* was a ferry that made travel easier between the Indiana and Kentucky shores of the Ohio River. All that remains of the place today is a hilltop cemetery.¹⁰

Mary and Amos Lane both thought highly of the Piatt family that resided in the small Kentucky settlement. A local history recorded an epitaph that would have impressed Mary Lane: "Jacob Piatt....A Soldier of the Revolution and a Soldier of the Cross." Later recalling what most impressed her about 1810, she noted, "this year I made some acquaintances that lasted for life [including] Judge Piatt and wife, who were as long as they lived as kind as an own father and mother." That Piatt's faith happened to be Methodism fortuitously channeled the historical trajectory of the Lane family. Once this aging couple, Jacob and his wife, Hannah, befriended

Mary Lane to the extent of assuming the mantle of surrogate parents, she quite naturally focused on religious views they all shared in common.¹¹

A fortuitous combination of religion and personal experience made the Lane family ambivalent about slavery. Circumstance literally situated them in a position to see both sides of the issue. Presently they made the acquaintance of Elijah Sparks, who resided on the ostensibly non-slaveholding northern shore of the Ohio. A native of Queen Anne County, Virginia, Sparks had settled in Lawrenceburg in the spring of 1806. He was both an able preacher and practicing lawyer. Mary later recalled that “soon after I got to my new home I was introduced to Rev. Elijah Sparks; though a lawyer [who] stood high at the bar, he was still a Methodist preacher and a very zealous and devout man.” A county history extolled him as “one of the most prominent instruments of the planting, spread, and symmetry of Methodism in this part of Indiana.”¹²

If the Lanes tended to be neutral on slavery, they held strong feelings on a range of other contemporary social issues. Amos no doubt regarded himself an American patriot. Mary, for her part, besides being extremely well educated for a woman of her day, subscribed to a notion of American exceptionalism she believed was imperiled by national sin. During the early 1830s she thought the country’s well-being depended on a return to Christian virtue: “I am more and more impressed with the idea that as a nation we shall be visited with national calamities if we do not worship more fervently that God who has watched our infant colonies—fought for us our battles in the glorious struggle for independence—endowed us with blessings superior to any nation on earth.”¹³

Although Mary Lane forbore itemizing the country’s collective transgressions, some of her free spirited fellow countrymen then populating the Ohio River borderlands in that early period no doubt wracked up transgressions worthy of inclusion in almost anyone’s catalogue of

national sins. As Stephen Aron observed, “There was no established church in the post-Revolutionary West, and no denominations could keep pace with Kentucky’s rapidly growing population....By the late 1790s only about 5 to 10 percent of Kentuckians belonged to a Christian church.” Moreover, when the Lanes made their trek down the Ohio, changes in the religious sphere unfolded in a way that almost guaranteed continued insensitivity in some quarters to the plight of peoples outside the pale of Anglo-European culture. These changes occasioned only a short-lived fusion of religious and antislavery sentiment along the Indiana-Kentucky border.¹⁴

Before the Lanes reached Cincinnati in March 1808, a backlash had already taken shape against a species of religious enthusiasm that only a few years earlier saw a tentative intermingling of black and white congregations on the Ohio. Such inchoate stirrings, with their implications for prevailing racial norms, lasted for only a short time. It also happened that Amos and Mary subsequently settled their family less than a hundred miles from Paris Kentucky, the renowned starting point and epicenter of America’s Second Great Awakening. In the summer of 1801, an immense ecumenical camp meeting hosted by the Cane Ridge Presbyterian Church morphed spontaneously to achieve a critical mass that historian Paul Conkin characterized as “the most important religious gathering in all of American history.”¹⁵

Meanwhile the slave-holding Piatt family in Tousey Town complemented the influence of Judge Sparks in converting Mary Lane to Methodism. She regarded Mrs. Piatt as:

a woman of great energy of character and a devoted Methodist; she led me to the first class meeting that I ever attended...I had not fully made up my mind to join the Methodists; but all my former prejudices were done away, and my having never been satisfied [with] Calvinist doctrine, I was much easier persuaded to join the Methodists than I otherwise would have been.¹⁶

For Mary Lane, Jacob Piatt and Elijah Sparks embodied all the Ohio River champions of Methodism who stood ready to capitalize on a seemingly growing public discomfiture with Calvinist dogma.¹⁷

Even so, Mary's conversion to Methodism was a very gradual process that played out over a period of several years. Over time, she simply came to feel more comfortable among Methodists. By her own account, they gave her a warm welcome, while members of her own church "passed by on the other side." Although she first placed herself under the "watch-care" of the local Lawrenceburg Methodist Church in 1809, she waited nine years before accepting full membership in 1818. That in June, 1814, she gave birth to James Henry, the second of three children born to Amos and Mary Lane in the midst of this transitional period, explains the genesis of her son's affiliation with Methodism. However far from its teachings he subsequently strayed in later life, his mother's gradual conversion was in retrospect the determining step that initially steered his thoughts toward this particular venue of American evangelicalism.¹⁸

Prior to the War of 1812, still years before the acrimonious slavery debate of 1819 poisoned congressional discussion of Missouri's impending statehood, an almost universal spirit of acquisitiveness pervaded the Ohio River settlements between Louisville and Cincinnati. In large measure, Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky provided the inspiration for this spirit, thanks to his advocacy of what was called the "Bluegrass System." Its central feature, according to one historian, entailed "enhancing the productivity of property and effecting the economic consolidation of Kentucky." Clay incidentally resided in Lexington, only fifteen miles distant from Cane Ridge, and less than a hundred miles downriver from where the Lane family settled. Thanks to their geographic proximity to Lexington, the Lanes were well situated to benefit from Clay's Bluegrass System.¹⁹

Mary's husband, Amos, probably felt much more comfortable among the Bluegrass gentry typified by Clay than he would have cared to admit later in his political career. To the extent this was true, it created friction between husband and wife that lasted throughout their lives. There is little doubt that the prevailing zeitgeist with its attendant emphasis on materialism helped fuel Mary's concerns about Amos' religious backsliding, as well as her general sense of uneasiness relative to social declension and the current state of national sin. Mary represented a religious counterpoint to her husband's primary preoccupation with achieving success in the legal profession and other business ventures. If Amos Lane wanted to settle somewhere far removed from where Jefferson's trade embargo took its debilitating toll on Ogdensburg's local economy, the decision to locate along the Lawrenceburg/Boone County stretch of the Ohio River was an excellent choice.²⁰

The Lanes arrived in Boone County at the height of a regional boom in hemp production. Over time, as Amos' legal practice began thriving, they assimilated into an Ohio River economic elite whose influence radiated outward from Lexington to affect points west of Cincinnati, specifically including the two North Bends, and Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Stephen Aaron observed that "hemp and hemp manufacturing escaped the depressing consequences of Jefferson's embargo [and] heralded a brilliant future for...Bluegrass planters, dealers, and manufacturers." Thus, as diplomatic tensions increased between the United States on the one hand, and the warring great powers of Europe on the other, Henry Clay aspired "to rig the Navy with cordage made of American hemp—Kentucky hemp—Ashland hemp." This was staple agriculture operating full-tilt. Yet it was not of the single-crop variety typical of the cotton-growing South. Farmers along the Ohio sought to diversify the products they offered for sale on the market.²¹

Part of the agricultural diversification along the Ohio incidentally involved the use of slave labor to grow tobacco, commonly considered a “nigger crop” because of the constant labor-intensive effort required for its cultivation. Just as Jim Lane’s religious preferences can be traced to his mother’s affiliation with Methodism in the Ohio valley, so was his attitude regarding the use of slave labor to till the soil influenced by the realities of early nineteenth-century agriculture in southern Indiana. He would be taken to task in Kansas for opining that the territory’s potential for hemp or tobacco production would determine his stance on the free soil question. Still, he was born into an environment whose residents regarded slavery as eminently reasonable under certain conditions.²²

Treason under the guise of a plot known to history as the Burr Conspiracy surely commanded the attention of Amos and Mary Lane during their 1808 pilgrimage down the Ohio River. The family arrived in the Cincinnati area just at a time when that portion of the Old Northwest was trying to shake itself free of the stigma caused by the machinations of Thomas Jefferson’s erstwhile vice president. As explained by one of Indiana’s Progressive Era historians, the Burr Conspiracy was “a ‘Napoleonic’ scheme to separate the Western States from the East, join them with Louisiana and Spanish America to form an empire with Burr as the Emperor and [General James] Wilkinson as second in command.” In the aftermath of the Hamilton-Burr duel and the completion of Burr’s tenure as Vice-President, “The Ohio Valley,” said Leslie Henshaw, “was the leading section of the West at this time,” and as such figured prominently in the plans of the alleged conspirators.²³

The plot collapsed in the wake of a hostile public reaction and a presidential proclamation enjoining public officials to uphold the laws and the territorial integrity of the United States. Burr and his alleged co-conspirators were apprehended, brought to Virginia, and tried for treason

in a U.S. circuit court, with John Marshal, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court serving as presiding judge.²⁴

Although some aspects of the conspiracy lie outside the scope of the present study, a few details of the drama must have held special interest for Amos and Mary Lane, for at least three reasons. Two of their children would marry into a family whose members took an active part in suppressing the conspiracy. Secondly, their own Kentucky landlord, Captain John Brown, and his son-in-law Zebulon Pike, while not directly implicated in the plot, were nonetheless tainted by rumors and publicity that surrounded it. Finally, as the Lanes reached Cincinnati, people residing in Indiana Territory drove their elected officials to take extraordinary measures to neutralize the stigma that the conspiracy temporarily foisted on Western settlers. A collective concern if not paranoia briefly took hold of the public consciousness. The total mix inevitably comprised part of the political landscape as it existed when Amos Lane first set out to practice law in his new surroundings.²⁵

One of Burr's co-conspirators was one Harman Blennerhassett, who owned an estate on a rather nondescript island in the Ohio River. It lay within the boundary of what later became the state of West Virginia. Burr intended to use Blennerhassett Island as a logistical hub in support of his plans, and enlisted the help of its owner in carrying them out. In charge of local efforts to suppress the conspiracy was Joseph Buell, then a major general in the Ohio state militia. On December 10, 1806, General Buell received the following communication from the governor of Ohio:

You are hereby authorized and required...to arrest and secure Harmon Blennerhassett, Esq. if he may be found within the jurisdiction of the State of Ohio, to answer to the following charges, to wit: that he...hath procured to be fitted out on the Muskingum river within the jurisdiction of this State a number of Batteaux, with the Intention that such Batteaux shall be employed to disturb the peace and tranquility of the United States...and you are further

authorized and required to take possession of and detain the Batteaux aforesaid.²⁶

There can be little doubt that the Lanes knew the identity of the Ohio militia general who did his duty in seizing Burr's boats at Blennerhasset Island in December 1806.

Joseph Buell numbered among the first settlers who came to Marietta in 1790 under the auspices of the Ohio Company Associates. A branch of his family hailed from Ithaca, Cayuga County, New York, where Amos Lane formerly resided before leaving for Cincinnati and the West. While growing to manhood in the former location, Amos probably made the acquaintance of Salmon Buell, a prosperous local merchant who also subsequently settled in the West, and whose progeny eventually married two of Lane's children. In the context of the present study, both families—Salmon Buell's and Amos Lane's--originated in the same part of New York state, but the Buell presence on the Ohio River antedated that of the Lanes by more than ten years.²⁷

The first paragraph of President Jefferson's November 1806 proclamation on the Burr conspiracy mentioned "a military expedition or enterprise against the dominions of Spain." This added to speculation that Captain John Brown and his son-in-law Zebulon Pike, might have been involved in the conspiracy. The Lanes must have been uneasy about speculations relative to their landlord's alleged participation. Burr supposedly met on more than one occasion with John Brown at the latter's Kentucky residence before setting his western plan in motion. By 1808 historical hindsight surely complemented popular speculation about Brown's role in the Burr fiasco in a way that the Lanes could hardly have found comforting. However Amos Lane may have felt about John Brown personally, having a landlord tainted by the Burr conspiracy could potentially amount to a political liability. Such considerations likely weighed heavily on his mind as he pondered his professional future.²⁸

It was only natural that Lane wanted to build on the professional foundation that he initially laid in Ogdensburg. He had a family to provide for, and, as noted earlier, lawyers, together with well-to-do planters and merchants, comprised a highly visible elite in Ohio River communities. A local history recorded that on the Indiana side of the river, “the most important personages in the country...were the young lawyers, universally called ‘squires’ by the old and young, male and female.” When the Lanes first arrived in the vicinity of Lawrenceburg, legal opportunities must have seemed ripe for the picking.²⁹

At this precise moment in time, a pair of prominent local politicians intervened to frustrate Amos Lane’s initial attempt to realize his professional ambitions. The reason this happened was briefly addressed by Omar F. Roberts, a nineteenth-century member of the Indiana bar who claimed a personal acquaintance with the Lane family, specifically including Amos, and later, his more famous son, James Henry. By Roberts’ account, when Amos Lane ventured to the north side of the Ohio seeking admission “to the bar, [he] was refused license for the sole reason...that he was an ardent friend of Thomas Jefferson. At that time Doctor [Jabez] Percival was the probate judge and Gen. James Dill county clerk, both of whom were strong Federalists.” These two men apparently took it upon themselves to preempt Amos Lane’s efforts to practice law in Lawrenceburg. “They were,” continued Roberts, “not inclined to show favor to anyone who was not of their household of faith; and consequently they rejected Lane’s application for a license to practice law.”³⁰

From a twenty first century vantage point it is difficult to identify any insurmountable obstacle that would have kept Lane and these two influential Lawrenceburg Federalists from reaching some sort of accommodation. It was hardly as if the Outer Bluegrass country that surrounded Lawrenceburg was altogether devoid of Democratic Republican lawyers cut from

similar political cloth as Henry Clay, who by 1809 was parlaying his Kentucky fame into a national reputation. One Kentucky historian noted that “even though the Bluegrass elite was dominated by men who considered themselves good Republicans, they embraced a political economy that swerved away from the localism and agrarianism associated with one strain of the Jeffersonian movement. Out in front of this nationalist and developmental persuasion was Henry Clay.” When measured by criteria that included ardent nationalism, a cosmopolitan world-view, and an enthusiastic advocacy of government support of internal improvements, Amos Lane and Henry Clay held much in common.³¹

Still, Kentucky was not Indiana. North of the Ohio in 1809, espousing Jeffersonian principles carried some degree of risk. Amos Lane coincidentally reconnoitered Lawrenceburg while Dearborn County was still in the midst of a lively political contest to determine who would serve as Indiana’s territorial delegate to the U.S. congress. The visceral issue that attended this canvas concerned slavery. Merely to suggest, as most Lane biographies have to date, that local officials prevented Amos Lane from establishing a legal practice on the basis of his political sympathy with Thomas Jefferson, entirely overlooks the divisive role slavery then played in Lawrenceburg and throughout Indiana at large. If the Lanes considered themselves reconciled to what they perceived as the realities of the South’s peculiar institution, it indirectly sabotaged their first attempt to settle on the Ohio’s northern shore. The ongoing campaign there to elect a congressional representative in some ways bore an eerie similarity to the muddled political situation James H. Lane encountered upon his arrival in Kansas at mid-century.³²

A native of Ireland, James Dill was arguably the most prominent member of the Dearborn County bar in 1809. During Anthony Wayne’s Indian campaigns of the 1790s, Dill served as an aide to William Henry Harrison. Following the Treaty of Greenville he first settled

in Cincinnati where he studied law under former territorial governor Arthur ST. Clair, and embarked alongside Samuel C. Vance on an ill-starred business venture. Over time, Vance, a colleague of Dill's during the Indian campaigns, became a son-in-law and lifelong friend. So devout a Federalist was James Dill during this period that he named his only son after Alexander Hamilton.³³

As a family unit, the Dills presented anything but a united political front to the outside world. James Dill had married a widow, Mrs. Eliza St. Clair Lawrence, who brought to their united family several children by her first marriage. Although one of her daughters eventually married Dill's friend, Vance, another wedded a native Virginian and cousin of Thomas Jefferson named Thomas Randolph. The latter union brought together all the ingredients necessary for making a political family feud, which plausibly exacerbated Dill's resentment of Amos Lane's identification with Jeffersonian democracy.³⁴

In 1805 Indiana's territorial legislature passed an indenture bill that closely resembled Virginia's slave code, and sidestepped many of the strictures on slavery imposed by the Northwest ordinance of 1787. James Dill resented this measure, which, according to one Indiana historian, "was not an expression of the will of the people but rather a bit of sharp practice in the interest of a few politicians who no doubt were looking far into the future for political favors." Sharp practice or not, this controversy involving slavery had only recently played-out when Amos Lane attempted to set up a new legal practice in Dearborn County. Dill, meanwhile, remained the most influential Federalist in the county, having received his appointment as recorder from Governor William Henry Harrison in 1803, when the county was first organized.³⁵

Amos Lane and James Dill probably presented public images that differed markedly in style and deportment. Lane would have adopted the simplicity of dress common among

advocates of egalitarianism and supporters of Thomas Jefferson. By contrast, noted one historian, “when General Dill appeared in court, it was in the full costume of the gentlemen of the eighteenth century—his knee britches and silver buckles and venerable cue neatly plaited and flowing over his shoulders, seemed a mild protest against the leveling tendencies of the age.”³⁶

The lives of General Arthur St. Clair, James Dill, and Amos Lane were strangely intertwined in a familial web of marriages. Dill wedded one of St. Clair’s daughters, and two of Lane’s children would marry grandchildren of St. Clair in the early decades of the nineteenth century. St. Clair, as already mentioned, was Dill’s legal mentor and benefactor. The latter owed a measure of loyalty to both St. Clair and William Henry Harrison, both of whom were Federalist appointees and governors of the Northwest Territory. For a brief period during the 1790s St. Clair served concurrently as territorial governor and the highest ranking officer in the United States Army during President George Washington’s administration. When Congress in 1800 divided the Northwest Territory into the separate territories of Indiana and Ohio, St. Clair continued to serve as Ohio’s governor until 1802, when President Jefferson removed Governor St. Clair from office for publicly criticizing the enabling act that brought Ohio into the Union.³⁷

If General Arthur St. Clair had fallen from political grace in the early 1800s, his son-in-law and protégé, James Dill, continued to be a local power broker in Indiana territory when Amos Lane arrived with his family in Dearborn County. The outcome of Indiana elections scheduled for 1809 would determine whether Democrats or Federalists would control the territory’s legislative apparatus as the time for statehood drew near. That personal circumstances fueled Amos Lane’s need to begin practicing law in Dearborn County on the eve of these elections made efforts to establish a political rapport with Dill awkward at best.³⁸

By June 1808, three months after temporarily settling on John Brown's Ohio River plantation, Mary and Amos Lane were already expecting their second child. Mary subsequently gave birth to the couple's second daughter, Ann, on March 1, 1809, less than a month after President Jefferson signed into law the act that formally created Illinois territory, separate and apart from its parent territory, Indiana. James Dill, meanwhile, denied Amos Lane's application for a license to practice law in Indiana. Thus began a mutual enmity and political feud that lasted a lifetime, ending only with Dill's death in 1838. This turn of events, besides making Lane livid, left him with nowhere to turn for redress on the Ohio's northern shore. Little choice remained but to return across the river to Tousey Town, where according to Omar F. Roberts, "he remained two years, turning his hand to anything that would enable him to make bread for his family." His wife, meanwhile, was anything but idle in using her skills to compensate for Amos' temporary professional setback.³⁹

As spring turned to summer in 1809, Mary Lane contributed to getting her family through its hard times by plying a demonstrated aptitude for teaching. Writing in early 1855, the Reverend F. C. Holiday recorded that "her father took great pains with the education of his children...Mrs. Lane was well introduced in the branches usually included in an English education." Mary first taught school back in Connecticut at the tender age of fifteen. As an adult, in the months following her arrival at North Bend, Kentucky, she built on her earlier experience by opening a school that boasted "upward of twenty scholars," some of whom she boarded in her home. After Ann's birth she did much the same thing in Tousey Town, albeit on a somewhat larger scale, with attendees "increased to seventy scholars." Subjects taught included "the usual branches of an English education." Apparently members of both genders benefited from her instruction. "Among Mrs. Lane's scholars at Touseytown," concluded

Holliday, “may...be numbered some of the first gentlemen and ladies both in Kentucky and Indiana.”⁴⁰

Amos Lane’s day came in Lawrenceburg, in due season; and when it did, political retribution was the order of the day. “You may safely conclude,” Omar Roberts wrote in the 1880s, “that those who had given him the cold shoulder at his first advent in Lawrenceburg received but little favor or mercy at his hands, when in a legitimate way he could reach them.” For the present, however, Lane would have to bide his time. The 22 May election brought victory to the antislavery candidate, Jonathan Jennings, by a margin of only 26 votes over his rival Thomas Randolph. The outcome also suggested that the local Federalist regime would retain its ascendancy for the immediate future. If political developments gave Lane little cause for rejoicing, the realm of personal affairs looked considerably brighter by comparison. The coming years blessed the Lanes with two more arrivals, both boys, while the family still resided on the south side of the Ohio.⁴¹

By Mary’s account they had moved from the Brown plantation at North Bend to Towsey Town—five miles down river—in early April 1810. There on the twenty-first of December that same year she gave birth to John Foote Lane, the couple’s eldest son. Perhaps through the good offices of Jacob Piatt, in 1811 John’s father seized an opportunity to practice law at Burlington, the seat of government for Boone County. “Here,” continued Roberts, “Lane was admitted to the bar, Mrs. Lane resuming her vocation of school teacher.” Burlington also was the birthplace of George W. Lane, a second son born to Amos and Mary on November 7, 1812.⁴²

Changes wrought during the first dozen years of the nineteenth century were as profound for the Northwest Territory at large as they had been personally for Amos and Mary Lane. Perhaps most significant among these were a total of eight treaties struck between Anglo-

European settlers and native peoples of the Northwest Territory that garnered the United States roughly 3,000,000 acres of land at a cost of one-third of a cent per acre. Not infrequently were these treaties negotiated personally by the governor. For that reason William Henry Harrison, acting in the capacity of a ranking superintendent of Indian affairs, often delegated the details of workaday administration to the territorial secretary, John Gibson. For much of the century's first decade, Harrison governed in absentia.⁴³

The Indian war of 1811, which ended disastrously for the native peoples with the Battle of Tippecanoe, brought an added measure of notoriety to Amos Lane's Dearborn County nemesis, James Dill. Dill was commissioned a captain in the Dearborn County militia in March 1809, a month that happened to coincide with the birth of the Lanes' daughter, Anne. Governor Harrison subsequently brought his military campaign of 1811 to a successful conclusion before the Dearborn County militia could fully organize, deploy, and be brought into play. By that time the Lanes were well established south of the Ohio in Tousey Town.⁴⁴

Shortly thereafter, the barrier that the Ohio River provided against universally feared Indian depredations no doubt made Boone County, Kentucky seem like a splendid place to weather the War of 1812. That Amos Lane took no active part in the conflict hardly made him and his family disinterested onlookers. While Mary set up housekeeping and taught school, and Amos worked to establish a local reputation as a competent lawyer, their trans-Allegheny kindred, though geographically removed, played a far more active role in permanently linking the collective personal destiny of all of them to the country's foremost institution for producing military leaders. During the 1860s another son of Amos and Mary Lane—Senator James Henry Lane of Kansas—would lead a clique of legislators highly critical of generalship they considered typical of West Point graduates. Yet until now, his extended family's first contact with that

institution during the War of 1812 has gone virtually unnoticed by historians. While this initial contact predated Jim Lane's birth by several months, the association nonetheless turned out to be an abiding one that directly influenced his life trajectory.⁴⁵

CHAPTER FOUR

1812 and Beyond: Continuity, Contingency, and Opportunity

Where the Whitewater River meets the Ohio in southeastern Indiana, Amos Lane bristled under the strictures imposed by a self-appointed guardian of Federalism named James Dill. Still, Lane would not be denied the pursuit of his chosen vocation. If he could not practice law in Indiana Territory, Boone County, Kentucky at least offered a viable alternative. From Tousey Town, on the river's southern shore directly opposite Lawrenceburg, he moved his family to Burlington, the seat of Boone County. There, according to historian Wendell Holmes Stephenson, in short order "Lane was admitted to the bar and soon had both civil and criminal practice." The clerk of the Boone County circuit court, Absalom Graves, later commented on Lane's professionalism. During this period, said Graves, Amos Lane "performed all his...duties with independence, ability and honest integrity, and with an unusual degree of attention, industry and perseverance; and with great success." If draconian measures were called for to meet expenses inevitable in relocating his still-growing family, a supportive spouse stood ready to help.¹

Once again, Mrs. Mary Lane's early life experiences in Connecticut enabled her to generate income in yet another new environment. She opened a subscription school in Burlington that eventually accommodated about seventy pupils. As mentioned earlier, it was there also that Mary presented Amos with their second son, George W. Lane, born November 7, 1812. They were now a six-member household, which besides both parents, included two pairs of daughters and sons. The birthplace of each child mirrored the trace of the family's trek from northern New York to the Indiana-Kentucky borderland. Their two eldest children, Mary and Ann, were born

respectively on the St. Lawrence River and at North Bend, Kentucky. Then came John Foote, in Tousey Town, just a ferryboat ride across the Ohio River from Lawrenceburg, followed by George, their latest addition, at the Boone County seat of Burlington, Kentucky.² The year 1812 turned out to be an auspicious year for the Lanes for reasons that transcended the short-term prospects of the immediate family. Events of national import raised a troubling potential for eclipsing, if not derailing, personal priorities, hopes, and dreams.

This proved to be less true for the immediate Lane family than for kinfolk left behind in upstate New York. As war clouds gathered in 1812, residing on the Kentucky side of the Ohio offered some respite from nagging concerns that parents of their day had for their children's safety. Let James Dill and his cronies in the Indiana militia worry about possible Indian or British thrusts toward the Ohio River. Its natural barrier combined with a militia presence north of the river to provide a buffer sufficient to ward off potential threats to Kentucky's Bluegrass country. It also afforded Amos and Mary the luxury of focusing almost exclusively on personal concerns related to raising a family.³ Advantages of that sort were scarcer, though, for northern kin residing on the St. Lawrence, where Mary's recently widowed mother, first-born son, two sisters, and a host of in-laws remained uncomfortably close to the country's border with British Canada.

That Lane relatives would be denied the opportunity to live out the war quietly became apparent in February 1813, when a minor skirmish left the English in possession of Ogdensburg, New York. At that time, Thomas John Davies still held the position of St. Lawrence County sheriff, assisted by another brother-in-law of Mary named Joseph York.⁴ It was probably inevitable that war would return to Ogdensburg, as soon as the beleaguered American army could marshal the resources necessary for a major push into the St. Lawrence River valley.

Chance made its unfortunate citizens vulnerable to contingencies that would attend any nearby military operation. Possession of the vital river valley linking Lake Ontario with the Atlantic Ocean offered an advantage to whichever side that controlled it.

A window of opportunity that lasted some months opened for the United States in 1813. Early that year, Oliver Hazard Perry helped seize Fort George at the mouth of the Niagara River. In May, he then defeated a British fleet on Lake Erie. Seeking to parlay these gains into a strategic victory that might wrap up the war, American leaders planned a new lunge at southern Canada. In overall charge of this offensive was recently promoted Major General James Wilkinson.⁵

Among an exclusive circle of subordinates that comprised Wilkinson's staff was the army's foremost technical expert on siege warfare and the construction of fortifications: Colonel Joseph Gardner Swift. Ironically, less than two years earlier, in the Christmas season of 1811, Swift had served on a military board of enquiry that cleared Wilkinson of charges stemming from his alleged role in the Aaron Burr conspiracy. It literally required an act of Congress, or at least, the Senate, to designate Swift as the army's chief engineer officer. His subsequent selection as Wilkinson's chief engineer for the St. Lawrence campaign brought unintended consequences to the Lane family's extended kinship network that would last for decades.⁶

The war's onset required Colonel Swift's immediate presence in New York City to shore-up its woefully inadequate harbor defenses. After completing that task in May, 1813, he received the orders he had requested earlier, sending him to the northern frontier. There, in Swift's own words, General Wilkinson was assembling an army "for some movement on the St. Lawrence." This transfer proved fateful for the Lanes because it brought their extended family—most

particularly the Davies—in direct contact with the officer whose singular influence in supporting candidates to West Point was unequaled within the fledgling U.S. military establishment.⁷

By the latter part of October 1813, Wilkinson had directed his chief engineer to conduct a reconnaissance along the St. Lawrence River valley, to include the British garrison of Prescott, directly opposite Ogdensburg. Swift recorded in his memoirs that his task was to “plan an attack upon that post, and to sound the river with a view to a rapid passage down the river.” This requirement effectively channeled Swift’s advance in a way that led him almost directly to the Lanes’ former hometown of Ogdensburg. Predictably, the chief engineer depended on local New Yorkers sympathetic to the American cause to serve as guides.⁸

Members of the extended Lane family apparently stood willing and able to meet this need. Swift wrote that on October 23 he established contact with an American dragoon commander near Oswegatchie, “and with him arranged to be furnished with escort, and thence we proceeded to Ogdensburg...opposite to Brockville, in Canada.” Swift also recorded that his reconnaissance included meeting a Mr. York of Ogdensburg, who provided “much assistance.” It happened that this particular Mr. York was Joseph York, Mary Lane’s brother-in-law. He had succeeded Thomas John Davies, her sister’s husband, as sheriff of St. Lawrence County. Davies’ fifteen year-old son, Charles, who was also York’s nephew, numbered among the local citizens who did what they could to help Wilkinson’s seven-thousand-man army as it passed through the area.⁹

Help provided by Mary Lane’s nephew to the American army during its 1813 campaign on the St. Lawrence soon caught the eye of the U.S. Military Academy’s absentee superintendent. A family memoir contends that Colonel Swift visited the home of Sheriff Thomas John Davies. Although the details of Charles Davies’ service have been lost to history,

Swift's surviving words testify to its quality. In the aftermath of the engagement at Chrysler's Farm, Wilkinson's engineer made this entry in his memoirs for November 25, 1813:

I wrote Sheriff T.J. Davies on Black Lake that the Secretary of War had acceded to my request to send his son Charles to West Point as a cadet. I had given the secretary an account of the zeal that this youth had exhibited in the campaign on the St. Lawrence, and also [of] the service that the father had rendered to the march of the army between Ogdensburg and the rapids below, in foraging, etc.¹⁰

Swift's praise of the services rendered by Joseph York and the Davies family in particular chronicled at least one positive outcome of a campaign that did not end well for the American army. Widespread gastric problems caused by bad rations hampered the already phlegmatic efforts of geriatric leaders whose personal health issues should have disqualified them from command in the field. When British forces caught up with Wilkinson's army at Chrysler's Farm, they dealt it a defeat severe enough to compel an American withdrawal. "Our columns," wrote Colonel Swift, "having every fifth man killed or wounded (one hundred and two of the former and two hundred and thirty-eight of the latter), [left] our dead on the field, marched deliberately to their boats, pushed off, and descended the river."¹¹ Swift's advocacy of Charles Davies' appointment occurred in the immediate aftermath of the debacle at Chrysler's Farm. Besides opening new vistas for the kinship network that included the Lane family, this personal intervention also aligned well with Thomas Jefferson's intent when the president first established the U.S. Military Academy.

Thomas John Davies' status as one of St. Lawrence County's prominent Democratic Republicans might well have been as significant to Charles' appointment as the support his family provided Wilkinson's army during its St. Lawrence campaign. If being "an ardent friend of Thomas Jefferson" impeded Amos Lane's quest for gainful employment in Dearborn County, Indiana, it quite probably had the opposite effect on extended family expectations back home in

New York. While weighing the possibility of recommending Charles for attendance at West Point, it hardly could have escaped Colonel Swift's attention that the father's credentials as a loyal Jeffersonian were impeccable. Without question, T.J. Davies' experience, first as a county sheriff and later as a St. Lawrence County judge, suggested strong political commitments if not aspirations. The Davies family memoir claims that Thomas John "took an active interest in politics and throughout his life was a consistent and earnest Democrat, and had much power and influence in his party." To the extent this was true it boded well for Charles' appointment as a cadet to the U.S. Military Academy.¹²

Throughout the presidential administrations of both Thomas Jefferson and James Madison the coincidental marriage alliance between Davies and Footes probably increased the chances of both families to qualify for a share of political spoils. In the early years of the nineteenth century, a lynchpin of that inter-family alliance was Mary Foote Howse Lane's older brother, Ebenezer Foote. Ebenezer was an up-and-coming lawyer in Albany who had established both a professional and personal relationship with the late Governor George Clinton, who, until the latter's death in April 1812, embodied the Democratic Republican faction in New York state politics.¹³

Clinton was the governor of New York between 1801 and 1804, during Jefferson's first term as President. He then served as U.S. vice president during Jefferson's second term, and died in office while still serving as vice president under James Madison. A Foote family memoir records that Ebenezer Foote's legal competence "attracted the notice" of Clinton. The latter held Foote in such high regard "that in 1801 he had him appointed assistant attorney general for the counties of Columbia, Rensselaer, and Greene." Although Clinton was deceased by 1813, Ebenezer Foote still held his own position as assistant attorney general during the War of 1812,

when Colonel Swift “discovered” Charles Davies while conducting military operations on the St. Lawrence. Any intra-New York notoriety that the Foote family accrued from Ebenezer’s position would have enhanced the chances of his nephew’s appointment to the U.S. Military Academy. Conversely, any of the same notoriety that leached beyond New York to penetrate Federalist circles in Indiana Territory would have had a detrimental effect on Amos Lane’s efforts to carve out a professional niche for himself among still-entrenched Dearborn County Federalists.¹⁴

Notwithstanding the curious twist of fate that garnered his appointment as a West Point cadet, Charles Davies would need more than political connections to remain at the academy. Upon arrival there, he found an environment specifically designed to test the metal new attendees. Only through dedication and perseverance would he be able to capitalize on his appointment. Perhaps his most impressive advantage was a well cultivated reservoir of natural aptitude. Whatever academic rigors his immediate future might hold in store for him, as Charles Davies reported for duty at West Point in December 1813, he stood at the apex of a robust kinship network whose collective political ambitions stretched from upstate New York to southern Indiana.

Rivers that first served the Lanes as highways on their pilgrimage to Cincinnati now proved useful as mail-routes that kept them in touch with family and friends. Personal news about Lanes, Davies, and Footes made its way back-and-forth among geographically separated kinfolk, carrying word of triumphs and tragedies alike. If the Lanes sat out the War of 1812 in one of its backwater locations, they were anything but immune from its changing fortunes. They kept very much abreast of news important to themselves and their New York kindred, and no doubt welcomed Charles Davies’ appointment to West Point as a positive indicator for the

coming year, even if they harbored any doubts on how the drama would ultimately play out in 1814. In any event, life on the Ohio gave the Lanes plenty to contend with in their own new environment. The ensuing twelve months proved a bitter-sweet period for their still growing immediate family.

Although a multi-pronged British invasion made it a rough year for the American cause, William Henry Harrison's September 1813 victory near Moravietown on the Thames River surely raised Lane spirits. Tecumseh's death and the resultant elimination of the pan-Indian threat to white settlement north of the Ohio removed any lingering doubts that Amos Lane's family would remain out of harm's way for the duration of the war. Meanwhile Mary could only hope for the best for her kin on the St. Lawrence, which now included a recently widowed mother. Topping the family's list of hopes and expectations for the coming year was the prospect of yet another addition.¹⁵

When the couple's third son, James Henry Lane, entered the world on June 22, 1814, the outcome of the War of 1812 remained in doubt. Certainly the Battle of the Thames would have buoyed Lane family hopes, and General Andrew Jackson's more recent success at Horseshoe Bend in east-central Alabama came as welcome news. Still, several doubt-filled months would pass before Jackson's decisive victory at New Orleans heralded the approaching end of the war. That circumstances on the Ohio River's northern shore changed in a way that allowed Jim Lane's birth to occur in Lawrenceburg, Indiana in itself amounted to a personal victory for his parents.¹⁶

Over time, the exigencies of war had loosened the Federalist death-grip on local politics, making it possible for Amos and Mary Lane to relocate their family to their original town of choice. Lawrenceburg remained the family hub for the balance of their lives. Although James

Dill, in his dual capacity as county recorder and county clerk, still remained a power to be reckoned with in Dearborn County, local Federalist political hegemony no longer existed. Thus, Omar Roberts, a family friend, observed that Amos Lane encountered no further obstacles in gaining admittance to the bar and establishing a reputation as an up and coming criminal lawyer.¹⁷

Sadly, family celebrations that attended the summer of 1814 were destined to be short lived. Fate handed the Lanes equal draughts of joy and sorrow that year. There is never a good time for death to visit a family. When at length it comes to an aging parent, its role as part of an inevitable natural order at least provides a small measure of solace. Without doubt Mary Lane grieved three years earlier when she learned of her father's death in Connecticut at age sixty-seven. Still, by all indications she took it in stride and focused on nurturing her new family.¹⁸

The abrupt and untimely death of her brother, Ebenezer, in Albany, New York was an altogether different matter. Precisely because it was so unexpected, it seemed doubly cruel. This was the same sibling that governor George Clinton had earlier appointed to the post of assistant attorney general. What was then called bilious fever struck Ebenezer down in the prime of life at age forty-two. A family history records that in early July he had traveled to Troy to attend the circuit court of Rensselaer County when he suddenly fell ill. After four or five days, a fever "assumed a serious aspect," and he died eleven days later, on July 21, 1814, less than a month after the birth of his nephew, James H. Lane.¹⁹

A poem that Mary Lane penned on the second of August testifies to the severe blow this loss dealt to Mary Lane's psyche, and makes clear the considerable emotional support her brother formerly provided in times of stress. It also reveals the extended family's collective sentimental attachment to pastoral settings in New York, especially the Hudson River. She

recalled Ebenezer as a “youthful guide” who had soothed her “youthful heart” years before, when death claimed her first husband in 1799. “In all my grief he bore a part,” she wrote, “and strove my life to cheer.” She also enjoined a “Sacred Muse” to help her “portray those blessed, those much-loved scenes, the Hudson’s broad extended sides, [its] bosom swelling with the tides” that flooded her memory. Although Mary Lane eventually consigned herself to Ebenezer’s loss, the tragedy made an indelible mark that left her feeling as though the “dreams of youth [had] fled.”²⁰

Whatever his family’s domestic joys and tribulations in 1814, Amos Lane ploughed ahead establishing a professional beachhead in Lawrenceburg. By no means were practicing law and dabbling in local politics mutually exclusive vocations. Not only could they be pursued concurrently, but in Lane’s case they complemented each other. Accordingly, Amos divided his time between both. When the Lanes moved to the north side of the Ohio, Indiana statehood was still two years away. In 1815, Amos began what would become an eight-year tenure as prosecuting attorney of Dearborn County. The February following Indiana’s admission to the Union in November 1816, the state’s first governor, Jonathan Jennings, appointed him as a notary public for Dearborn County.²¹

Serving in these positions did not rule out entering the lists for a seat in the state legislature, which between 1816 and 1825 met at Corydon. Elections to the lower house were held annually, and Lane ran and won on three different occasions. Members of Indiana’s first General Assembly witnessed sure indications of their colleague’s political competence. Lane took an active interest in a broad range of subjects, and by some accounts, introduced more bills than anyone else in the lower house. He also served on myriad legislative committees, chairing four of them. He strove for uniform application of laws throughout Indiana; insisted that local

justices of the peace adhered to a codified set of professional standards; and worked to ensure that punishments meted out to law violators were proportional to their crimes. During this same period he also helped frame legislation aimed at deterring the common practice of Negro stealing.²²

Lane's performance in the first session of the general assembly was such that in 1817 he won reelection to a second term. Isaac Blackford, a political ally and colleague from a neighboring southeast Indiana county, had presided over the first session. This time around, though, the legislature chose Amos for the position of speaker of the house. Though just entering his fourth decade of life, and still relatively new to the world of politics, Amos Lane discharged the duties of his new post with the skill expected of a seasoned veteran.²³

That service in the Indiana General Assembly left Lane ample time to practice law in Lawrenceburg proved both a blessing and a curse. The assembly of representatives that comprised Indiana's lower house first met at Corydon on November 4, 1816, and remained in session for only two months before adjourning on January 3, 1817. Before and after this period Amos shouldered a daunting caseload with high potential for consuming every spare hour for the foreseeable future. Before the Indiana supreme court alone Lane argued no less than forty-six cases on appeal between 1817 and 1845. Of that number he represented twenty-seven plaintiffs, and nineteen defendants. According to one historian, on twenty-eight such occasions "he was sole counsel" for his clients.²⁴

Complementing the rise in Amos Lane's professional fortunes was yet another personal blessing. April 1817 witnessed the birth of Jane, the third and last daughter Mary Lane bore her husband. They now had a total of six children, ranging from Jane, the newborn, to their eldest daughter, Mary, now ten. Although James Henry Lane was still just a toddler when his little

sister arrived on the scene, there can be little doubt that their father was a super-achiever of his day. Jim Lane and his five brothers and sisters were born into a family wherein ambition and political discourse pervaded the domestic environment.²⁵

Although these events boded well for Lane family prospects in Indiana, during the same period perhaps even more portentous developments continued to unfold in New York. Making them more portentous was the likelihood that their far-reaching implications could potentially spill across regional boundaries to affect the entirety of the greater kinship network. At West Point, Charles Davies lost no time making a name for himself. When he first reported to the academy in December 1813 he was just on the eve of his sixteenth birthday. The institution was still so new that the program of study had yet to coalesce into an established four-year curriculum. While the balance of the War of 1812 ran its course, Davies applied himself to his studies and graduated in December 1815, two years after his arrival.²⁶

In December 1816, less than six months after becoming an engineer officer, Davies resigned his army commission in favor of joining West Point's faculty as an assistant professor of mathematics. Whether intended or not, Colonel Joseph Swift's mentorship of Charles Davies turned out to be a prescient move: in selecting a prospective cadet for attendance at the academy, he had incidentally also groomed someone destined to become a major mover and shaker in what more than a few contemporaries regarded as its most important department.²⁷

By 1820 the implications for their own children of Davies' apparent if tentative success teaching at the Academy began to dawn on the parents of John, George, and James Henry Lane. The latter was only two years old when his mathematically gifted cousin first embarked on what eventually turned out to be an exceptionally lucrative career that ere long included translating, writing, and publishing textbooks. Davies' tenure as an army officer had never taken him far

beyond the boundaries of his home state. Yet in the extreme southern reaches of Indiana, a caring and politically savvy set of parents kept careful watch for opportunities to secure rewarding futures for their own sons and daughters. Though the Lanes had chosen a new life in the West, the lure of academic self advancement exerted a magnetism that turned their attention eastward. When Charles Davies began his West Point teaching career in 1817, a seed had been planted at the academy, even if it would require some time to germinate. A representative of the Foote-Davies-Lane kinship network now existed inside the institution; a representative strategically located and mentally predisposed to do his part in turning extended family aspirations into reality.²⁸

When the second session of the Indiana General Assembly ended in late January 1818, Amos Lane suffered from no want of things to keep him busy in Lawrenceburg, where he continued to discharge his duties as a prosecuting attorney. Within the circle of his immediate family, his wife, Mary, brought the pair's last child into the world: a son named William, born in May, 1819. This may well have been the happiest period in their married life. Amos had only recently returned home after two successful back-to-back terms in the new state legislature to resume his successful legal practice. Mary, now able to devote all her time to raising a family, assumed a major role in church activities. Moreover, their children, especially including the newborn, enjoyed apparent good health.²⁹

In 1820 a murder trial roiled the atmosphere in Lawrenceburg, and coincidentally "made" Amos Lane's reputation throughout Indiana as a renowned trial attorney. Briefly stated, the situation involved a lover's triangle wherein all three individuals were popular and well known about town. Two suitors vied for the affections of the same young lady. A sensation resulted in January after Amassa Fuller, the rejected party, fatally shot his rival, Palmer Warren. During a

trial held in March, Amos and another lawyer prosecuted the case on behalf of the county, opposed by a five-man legal team for the defense. Lane and his colleague won the conviction, and Fuller was hanged in mid-August.³⁰

A year after this sensational trial had run its tragic course, Dearborn County conducted its sixth annual canvas to choose a representative to the General Assembly. In August 1821, Amos Lane won a third term in the state legislature. On a more personal note, no less tragic in its own way than the murder and ensuing trial two years earlier, late 1822 brought word that Mary's mother, Mary Peck Foote, had died in Ogdensburg, New York. She had made her home there, alongside the family of Thomas John and Ruth Foote Davies, since her husband's death in 1809. She had survived the War of 1812, witnessed the birth of several grand-children on the St. Lawrence (including Samuel Alfred Howse, Mary's son by her first husband), and lived to see one of them graduate from the U.S. Military Academy. Although she would be missed as the matriarch of the extended family, those close to her—both literally and in spirit—could take comfort in the knowledge that she had led a full and active life before finally passing at the ripe age of seventy-seven.³¹

Mary Foote's surviving daughter in Indiana, Mary Foote Howse Lane, though saddened by her mother's demise, had much to live for in the coming decade, as two of her own daughters, Mary and Ann, approached marriageable age. When their maternal grandmother died, they were respectively fifteen and thirteen years old. When the time for marriage arrived, both women demonstrated a proclivity for choosing beaux whose pedigrees linked them to influential families back East. Mary Lane eventually wed Arthur St. Clair III, a grandson of the general who once served as governor of the Northwest Territory. Ann Lane, by marrying George Pearson Buell, would enter a family that completed the pan-Alleghany kinship network.³²

Because the Lanes and Buells originated from the region of New York that included Cayuga County and its environs, it is highly probable that both these families were mutually acquainted before the Lanes left their native state for Indiana. Considering Amos Lane's legal credentials and aspirations, it might have been somewhat strange had he *not* been familiar with this particular set of Buells. By early in the nineteenth century, according to historian Stephen Douglas Engle, George Buell's father, Salmon, had carved an impressive niche for himself among the power elites that comprised New York state's legal, educational, and political establishments. Because Buell connections vaulted the geographic bounds of Ithaca and Cayuga County, they quite possibly included selected members of the Davies and Foote families as well.³³

In his biography of General Don Carlos Buell, Engle discusses in detail how Salmon Buell's sons and daughters came to settle at Lawrenceburg and points east. Ann Lane's future husband, George Pearson Buell, arrived in Lawrenceburg in 1820 and together with Luther Geer, another cousin of Jim Lane, promptly went into the pork-packing business. An observation Engle made about Marietta Ohio's shipping trade could be applied equally well to Lawrenceburg: "Merchants filled the streets and markets with the business of the shipping industry, but the river city essentially supplied the wants of a rich agricultural region of diversified productions in corn, wheat, oats, potatoes, dairy products, fruit, and wool." Recent advances in steam technology surely helped facilitate this enterprise, since by then steamships were capable of moving huge quantities of cargo both up and downstream on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.³⁴

To be sure, Amos Lane, as a member of the board of directors of the local Lawrenceburg bank, was part of the action when George Pearson Buell became a pork packing entrepreneur in

Dearborn County. Stephen Engle rightly suggests that their shared interests played a role in Buell's courtship of Lane's daughter. Just as her father's New York courtship of Mary Foote Howse unfolded against the backdrop of a legal practice, Amos' Lawrenceburg business dealings with George Buell provided a venue that allowed Ann Lane to make the acquaintance of her future husband. George Pearson Buell and Ann Lane married on June 20, 1824.³⁵

The early 1820s, while proving to be a season for cementing marriage alliances, also ushered in another period of mourning. Everyone dreaded summer for the dangers posed by cholera outbreaks that seemed to be a macabre annual routine in many of the river towns. In 1823, the Buells lost three of their own, including George's brother, Salmon, to an epidemic that quite probably also carried away Amos and Mary Lane's youngest son, William, then only four years old. Almost a decade had passed since death suddenly and unexpectedly overtook Mary Lane's older brother in New York, a few years after their father died in Connecticut. Now, as 1823 turned into 1824, the grief resulting from William's death likely took an even greater emotional toll on the Lanes than the loss only eleven months earlier of Mary's last surviving parent. A major difference this time, though, was that some of their children—including nine-year-old James Henry Lane—were now old enough to understand, and be emotionally scarred by, the same tragedies that affected other family members.³⁶

Whatever personal crosses Amos Lane had to bear at home as a husband and father, rapidly evolving professional and political realities beckoned his attention to more public venues. Amos Lane's dilemma of reconciling long-cherished Jeffersonian principles with his newfound status as "entrepreneur" on a bank board of directors was hardly unusual for a professional politician of his day. As the Era of Good Feeling that marked the presidential administration of James Monroe came to an end, so too did the unity of purpose that had formerly cemented old

ties within the party of Thomas Jefferson. While he yet lived, more than a few Jefferson supporters still espoused the “Principles of 98” even as the country’s accelerating pace of development made them seem superannuated. It proved to be a time for breaking old alliances and making new ones. Amos Lane, a self-professed ardent friend of Thomas Jefferson, wanted to have it both ways.³⁷

The changing spirit of the times affected everyone in the Lane household, not just Amos alone. By the mid-1820s, three variables collided in a way that viscerally affected the life trajectories and future careers of all his sons, including James Henry. Two of these variables were personal, the other impersonal. On June 22, 1824, James Henry turned ten years old. If he was old enough to understand the grief that the family suffered over the loss of his little brother, he had also started to develop a rudimentary consciousness of how external political events could affect the lives and the destinies of people closest to him. Jim’s older brother, John Foote Lane, represented the second personal variable. By 1824 John had reached an age and personal plateau where his own immediate future warranted serious planning, preparation, and marshaling of family resources.³⁸

The evolution of Indiana’s political infrastructure continued apace throughout the early 1820s. By mid-decade, the state’s politicians had abandoned their first capitol, at Corydon, in favor of discharging their official duties in the more cosmopolitan atmosphere of Indianapolis, a new and growing city centrally located along a recently completed stretch of the Cumberland Road. Amidst these changes, the time also grew near for politics in general to take on a more cosmopolitan flavor, as prospective candidates for elective offices began publicly aligning themselves with programs and policies associated with prominent figures that led various

factions then rapidly coalescing to form what would soon become America's second two-party system.³⁹

Earlier, though philosophically a loyal champion of Thomas Jefferson, Amos kept his own political aspirations within the proscribed bounds of what traditionally had been an inherently inward-looking local, county, and state party infrastructure. By 1824, however, as was the case with an increasing number of his colleagues, the sweep of Lane's political vision had grown to encompass a much broader horizon. Catalytic for that change was the role played back East by key figures whose actions affected the greater family kinship network. Some were blood kin; others were not.⁴⁰

CHAPTER FIVE

The Political Transition of Amos Lane, 1824-1828

On the face of it, there seemed no particular reason why John C. Calhoun and Amos Lane should know each other. In the early 1820s, one politician could boast of a burgeoning national reputation made even more influential by his appointment as secretary of war, while the other focused on more prosaic, though locally significant, issues inherent in setting up and running a newly established state government. Yet, they plausibly made each other's acquaintance, if not face-to-face, then perhaps indirectly, through the agency of Lane's nephew, Charles Davies. The latter's 1817 appointment to the West Point faculty brought him in contact with men and means that could well have proven catalytic in making both politicians aware of the other's existence. Thanks to experiences and insights gained during the War of 1812, their views converged in a way that, for a time, suggested a potential for mutual cooperation.¹

Each had his own reasons for favoring a strong military. On January 20, 1817 Calhoun, while still a South Carolina congressman, had urged his colleagues in the House of Representatives to prepare for war in time of peace. Less than two years after delivering his "Speech on the Additional Revenue Report," this self-same southern nationalist found himself serving as an appointed cabinet member in the national administration of President-elect James Monroe. Upon assuming the duties of Monroe's secretary of war, Calhoun continued to advocate a strong national defense, consistent with arguments he formerly made in Congress.²

Amos Lane, though still focused like most of his fellow Hoosiers on the traditionally parochial preoccupations of state and local politics, incidentally held opinions similar to those of Calhoun on matters that touched on national defense. By 1816, however, his views could hardly

be considered entirely disinterested. Lane's personal stake in the War Department involved his New York nephew, Charles Davies. Any measures undertaken to make America's shrunken post-war army stronger would correspondingly create conditions favorable for maintaining a larger and more professionally robust officer corps. Such measures would also incidentally enhance the career prospects of the small, select group of West Point stewards charged with preparing prospective officers to shoulder the daunting array of professional responsibilities that inhered with choosing the military as a vocation.³

Davies' timely appointment as a full time math instructor allowed him to assist West Point's new superintendent, Sylvanus Thayer, in bringing some order to the academic and leadership chaos that till recently had plagued the academy. Successful changes implemented by Thayer subsequently established his reputation as "father of the military academy." Davies, who rejoined the faculty as a civilian only a few months before the superintendent's arrival, soon became Thayer's alter ego inside the math department. Indeed, Davies formulated and implemented a number of his own nuanced innovations, subject always of course to the advice and consent of his new boss.⁴

West Point's evolving curriculum reflected the hand-in-glove cooperation that characterized the relationship between Thayer and Davies. Their partnership made an impressive combination. The academy superintendent desired a program of instruction heavily laced with mathematics courses, and Davies was willing and able to oblige. Still, he did not spend quite all his teaching career in the mathematics department. After an initial period as an Assistant Professor of Mathematics that lasted through 1821, Davies devoted two academic years—from October 1821 until May 1823—to teaching physics inside the Department of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, headed by his future father-in-law, Jared Mansfield.

Davies' students, meanwhile, in contrast with his own earlier career as a cadet, now progressed systematically through a standardized four-year curriculum that guided their academic path from military novices to newly minted army officers.⁵

The year 1823 marked a significant professional milestone in the life of Charles Davies, who then became the standard bearer for the New York branch of a trans-Allegheny kinship network that now embraced Lanes and Buells in addition to kin who shared his own name. The untimely death of another faculty member triggered a staff realignment that proved catalytic in Charles' promotion to full professor and concurrent appointment as chairman of the academy's math department. From an institutional perspective, the new configuration represented the culmination of General Joseph Gardner Swift's earlier efforts to resolve some personality conflicts that created a drag on West Point's effectiveness in the years that spanned the War of 1812. Davies, whose self-effacing personality helped him embody Swift's solution to the problem of faculty personnel turnover, would remain at his post for fourteen years. Along with the promotion and increased responsibility came membership in West Point's prestigious academic board.⁶

Charles Davies' participation in academic board proceedings boded well for Lane family prospects. One West Point historian characterized the board as a "lynchpin" that "controlled every phase of the [institution's] academic operation." It also, as an instrument of Thayer's new policies, put measures in place to certify the capability of prospective cadets to meet rigorous academic standards prerequisite for attendance at the academy. Professor Davies personally tested these cadets to verify their aptitude for mathematics.⁷

Despite an easygoing demeanor that seemed to match his low public profile, Davies plausibly played a key role in securing an academy appointment for his Ohio River cousin, John

Foote Lane, at a time when John's father lacked sufficient influence in Indiana political circles to pluck such a coveted educational plum through his own influence. In any event, the serial fashion in which events played out strongly suggests the presence of Charles Davies' invisible hand personally shepherding John Lane's academy appointment through the army's labyrinthine bureaucratic channels. Less than a year after Davies first became a full professor and chairman of West Point's mathematics department, Cadet John Foote Lane began a successful academic career that four years later garnered him a commission in the artillery upon graduation in 1828. In a sense, John Lane's appointment to West Point symbolized the culmination of his cousin's six-year teaching apprenticeship that turned out very well indeed, not only for Charles Davies, but also for far-flung kinfolk that now resided far west of the Allegheny mountains.⁸

One can easily imagine a family conference convened around the Lane dinner table in Lawrenceburg, Indiana that mirrored an earlier gathering held by the Davies family in upstate New York during the War of 1812. In the first meeting, records a family memoir, "an agreement among the members of the family was made and carried out, that the elder brother should remain always at the [Oswegatchie] homestead, and care and provide for his parents in their decline of life...while the younger sons should go out in the world, and there unaided strive for fortune." In 1824, it was the elder Lane brother who embarked on a West Point adventure while his siblings, including James Henry, four years his junior, remained at home with their parents in Lawrenceburg.

If surviving records are any indication, the decision to allow John's attendance at the academy caused little if any angst within the Lane family. A letter of acceptance bearing the endorsement of Amos Lane, besides confirming that Secretary of War Calhoun sanctioned John's appointment, fairly oozes the timeless enthusiasm patently characteristic of early teen

years. Promising his best effort in the coming months, John sought to not only “accept the appointment with a full resolution of complying with all its requisitions,” but also to assure the secretary of war that “nothing shall be wanting on my part to prove myself worthy [of] the confidence of so exalted a statesman, if industry, economy, moral deportment and a cheerful performance of every duty [can] furnish such proof.”⁹

As the exuberant thirteen-year-old verged on leaving the family hearth to chart his own course in life, his letter to the war secretary is also noteworthy for its closing, which referred to Calhoun as a patron. Whether or not nine-year-old James Henry took any active part in the planning that held such momentous implications for John’s future will probably remain a mystery. Certain it is, however, that he was old enough to appreciate the significance of decisions being made around him. As his brother began preparing to depart for West Point, Jim Lane was now his parents’ youngest surviving son. Less than a year earlier, death had claimed his little brother. Now an older sibling stood at the threshold of a higher calling that might well transform him into a role model vested with all the martial glamour that attended the profession of arms. If, as critics charge, Jim Lane subsequently exhibited an obsessive tendency to acquire and dispense patronage, he received his first practical lesson in the art at a tender age.¹⁰

Any personal interest that John C. Calhoun may have taken in John Foote Lane’s appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point brings to mind Aesop’s fable about the lion and the mouse. It begs the question of whether John’s father, Amos, possessed any means of helping Calhoun achieve some goal that the latter sought in the immediate future. Was a *quid pro quo* involved? That the former South Carolina congressman harbored presidential ambitions is common knowledge among historians, yet it is also true that formally tendering appointment offers to prospective West Point cadets fell within the scope of Calhoun’s routine duties. Thus,

whether John's appointment in the presidential election year of 1824 is merely an historical coincidence, or holds deeper significance in the context of some arrangement or understanding that involved his father, is a question that warrants further study.¹¹

Acknowledging the indirect role played by Charles Davies in John Lane's appointment does not rule out the possibility that to John C. Calhoun, Amos Lane represented a benevolent influence potentially capable of providing a source of Indiana electoral votes that would be up for grabs in the coming campaign season. Indeed, Davies probably served as a conduit that linked the two politicians, making both aware of the potential advantages that could accrue from a course of mutual cooperation. Moreover, in the years that preceded the 1824 presidential election, changes in Indiana demographics may have coincidentally boosted Amos Lane's importance, as viewed through the lens of prospective presidential hopefuls.¹²

Although Amos Lane ran for no political office in 1824, his former status as a member of the Indiana general assembly and speaker of the house connoted a potential if indeterminate capacity to sway voters. This was especially true with regard to the state's burgeoning Third Congressional District. The 1820 federal census stood as a reminder that its population justified allocating Indiana three representatives in the U.S. Congress, giving the new state a total of five votes to be cast in the electoral college during the 1824 election. Moreover, for the first time since Indiana's admission to the Union, in 1824 its electors would be chosen directly by popular ballot rather than through the state legislature. That Lane's potential for influencing voters in southeast Indiana represented an unknown variable in the impending campaign increased his importance to a large field of presidential contenders.¹³

That this demographic accident placed Amos Lane in the enviable position of being courted as a local source of support in the coming election was a point unlikely to be lost on John

C. Calhoun. Other presidential candidates in 1824 included General Andrew Jackson of Tennessee; Secretary of State John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts; Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Henry Clay of Kentucky; Secretary of the Treasury William Crawford of Georgia; and for a time, former Governor DeWitt Clinton of New York. Until circumstances compelled Clinton to drop out of the race early, his New York background, coupled with his status as the embodiment of an internal improvements ethos, probably placed him first in line to win Amos Lane's support, in comparison with the qualifications of the other candidates. Such an advantage, however, would not have dissuaded John C. Calhoun from making some friendly gesture, say a West Point appointment to a first-born son, for example, as a means of establishing rapport with an increasingly important local opinion leader in southeast Indiana.¹⁴

From New York to Indiana, the coming campaign promised to roil the mood of the entire nation. Viewing the political landscape from his vantage point on the Ohio, Calvin Fletcher, soon to be elected an Indiana state senator, observed, "The presidential election had become the topic of legislative bodies in each state; the hobby of every newspaper; and the chitchat of the counting rooms of merchants, the barrooms of inns, and the firesides of farmers." Yet in 1824, the presidential campaign proved less divisive than in other states. "All the candidates," said one Democratic party history, "were members of the Republican party, and there was no declaration of principles, as it was assumed that any of [the candidates] would carry out the policy of previous administrations."¹⁵

Whatever overtures Amos Lane may have received from John Calhoun and other candidates during the presidential canvass of 1824, he apparently thought it best, at least for the time being, to preserve his former ties with the John Quincy Adams/Henry Clay faction of the Democratic party. If pursuing this course permitted Lane the luxury of keeping his former

political alliances intact, the support of Adams and Clay for a national policy favoring internal improvements closely coincided with Lane's views.¹⁶

Lane's advocacy of internal improvements typified the feelings of many Hoosier politicians of his day, who, as westerners, regarded such programs conducive to accelerating the settlement of their state and pushing the national boundary westward. Amos Lane's personal hobbyhorses under this venue included setting land aside for building the Wabash canal, funding in support of the Cumberland road, and constructing a road from Fort Wayne, Indiana, through Lawrenceburg that would terminate at the Kentucky River. During the presidential campaign of 1824, few Indiana politicians were willing to be viewed as obstructionists. For that reason, virtually all the leading political factions in the state portrayed their respective candidates as champions of internal improvements, and few leaders disputed the notion that the U.S. Constitution sanctioned federal aid for these improvements. After DeWitt Clinton withdrew from the presidential race, Lane's support of the Adams/Clay faction of the party aligned with positions he had taken earlier.¹⁷

The circumstances surrounding Clinton's withdrawal as a candidate in 1824 provides insights into a long neglected comment embedded in John Speer's 1897 biography of Jim Lane. Speer abruptly digressed from a discussion concerning the vital role Lane's parents played in his education long enough to observe that "Thurlow Weed was one of [Lane's] ideals of a great man, and opportunities with such a man we may readily imagine would never be lost on such a pupil." The absence of any further elaboration on Speer's part renders his comment on Weed virtually unintelligible to twenty-first century readers, given the fact that, before Abraham Lincoln's election to the presidency in 1860, Jim Lane and Thurlow Weed often found

themselves at opposite ends of the political spectrum. Yet, Speer's comment makes sense in the context of shifting political alliances that occurred during the mid-1820s.¹⁸

Before James Henry Lane entered his teen years, pro-Clinton arguments advanced in Weed's *Rochester Telegraph* aligned closely with positions taken in Indiana by Amos Lane and other politicians who championed internal improvements. During the presidential election year of 1824, anti-elite sentiment in both states was on the increase, and prospective candidates who hobnobbed with members of such elites incurred a measure of political risk. When backers of Martin Van Buren inside New York's legislature arranged Clinton's dismissal as the state's canal commissioner, the resulting popular backlash brought about his nomination for governor on a new People's Party ticket. Indeed Weed biographer Glynden VanDeusen explained the organization of the People's party in New York as "a state-wide, anti-Regency movement, designed to take the choice of presidential electors away from the Regency-controlled legislative caucus and give it directly to the voters."¹⁹

Amos Lane watched these developments with interest from his vantage point on the Ohio. Van Deusen described politics inside Lane's native state during the mid 1820s as a "turgid stream" that "swirled and eddied...as though to keep company with national movements." The best source of information on New York politics available to Lane was Charles Davies, who then taught at one of the country's most famous bastions of internal improvements sentiment. Although no record survives confirming that Davies ever met Thurlow Weed or DeWitt Clinton, circumstantial evidence suggests the possibility. In any event, the math professor was in an excellent position to serve as a communications link that kept his Indiana kin apprised of Clinton's political fortunes, and other New York-related matters of interest to his uncle.²⁰

Davies' capacity as an information provider derived from his faculty billet as head of West Point's mathematics department. As its incumbent he was strategically positioned to receive regular invitations to soirees hosted by one Gouverneur Kemble, a close confidant of academy superintendent and fellow bachelor Sylvanus Thayer, and owner of the West Point foundry at Cold Spring, New York.²¹ Situated on the east bank of the Hudson opposite the military academy, Kemble's estate was a drawing card for the occupants of the school's "faculty row." As one army historian observed:

[Kemble's] interest in cannon production, the location of the foundry, and the resplendent estate he built on the Hudson, all contributed to the warm, long-lasting friendships with staff and faculty members at West Point. From these had arisen his custom of inviting the superintendent, senior officers, and professors of the Academy to the lovely dinner parties held in his home every Saturday night. His business acumen aside, Kemble was a brilliant man and a fine host. His gracious social affairs were occasions of note and...attended by the most influential men in the Eastern United States, including Washington Irving, DeWitt Clinton, the Schuylers, George Bancroft, Edward Everett, and Joel Poinsett.²²

Shortly after Charles Davies assumed his responsibilities as head of West Point's math department, the impending 1824 presidential drew ever closer, increasing the likelihood that politics, including Clinton's irrepressible advocacy of internal improvements, would be a popular subject for discussion both at Kemble's dinner parties, and the Lane family dinner table in Lawrenceburg. During this period, which predated his later close association with William H. Seward, Thurlow Weed devoted his prodigious political and journalistic talents to the former New York governor. In this context John Speer's later observation, that Jim Lane regarded Weed "as one of his ideals of a great man," makes sense.²³ Jim Lane would have received these impressions, no doubt through his father, when he was about ten years old.

As mentioned previously, Amos Lane, publicly at least, remained steadfast in his support of the Adams/Clay faction in Indiana's Democratic party throughout the presidential election of

1824. After Clinton dropped out of the presidential race to run for governor of New York, Clay and Adams stood next in line to claim Lane's loyalty, mainly because of their consistent support for internal improvements. Still, Andrew Jackson's overwhelming popularity in the aftermath of the election emerged as a new political reality in Indiana, leaving Lane to ponder the ramifications for his own political future. Over time, he would forge new ties with the Jacksonians.²⁴

Early 1825 saw DeWitt Clinton preparing to resume his residency in New York's governor's mansion, and Thurlow Weed serving his one and only term in the state legislature. In the same year, meanwhile, a new gubernatorial contest loomed in Indiana. Isaac Blackford, a former Lane ally in Dearborn County, entered the lists as a candidate for the statehouse. Opposing him was James B. Ray, one of Clay's former electors in the 1824 contest. When Ray openly ran on an internal improvements platform, Lane publicly declared his support. This action on Lane's part angered Blackford, who the former had previously encouraged to seek the governor's chair. Thus, the dissolution of the old Jeffersonian consensus pitted two erstwhile political allies against each other in 1825.²⁵

Their rift became public immediately following a visit Clinton made to Lawrenceburg. The governor-elect toured the Ohio River states to agitate in favor of more canal construction. After stopping in central Ohio's Licking County for a July 4th celebration, he continued on to Louisville, Kentucky before making his return trip upriver. Upon reaching Lawrenceburg on July 18, he was met by none other than Amos Lane, who acted as host for the occasion. Lane played the role for all it was worth, to include remarks made in a welcoming address that favorably compared Clinton with George Washington.²⁶

Historian W. H. Stephenson cast the feud between Isaac Blackford and Amos Lane in August 1825 as a “bitter quarrel” unusual for its invective and violent symbolism. Blackford called Lane “a cowardly scoundrel and a base fabricator of falsehood.” Lane responded by calling Blackford a “diminutive, weezle-faced sparrow” and “princely slanderer.” Perhaps most unfortunate was Lane’s remark to the effect that Blackford would prefer to lose fifty elections rather “than call Amos Lane to the field of honor, in order to test his firmness or his courage.”²⁷

Whether this was the first time Lane publicly alluded to dueling is uncertain. That he condoned the practice placed him in the same company of other prominent contemporaries, including Aaron Burr, Thomas Hart Benton, and Andrew Jackson. The latter garnered a plurality of Indiana votes in the election, despite press criticism suggesting that a proclivity for dueling should automatically disqualify a candidate for the presidency. In 1824 Amos Lane had maintained a discreet silence on this score. The 1825 gubernatorial contest in Indiana apparently permitted coarser doses of candor in larger quantities.²⁸

Although Stephenson’s article on Amos Lane as the exemplar of “Western Democracy” records some of the bitter exchanges that occurred between Amos Lane and Isaac Blackford in 1825, it provides little analysis of what was perhaps their most significant feature. They fought their war of words in a public forum highly visible to two young and highly impressionable male members of the Lane family. James H. and John F. Lane not only imbibed what was being said, but also hung on every word. Jim Lane was only eleven when the political row erupted between his father and Isaac Blackford.²⁹

Although perhaps too little to read about the dastardly deeds of political foes that could only be set right by a display of manly virtue, Jim Lane surely listened to discussions touching on these subjects within the confines of the family home. Decades later, after immigrating to

Kansas, he would vow, “I am from Kentucky, and I understand the code!” Perhaps he gleaned his earliest conception of the code by witnessing the fall 1825 fracas between Blackford and Amos Lane.³⁰

W. H. Stephenson, perhaps projecting Jim Lane’s bigger-than-life public persona backwards in time to make it fit his father’s actions in 1825, attributed Amos Lane’s estrangement from Isaac Blackford to nothing more significant than political gamesmanship. Just as a later historian would write of the son’s “chameleonlike blending into shifting political backgrounds,” Stephenson described the senior Lane as a “weathervane in politics.” However, the parallel track followed by the gubernatorial contests in New York and Indiana in the mid 1820s points toward the possibility that more fundamental principles were involved that piqued the interests of both DeWitt Clinton and Amos Lane. Of these, anti-elitism and what was called the “right of instruction” ranked most important.³¹

During Clinton’s campaign for governor, Thurlow Weed’s *Rochester Telegraph*, besides excoriating opponents of the Erie Canal, or “big ditch,” as it was sometimes called, also argued, according to Van Deusen, that “the cause of the people was at stake,” and that “King Caucus must be overthrown.”³² To a degree, the tack taken by Clinton’s campaign resonated with Hoosiers, who like their New York counterparts, also resented nominating or electing candidates through a caucus system. “It was charged,” said Indiana historian Logan Esarey, “that everything was decided by a caucus of office-holders at Corydon or Indianapolis.”³³ In an age of ascendant Jacksonian egalitarianism, any politician aspiring to elective office risked the ire of constituents by associating with a perceived caste of office-holders. Amos Lane was no exception.

Lane, who still bore the political scars received at the hands of Lawrenceburg's Federalist elite, soon realized that his former alliance with Isaac Blackford represented a political liability. In 1824, Blackford had been a presidential elector for John Quincy Adams. According to historian Donald Carmony, "the net effect of Adams' practices regarding appointments, especially for Indiana, was to perpetuate an officeholding elite which was overwhelmingly of the Adams-Clay faction." As Clinton backer Thurlow Weed inveighed against the "Albany Regency" in New York, many Hoosiers accepted the notion that Blackford embodied an "Indianapolis Regency" in Indiana. Distancing himself from Blackford was an adaptive move that Lane probably believe enhanced his own chances for political survival. His former ally reacted predictably.³⁴

Closely related to a contemporary popular revulsion against political elites was a growing sentiment in favor of what was then called "the right of instruction." This doctrine sought to clarify the correct relation between elected officials and their constituents. As explained by Esarey, it held that votes cast by representatives occupying seats in a legislature should align with the views of the people who elected them. If matters of conscience or a conflict of interests placed representatives at cross-purposes with their constituents, they should relinquish the posts to which they were elected. Both James Henry Lane and his father went on record during their respective congressional careers as firm believers in the electorate's right to instruct its chosen representatives.³⁵ Any deviation from this path was sufficient cause for both Lane politicians to chastise their congressional colleagues.

Because opposition to special interests and support of the right of instruction typified views held by many Jacksonians, Amos Lane's stand on these issues edged him closer to the Jackson supporters in Indiana. Still, his feud with Blackford played out mainly at a local level.

Ostensibly he remained a supporter of Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams. Meanwhile, his concurrent support of positions taken by DeWitt Clinton on internal improvements involved no breach of party etiquette. On January 10, 1825, Indianapolis became the new capitol of Indiana. During the period that included Clinton's Lawrenceburg visit the following summer, Lane was careful not to burn any bridges to the newly elected Adams administration.³⁶

On September 29, 1825, in the aftermath with his quarrel with Isaac Blackford, Amos Lane became the father-in-law of Arthur St. Clair, an avid Jacksonian destined in the not too distant future to be appointed register of the Indianapolis land office. Coincidentally, the receiver of public monies at the Brookville, land office, Lazarus Noble, had recently died while in the process of moving his public records from Brookville to the new state capitol. Amos Lane made his views known to the new administration with regard to selecting a suitable replacement for Noble.³⁷

Upon learning that one Captain Thomas Porter had applied for the position, Lane sent a cautionary note to the new secretary of state. Lane told Henry Clay that Porter had gone to greater lengths than any one else in the government to undermine public confidence in the new administration. "I have heard him say in public," wrote Lane, "that you was the damnest corrupt Scoundrell in the nation, that you sold yourself to Mr. Adams." Lane went on to label Porter and another potential nominee for the position as "violent Jackson men," and as an alternative, recommended the appointment of Noah Noble, a sibling of the deceased incumbent. Noble, concluded Lane, "will be the most popular and politic appointment....In the last election he was your friend and voted the Clay Ticket, and has [consistently] expressed...his approbation of the result of [the presidential] contest."³⁸

Although the secretary of state acceded to Amos Lane's request that Noah Noble be appointed as the successor to Noble's deceased brother, Lane's political alliance with the Adams administration would not last much longer, in part because of the growing influence of Arthur St. Clair within the Lane household. Meanwhile, the window in time during which Amos Lane's family would look favorably upon the work of Thurlow Weed was also beginning to close. If he did not have a hand in John Lane's attendance at West Point, Weed plausibly played some role in Amos Lane's appointment to the prestigious board of visitors that would visit the academy in 1826, the year following Clinton's visit to Lawrenceburg in the summer of 1825.³⁹

In any event, Weed was elected to the New York legislature as part of a People's Party slate of candidates that supported John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson respectively for the offices of president and vice-president, and DeWitt Clinton and James Tallmadge, Jr. for New York governor and lieutenant governor. Over the next few years, Clinton in New York, like Amos Lane in Indiana, drew closer to the Jacksonian wing of the Democratic party.⁴⁰

If DeWitt Clinton and Thurlow Weed saw eye-to-eye in their advocacy of internal improvements and opposition to Martin Van Buren's "Albany Regency" in New York, the same did not hold true with regard to their feelings about Andrew Jackson. As Clinton grew closer to the Jackson camp between 1825 and 1828, a rift developed between the former and Thurlow Weed, which lasted until Clinton's death in office in 1828. Not long after Clinton's demise, Weed launched an anti-Masonic crusade that assumed national proportions. This alienated both Amos Lane and his son James, both of whom became lifelong Masons. In later years, the Lanes numbered among Andrew Jackson's most stalwart Democratic party disciples, even as Thurlow Weed marshaled his journalistic and political talents in support of a virulent Whig opposition.⁴¹

The years between 1824 and 1828—the ones that spanned cadet John Foote Lane’s attendance at the military academy—are also those in which Amos Lane gradually drifted away from a galaxy of colleagues allied with John Quincy Adams, and toward another set of politicians who supported Andrew Jackson’s bid for the presidency. Throughout this period, which ended when Lane declared for Jackson following the election of 1828, the former remained something of a free agent, pondering how changing political alignments would affect his own personal future. This chapter has shown that the same years witnessed a parallel political universe wherein scripts that played out in New York mirrored those that affected how Amos Lane charted his political course in Indiana.⁴²

Of all the years encompassed by the presidential administration of John Quincy Adams, 1825 was probably the most propitious, not only for its short-term effect on Amos Lane’s political career, but also for its long-term implications for his family members. That Lane had invoked the language of the code duello in his public feud with Isaac Blackford was significant for the example it set for his three sons. DeWitt Clinton’s Lawrenceburg visit that summer probably accounts for Jim Lane’s lasting impression of Thurlow Weed. During the months that preceded Clinton’s visit, Jim’s older brother, John, assimilated into a military culture that, under certain circumstances, accepted a resort to arms as the final arbiter in settling personal disputes between gentlemen. Despite army regulations that strictly prohibited dueling, said one West Point historian, cadets from the frontier states “were known to have weapons hidden in their rooms reserved for affairs of honor.” John Foote Lane had only to peruse the newspapers sent from home to learn of his father’s example and feelings on a whole range of subjects that did not exclude the gentleman’s code. Jim Lane, then ten years of age, learned the same lessons at his father’s knee.⁴³

CHAPTER SIX

1824 to 1828: John Lane's West Point Years

The political journey from what amounted to free agency to a fierce Jacksonian loyalty was a multi-faceted, years-long process that involved the entire Lane family. John Foote Lane embodied its military dimension. Much was going on in his life as he prepared to leave for West Point during the summer of 1824. As his own personal adventure loomed immediately ahead, his older sister, Ann, made final preparations to marry George Pearson Buell in Lawrenceburg on June 20. That was the same day most new cadets labored through a battery of entrance examinations required by the academy. Fielding academic questions posed by a board of faculty members, chaired by none other than the academy superintendent, was an important aspect of meeting entrance requirements.¹

For John Lane, the interval between arrival and appearance before the academy's examination board was probably very short. The timing of his sister's marriage would have presented no insurmountable obstacle to his admittance. As was the case with another prospective first year cadet named Jefferson Davis, academy rules were flexible enough to accommodate late arrivals under special circumstances, and John was well positioned to benefit from this policy. On a case-by-case basis, then, individual cadets continued to trickle into the academy until the end of August, when the summer-long academic hiatus officially ended and fall classes convened to launch a new academic year.²

The brief period between signing-in and confronting the examination board left neither John nor his fellow first year cadets much time for reflection. "In the interval between his arrival and the entrance examinations," records West Point historian James Morrison, "the recruit

divided his time between the classroom where, for four hours daily, cadet instructors tutored him in Arithmetic and grammar, and the parade ground where student drillmasters taught him the fundamentals of military skills. These educational and training programs began even before the candidates had been fitted for a uniform.”³ That his own cousin, Charles Davies, sat as the foremost mathematics inquisitor on the entrance examination board probably helped dispel John’s misgivings about how well he would do.⁴

Thus, as the Indiana newlyweds, Mr. and Mrs. George Pearson Buell, established their household in his hometown of Lawrenceburg, John Lane simultaneously embarked on his new adventure at West Point. The correspondence that passed between John and his sister Ann Lane Buell between 1824 and 1828 reveal a deep bond of sibling affection. Besides keeping her brother updated on the local news about family and friends back home, Ann also served as a sympathetic audience to a broad range of John Lane’s thoughts, feelings, and observations relative to the ups and downs of cadet life.⁵

When John penned the earliest surviving letter to his sister he was already a “yearling,” someone who had successfully completed his first year at the academy. It was apparently written in response to a previous note from her that conveyed news that John found “both melancholy and pleasing.” If the nature of her good news remains a mystery, the letter’s melancholy aspect probably concerned the loss earlier that summer of 1825 of the Buells’ first child, a little girl named after her mother. George and Ann would go on to have seven more children, beginning with the birth of a son, Samuel, in October 1827. That they temporarily remained childless in the intervening months made the couple viable candidates as foster parents for George’s nephew, Don Carlos Buell, in the latter part of 1826. Taking him into their household, besides providing a

home for Carlos, helped the Buells fill the emotional space created by the death of their daughter.⁶

Don Carlos Buell's adoption by his uncle represented one component of a three-pronged attachment that permanently bonded the Buell and Lane families together throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. Another was the aforementioned marriage two years earlier of his Uncle, George Pearson Buell, to Ann Lane. Carlos Buell's sister, Sallie, and George Lane, another of Amos Lane's sons, forged the third and final link in the extended Lane/Buell familial chain with their marriage in March 1840.⁷ Buell's biographer, Stephen Douglas Engle, noted that "although [Don Carlos] Buell's sisters, Sallie and Aurelia, were still quite young when he departed for Indiana, he always kept in touch and remembered the kinship that began in the small village on the banks of the Muskingum River."⁸ In 1826 Sallie had remained behind in Marietta, Ohio when Carlos moved in with his foster parents. Even so, the Marietta Buells were sufficiently effective at staying in contact with their displaced relatives in Lawrenceburg to permit the courtship and marriage fourteen years later of George Lane and Carlos' sister. The couple lived happily together into the early 1890s.⁹

When young Don Carlos Buell first joined his uncle's family in Lawrenceburg in 1826, he found at least a few companions who fell generally within his own age group. His new cousins-by-marriage helped fill the void of a deceased father and erstwhile playmates who remained in Marietta, Ohio. This new set of extended family companions included his foster-grandparents' youngest daughter, Jane, just a year older than Carlos; James Henry Lane, four years his senior; and George Lane, at age fifteen the oldest of Amos and Mary Lane's sons still residing under the parental roof. Although John Lane had already left the family hearth to attend West Point prior to Carlos' arrival, his example pervaded the household ambience to an extent

that probably exceeded any influence he might have wielded by being physically present. If Carlos grieved for lost friends and family at his former home, Lawrenceburg at least offered a colorful cast of surrogates and viable expectations for the future.¹⁰

In other respects, the letter John Lane wrote to Ann Buell in Lawrenceburg in September 1825 contained complaints typical of West Point underclassmen. He spoke of loneliness, wanted to receive more mail from home, and frankly admitted difficulty in mastering the drawing class required for second-year cadets. This he hoped “to surmount by perseverance....I have been lately (and shall be for two weeks more) employed from morning until midnight continually drawing right line problems” necessary for completing his coursework. Penury was another misery he suffered along with fellow classmates. He needed twenty dollars to purchase a cloak, but was loathe to approach “a father who has always been so kind to me” to obtain the necessary money. In vain he had first turned to the academy superintendent. “I went to Syl Thayer,” said Lane, “to get [a cash advance] for a cloak (to pay upon delivery). He advised me to send [home] for that amount as I would [then remain] out of debt.” Thayer’s rebuff left Lane little choice: “I did not intend writing home for it but...was obliged to.”¹¹

His chief complaint was the abrupt way he had received word of another older sister’s imminent marriage to Arthur St. Clair, an Indianapolis lawyer and grandson of the Northwest Territory’s first governor. “I confess I was a little piqued,” he wrote, “at the manner in which Mary informed me of her intended marriage; so cold, but it is no matter. Whoever she chooses [her] choice will be a judicious one.” Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of John’s letter to his sister, Ann Buell, is its specific mention of James Henry Lane. John enjoined his sister to “have Henry study Arithmetic so that he will have a perfect knowledge of [the subject] next summer when I come home as I intend to bring him a complete Course of Mathematics which he is to

study.”¹² This is a clear indication that for a time the family seriously regarded Jim Lane a potential candidate for attending West Point.

To announce an intention to return home with a complete course of mathematics as then taught at the military academy also smacks of special treatment and access to resources normally unavailable to his fellow cadets. It also suggests the help Cadet Lane may well have received from Charles Davies who mentored his nephew while chairing the academy math department. Under normal circumstances it would be difficult for cadets to obtain all the material required to teach a West Point course in mathematics. “Since classroom recitations were based on material from textbooks,” explained historian James L. Morrison, “there was...little incentive for cadets to use the library...the primary purpose of the book collection was to support the faculty.” Yet where John Lane was concerned, access to library materials would hardly present a major obstacle.¹³

In hindsight, John’s indication of his intent to return home *next* summer (as opposed to *this* summer) is also significant. He had only just begun his second year at the Point, and furloughs of sufficient length to allow for trips back home were the exclusive domain of cadets who had already completed three years at the academy. Nothing in the letter indicates that in the late summer of 1825 he knew anything about his father’s appointment to the Board of Visitors, scheduled to convene the following June in time for the semiannual spring semester examinations. Even if John had some means of securing a privilege reserved exclusively for cadets with just one more year to complete before receiving their army commissions, Amos Lane’s impending visit to West Point would preempt any plans his son might concoct to be absent from the academy during the summer of 1826.¹⁴

The paternal visit, however, would bring the possibility of a more modest local furlough within striking distance. The same June examinations in which the Board of Visitors participated formally concluded the past academic year. With summer came an annual encampment where “both old and new cadets pursued the practical phases of their professional training, performing the duties of privates, noncommissioned [officers], and commissioned officers under the supervision of...the Department of Tactics.” Although the daily schedule during the summer encampment ran from 5:30 A.M. until 5:30 P.M., it was flexible enough to allow some time for extracurricular activities that included swimming in the Hudson and Saturday night dances attended by visiting young ladies. “The visits of relatives, friends, and the general public,” avers Morrison, “enlivened the summer. West Point was a favorite spot for tourists, and the cadets were the main attraction.” The main attraction for Amos Lane was his son, John Foote Lane.¹⁵

No record survives to indicate whether anyone accompanied Amos Lane to West Point during the first three weeks of June in 1826. Despite their status as visiting dignitaries, most board members were provided with only modest accommodations, even by early nineteenth century standards. Amos Lane shared the privilege of serving that year alongside the celebrated Harvard historian George Ticknor. On the fifth of June, Ticknor wrote his wife, “It is better you did not come with me. There is [contracted public lodging] where ten rooms are indeed reserved for the Board of Visitors, and they are made as comfortable as they can be in such a place; but...the floors of the parlors [that] are kept empty for them during the day, are literally covered with the beds of the strangers that crowd here at this moment.” Ticknor, as the personal guest of the academy superintendent, fared better than most; so too did Amos Lane, who no doubt enjoyed the relative luxury of lodgings provided by his nephew, Charles Davies.¹⁶

That his future bride arrived at West Point while he was still a cadet illustrates the extent to which Davies' personal destiny was bound up in the history of the academy. Mary Ann Mansfield's father, Colonel Jared Mansfield, numbered among its first faculty members. After an interregnum serving as Surveyor General of the Northwest Territory, he returned in 1814 to West Point, with family in tow, to become the professor of natural and experimental philosophy. His only daughter, Mary Ann, was seven years old when she first set foot on academy grounds. She married Charles Davies in October 1825, only months before Amos Lane visited West Point.¹⁷

A propitious political future appeared to stretch out in front of Amos Lane after he returned home in July 1826. The following month Governor James Brown Ray, the candidate Amos supported in the previous year's election, appointed him prosecuting attorney for Indiana's third judicial district: an area in the state's eastern quadrant that included roughly ten counties.¹⁸ Amos' son, though, was never far from his thoughts. John's own words testify to his father's diligence in writing letters to West Point. The compliment, however, did not apply to his sisters. In August Cadet Lane raked Ann and his other siblings over the coals for not corresponding more often. "If it be," he wrote, "that one is yet residing in Lawrenceburg who acknowledges J.F. Lane as a brother, allow me to inquire whether the Ohio has carried every vestige of the Lane family from its banks; or the yellow fever hinders the steam-boats from running; or are there no mails, no paper, no material for writing?" After sarcastically suggesting that his family had lost their capacity for recording their thoughts on paper, he opines that they simply decided not to write him anymore.¹⁹

After venting his anger about letter-writing, John turned to a more pleasant subject; namely, the growth of the extended family. Telling his sister that he had "some news," Lane

wrote, “The Professor has a daughter (two weeks old), Elizabeth. Mrs. Davies is well; Eunice Davies leaves the Point in two weeks.” Eunice was Davies’ unmarried sister who had traveled from Ogdensburg to West Point to assist “Mrs. Davies” as her pregnancy came to term. Although no written correspondence survives that documents the Indiana clan’s reaction to the news that John conveyed, there can be little question that in the years that followed, his mother and Mary Anne Mansfield cultivated an abiding mutual bond of affection. After a span of almost two decades following Elizabeth’s birth, Mary Lane, wrote in her own diary of an impending visit from Mrs. Davies, who still resided with her husband Charles near West Point.²⁰

The level of familiarity if not fraternization revealed in John Lane’s discussion of his uncle’s family says much about the ambience of antebellum West Point. In that context it is quite likely that Jefferson Davis and John Foote Lane knew each other, since both entered the academy in 1824 and graduated in 1828. Although Davis tended to avoid the company of what he called “the Yankee part of the corps,” he probably was disposed to make exceptions for those who, like Lane, came from states that George Julian later called “outlying provinces of the empire of slavery,” and Lawrenceburg, Indiana was situated within sight of that empire. Certain it is, though, that both Lane and Davis shared mutual acquaintances. One was Davis’ roommate, Walter Guion of Alabama. Another, William Fitzgerald, despite his New York origins, would have been well known to both cadets, for the simple reason that as the Christmas season approached in 1826, he ranked first in his class in academic standing. Fitzgerald, though generally regarded as brilliant, was also known for his potentially mean temper, as well as a tendency to resort to “the code” when he felt the situation warranted it.²¹

By first light Christmas morning, John Foote Lane and Jefferson Davis both possessed first-hand knowledge of what happened a few hours earlier, when Fitzgerald and nearly a third of

West Point's student body mounted a short-lived if spirited rebellion against the academy chain of command. At one level, it was little more than a Christmas party that got out of hand; at another, "drunken and raging cadets endeavored to kill at least one of their superior officers and converted their barracks into a bastion which they proposed to defend . . . against assault by relieving regular army troops." Several cadets, chagrined at the cancellation of a former policy that allowed them to brew eggnog on Christmas Eve, decided to throw a party despite the new restrictions. It went downhill from there. In the pre-dawn hours, shouts, curses, and other rude noises emanating from West Point's north barracks awakened Sylvanus Thayer to the most serious breach of discipline that occurred in the ten years since he first became superintendent.²²

Although order had been restored by mid-morning on Christmas day, the offshoot was a court of inquiry followed by courts martial for nineteen of the more serious offenders among the roughly seventy cadets who were involved. John Lane and Jefferson Davis emerged from the melee unscathed. Lane had shown the good sense to have nothing whatsoever to do with the affair; Davis, although implicated, had demonstrated sufficient presence of mind to obey a directive from the barracks proctor, Captain Ethan Allan Hitchcock, to return to his room. Consequently, he slept through the major disruption.²³

Some of their friends and mutual acquaintances were less fortunate. A court martial subsequently dismissed Davis' roommate, Walter Guion, from the academy. The same fate befell William Fitzgerald. While inebriated, Guion had discharged a pistol pointed in the general direction of Captain Hitchcock; fortunately for Hitchcock, the projectile lodged harmlessly in a door-facing. Then, at daybreak, after showing up drunk for formation on Christmas morning, Guion followed his antics of the previous evening by engaging a fellow cadet in a breakfast knife-fight. Witnesses observed Lane's friend, Fitzgerald, brandishing a scimitar during the

Christmas Eve ruckus. Then, still wielding the weapon, he made threatening gestures toward a lieutenant who vainly tried to calm him. The courts martial found that the infractions committed by both cadets were too serious to ignore.²⁴

In the months that followed West Point's Eggnog Riot of Christmas 1826, Andrew Jackson was already planning his next run for the presidency, and his advocates in Indiana had joined forces with other factions that were making life unpleasant as possible for their state's governor, James Brown Ray.²⁵ So plagued with controversy was Ray's tenure in office, wrote Indiana historian Donald Carmony, that "no pioneer governor completed his term so thoroughly discredited and so much a political *has been* as James Brown Ray." Amos Lane, as the governor's erstwhile champion in Lawrenceburg during the fall canvass of 1825, paid a political price for the support he tendered Ray during the campaign. It came in the guise of dismissal from his new position in the third judicial district. By late 1826, Ray's enemies in the Indiana General Assembly sought ways to curtail his authority. In December, it passed a law that took the authority to appoint district prosecuting attorneys out of the governor's hands and vested it in the legislature. Shortly thereafter, the majority of Indiana's five district prosecuting attorneys lost their positions. Amos Lane numbered among those replaced. By the end of 1826 he found himself cast off from his political moorings.²⁶

At this juncture, early in the following year he once again resumed practicing law on his own hook. As biographer Wendell Holmes Stephenson explained, in 1827 Lane

occupied an office in Lawrenceburg "next door to Mr. Hunt's Hotel." He notified "the public that he will *constantly* attend the Terms of the Supreme Court; the District Court of the United States, at Indianapolis; the Franklin, Dearborn, Switzerland and Ripley Circuit Courts; and any other Court in the State, on special application. That in the *future* his *undivided* and *persevering attention* and *talents* will be devoted to his profession."²⁷

This description of Amos Lane's situation in early 1827, although accurate as far as it goes, leaves out a significant dimension: the stress that political upheaval in Indiana's statehouse inflicted on the Lane family. Amos' anxiety over his dismissal as prosecuting attorney leached into letters he sent John at West Point, then rebounded through John's correspondence to the Buell household in Lawrenceburg.²⁸

On a bleak night in January, as the evening bugle for study sounded, Cadet Lane worried over his father's musings about leaving Lawrenceburg. "Father's last letter," wrote John, made it seem "possible, nay almost probable, that he should move from Lawrenceburg. "This [would affect] me," he considered, "like a second separation from home, to think he was about to move from the midst of children who are settled down happily about him, from...those acquaintances from whose society nearly all the sweets of life are desired. To leave all these [in order] to form new acquaintances and find new friends, 'tis a painful task." John's letter is unclear whether his father contemplated giving up politics, changing professions, or simply moving to another location that offered more lucrative opportunities to practice law. The letter does openly express an apparent consensus among the Lane siblings about their parents' character. John wrote his sister that "no one could bear up under all this, except a Father as firm and a Mother as pious as our own."²⁹

At least part of "all this"—the turmoil in Amos Lane's professional life—involved controversy surrounding a subject close to the heart of future President Andrew Jackson; namely the fate of indigenous peoples who resided in the northwest portion of Indiana. It was an issue superimposed on the public fervor over internal improvements.³⁰ Many Hoosiers viewed Potawatomi and Miami tribal control of lands situated between the Ohio River and Lake Erie as an impediment to developing Indiana's transportation infrastructure. In the spring of 1826, as

Amos made preparations to observe the annual cadet examinations at West Point, Governor James Brown Ray requested authority from the U.S. secretary of state to negotiate personally with the Indians. Thus, according to historian Donald Carmony, “in May 1826, [Henry Clay] wrote Ray, John Tipton, and Lewis Cass of their appointment as ‘Commissioners to Treat’ with the Miami, Potawatomi, and ‘any other Tribes claiming lands’ in Indiana” with a view toward arranging a major cession of native territory.³¹

The details of the stir created when the U.S. secretary of state appointed Indiana’s sitting governor as an Indian commissioner are beyond the scope of this study. Still, the resulting controversy tainted Ray’s administration, making him a liability to Amos Lane’s political future in Indiana. It also was part of the mix of issues that inspired the General Assembly to rescind their chief executive’s authority to appoint district prosecuting attorneys.³² Important for the present study, however, is the possibility that Lewis Cass’s concurrent appointment as Indian commissioner alongside Governor Ray facilitated the Michigan politician’s first contact with the Lane family.

In 1826 as President Jackson’s predecessor concurred in Cass’ appointment as an Indian commissioner to the Miami and Pottawatomi tribes, Cadet Lane still strove to complete his studies at West Point.³³ However, Lane’s letters home touched on subjects lighter than misgivings about his father’s professional future. He was particularly solicitous regarding his younger sister, Jane who would turn ten in the coming April. In one portion of his letter John jokingly calls her “a little fat round dumpling,” then asks, “why...does not the little lass write me?” In another he notes that she will soon be turning into a young lady. John also indicated that he was depending on another sister, Mary, to cajole his younger brother, James Henry, into writing.³⁴

For a second time, John expressed the hope that by the time he returned home he would find James Henry a “candidate for admission at this institution.” In an indirect reference to his mathematically talented cousin, John reiterated his intention to send Henry “a complete mathematical course.” That he intended to send it “by Mr. Buell” confirms that his brother-in-law, George P. Buell, made periodic trips to New York on business, to visit relatives, or both. Incidental to such visits, although of particular interest to John Lane, were opportunities to visit West Point. Lane also said that he was looking forward to returning home to find both his married sisters “sage and prudent housekeepers” and another sibling, George, “a deservedly esteemed young man.”³⁵

John’s correspondent, Ann, had apparently been bringing him up to date on news about her old beaux and impending marriages in Lawrenceburg. In that context, he mocked the subject of dueling. Learning that one H. Dill (probably a relative of the federalist county clerk who long before temporarily banned Amos Lane from practicing law in Lawrenceburg) was about to wed one of his former lady friends, John wrote, “you must not fear; we will fight with poor pistols, blank cartridges, and 700 yards distant. There will be no lives lost. I am no duelist.”³⁶

In reviewing his accomplishments over the past year, John Lane probably derived some satisfaction from knowing that after the last annual examination he ranked fourteenth academically in his class of forty-nine cadets. As previously noted, the Egnog Riot had taken its toll on some of the top members of his class. Though this was disheartening in some respects, it probably helped Lane’s class standing.³⁷ In 1826, however, the published *Register of Officers and Cadets* established a new precedent. For the first time, cadets were also ranked according to merit in conduct in a comprehensive list that included every member of the student body. *That* list indicated that Lane had plenty of room for improvement in areas unrelated to academic

standing: with four hundred demerits, he ranked fourth from the bottom in the entire corps of two hundred and twenty-two cadets.³⁸

Meanwhile, if Lane's cousin, "the Professor," encountered problems in running West Point's mathematics department, they were eclipsed by his achievements. For 1826 was the year Charles Davies brought out the first in a series of eight textbooks published during an initial eleven-year tenure at the academy. His *Elements of Descriptive Geometry, with Their Application to Spherical Trigonometry, Spherical Projections, and Warped Surfaces*, adopted officially as a textbook in 1832, remained the standard used in the academy's geometry classes until the Civil War.³⁹ Prior to Davies' arrival at West Point and the concurrent implementation of the Thayer system, the academy molded its mathematics curriculum to fit the French standards established in the applied sciences. Thus did academy leaders, scrambling to establish American military credentials during the height of the Napoleonic period, grasp for the kind of professional know-how thought to be the exclusive domain of contemporary European superpowers.⁴⁰

In the years that immediately preceded Sylvanus Thayer's appointment as academy superintendent, General Joseph Gardner Swift, with President James Madison's approval, sent his protégé to Europe to garner as much information as possible on the art and science of war. The objective was to make West Point the locus of practical military knowledge on the North American continent. Thayer returned with over a thousand works that formed the embryo of the U.S. Military Academy library. In one context, adding Davies to the faculty was part of a conscious effort to bridge a perceived "gap" or imbalance, between limited expertise of a fledgling American army playing catch-up to its erstwhile European rivals. An apt translator and

communicator, the professor, in company with his colleagues, soon set about funneling information formerly embedded in French textbooks into the minds of American cadets.⁴¹

So adept was Charles Davies in performing this task that over time he came to resemble an institution within an institution. According to one West Point historian, many of Davies' works:

were used as textbooks at West Point, most for long periods of time. Several of them began as translations and then were revised and improved for the Academy and the American market. Owing to the large number of graduates who taught mathematics after leaving the Army and to the wide recognition of the value of these texts, the books of Davies were extensively used in both colleges and schools. The 1828 text, *Elements of Geometry and Trigonometry*...from 1828 to 1895...appeared in 33 editions/printings and some 300,000 copies.⁴²

The business of publishing and marketing textbooks morphed over time into a full-blown vocation for Davies. Throughout an on again – off again professional connection with the Academy that lasted well into the 1870s, he “published 49 different titles appearing in at least 492 editions/printings....By 1875, Davies was selling about 350,000 books every year and reached a total of seven million sold by that year.” West Point scholars V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gallasch conclude that Charles Davies “completely dominated mathematics textbook writing in the 19th century.”⁴³ It is small wonder, then, that John Foote Lane felt comfortable making the promise in letters home to provide his younger brother, James Henry Lane, a complete course of mathematics as taught at the Academy.

As his sons and daughters made the transition from teenagers to young adults, Amos Lane transitioned from an Adams man to a Jacksonian Democrat. Losing his appointed position as district prosecuting attorney did not mean that he had also lost interest in politics. As Wendell Holmes Stephenson pointed out, throughout 1827, Lane remained in the good graces of the John

Quincy Adams and Henry Clay faction. Indeed, in November of that year, he presided over a gathering of pro-Adams men held aboard the steamship *Velocepede* “forty miles below Louisville.” The offshoot of the *Velocepede* meeting was a series of resolutions singing the praises of Adams’ presidential administration and denying allegations that in 1824 Adams and Clay had struck a “corrupt bargain” guaranteeing the latter’s appointment as secretary of state. The same resolutions pleaded Andrew Jackson’s lack of experience in venues outside a restricted military sphere.⁴⁴ Yet political fragmentation was more the rule than the exception in Indiana politics in 1827, and the extended Lane family followed suit when it came to determining political loyalties.

Amos Lane, along with a number of erstwhile colleagues in the Democratic party, probably suffered from a certain double-mindedness that year. Proclaiming himself “an ardent friend of Thomas Jefferson,” was formerly a safe political position to take between 1816 and 1825. The trouble in 1828 was in trying to define exactly what that meant relative to the radically changed political landscape in which the 1828 presidential contest played out. Andrew Jackson, if he lacked leadership outside the military realm, held impeccable credentials as a Westerner. That would have impressed, Lane, along with Jackson’s reputation as an enemy of special interests. Amos Lane’s new son-in-law, moreover, was an avid Jackson champion.⁴⁵

Arthur St. Clair’s early loyalty to Andrew Jackson would eventually be rewarded with an appointment as register at the Indianapolis Land Office.⁴⁶ He had married Amos Lane’s eldest daughter (named Mary after her mother) in the fall of 1825 at about the time her father threw his support to James Brown Ray during that year’s gubernatorial contest. Less than two months after Lane convened his *Velocepede* meeting on the Ohio River, his son-in-law attended a Jacksonian state convention in Indianapolis that, as Donald Carmony explains, “expressed

enthusiastic support of Old Hickory” even as it castigated Adams “as a ‘decided’ aristocrat and Federalist, for his corrupt bargain with Clay, as hostile to Western interests, and an opponent of universal suffrage.”⁴⁷

Perhaps out of a sense of personal loyalty to his mentor, Governor Ray, Amos Lane maintained a discreet distance from the political free-for-all that prevailed in Indiana during the 1828 presidential election campaign. For purposes of the present study it need only be said of Ray that in light of historical hindsight, his public blunders in 1828 seemed almost calculated to alienate pro-Jackson partisans. He managed to win reelection, albeit by a much diminished margin.⁴⁸ Although W. H. Stephenson averred that “sources have been searched in vain for evidence of Lane’s political activities in 1828,” that historian’s search for sources may not have extended to probing the political activities of Arthur St. Clair, who was well positioned to undermine Amos Lane’s support for Adams and increase his esteem for Andrew Jackson.⁴⁹

The reasons Lane later set forth explaining his conversion to Jacksonian democracy, Stephenson rejected out of hand as a “labored explanation,” fomented after the fact by a professional politician. In an account published in the March 12, 1831, issue of the Lawrenceburg *Indiana Palladium*, Amos indicated that doubts he once “entertained as to the qualification of General Jackson for civil rule” more recently had been dispelled. “My acquaintance with certain individuals in 1826,” said Lane, “removed much of my former prejudice against General Jackson. In the latter part of the year 1827 I became fully persuaded, that all my former opinions, my prejudices had been founded upon misrepresentations.” Arthur St. Clair surely ranked foremost among the “certain individuals” with whom Lane became better acquainted in 1826 and 1827.⁵⁰

In rejecting Amos Lane's explanation for his conversion to Jacksonian democracy in the late 1820s, Wendell Holmes Stephenson may have used the same bigger-than-life lens through which some Kansas historians later viewed Amos' son. In this instance the hereditary paradigm of "like father like son" might have operated in reverse. For anyone who consciously or unintentionally began a study of Jim Lane already believing he was a political chameleon, it was only a short leap to accept the notion that his father, the Amos Lane of 1830s Lawrenceburg, Indiana was, in Stephenson's words, "a weathervane in politics" exclusively focused on self advancement.⁵¹

Such an interpretation downplays the significance of other movers and shakers in Lawrenceburg's contemporary political environment, a son-in-law for instance, who plausibly could have influenced how Amos Lane felt about Andrew Jackson. Indeed, the historical record suggests that Arthur St. Clair was the first member of the family's extended kinship network to declare publicly his support for the Hero of New Orleans. What Ian Michael Spurgeon suggests regarding Jim Lane's behavior in Kansas can be easily applied to the quandary his father faced in the late 1820s. Lane was less "a man pulling the strings...than...a man struggling to retain his position in a shifting political environment."⁵²

Certainly St. Clair's advocacy of Old Hickory infected Mary Lane Sinclair, who late in Jackson's first term as president wrote her brother, then stationed at Fort McHenry, "John, I wish you were a Jackson man, but believe you have never said anything on the subject."⁵³ Yet, in the interim between Andrew Jackson's election and the date of Mary St. Clair's letter, Lieutenant John Foote Lane fought off personal demons so immediately daunting as to make the outcome of a remote presidential contest seem almost trivial. They assumed the guise of chronic bouts of

depression that too often made life's inevitable setbacks, slights, and uncertainties appear either intolerably offensive or insurmountable.

These hobgoblins surfaced in one of the first letters John wrote home from West Point after receiving his commission in July 1828. He had every reason to feel elated about a coveted first assignment as an instructor in Charles Davies' math department. Such jobs were reserved exclusively for cadets who graduated near the top of their class. John met this prerequisite, spending the first half of the 1828-29 academic year teaching under the supervision of his cousin, and the second half serving under Davies' father-in-law, Professor Jared Mansfield, in the Department of Natural and Experimental Philosophy. After what Lane had been through as a cadet over the past four years, this turn of events should not have presented a particularly daunting prospect.⁵⁴

Such positive developments notwithstanding, John's letter to his sister Ann Lane Buell, scrawled in a barely legible hand, reveals a personality too preoccupied with berating himself and doubting his own competence to appreciate the good fortune that had just come his way. Moreover, he was despondent over his failure to find a suitable companion among members of the opposite sex. "What fools we are and ever shall be," he wrote. "Now here am I, remaining in this country [i.e. West Point] as a matter of choice after years of cursing my stars and myself for consenting to [come here]." He went on: "Why, say I, should it so happen that love is to me a firefly which by approaching I cannot arrive at, [although] indeed I have reached it."⁵⁵ He confessed to being no closer to finding a girl than he had been a year earlier. Yet remorse over remaining at West Point and frustrations relative to a paucity of female company were not his main concerns.

Primarily, John Lane seemed intimidated by the nature of the duties he would be called on to perform in the coming year. After “the Professor” took him aside to discuss the details of a contemplated internal reorganization of the math department, John suffered a fit of despondency. His new position as a section leader, he wrote, “is a duty I must aspire to do and thereby earn.” Clearly, he was not looking forward to growing into his new job. After bemoaning the effort and energy required for preparation, he drew a damning conclusion: “*Mistake*: this is a strong term which is [appropriate to my situation.] I use it. No words can be too pungent which are used to express the folly of someone who is so unhealthy in respect to his own imaginings.”⁵⁶

After beginning his letter, John fell into a troubled sleep. He dreamed of a livery carriage that “stopped at a house of which I knew nothing whatever.” The carriage took on passengers who John was startled to find were his two married sisters accompanied by their mother. Then in the most revealing part of his letter, he ascribed the root cause of his mental anguish to heredity.

Oh fool of all fools is he who has the hypos. The hysterics that mother was subject to was nothing more than a long continuous hypo. Father is often afflicted in this way—so that ‘tis inherited with family. It is not the climate that gives it to me. Neither can I ascribe it to any customs or accident which has happened or is expected to happen.⁵⁷

After unburdening himself of these dark thoughts, John seemed to snap out of it and realize that in the real world his prospects and future never looked brighter. He then decided to go for a walk “and see if moving my limbs will not lighten my head.” After returning he again took pen in hand to address subjects that will provide grist for the chapters which follow in this study.⁵⁸

John Lane’s proclivity to magnify problems in his own mind suggested a disturbing potential for becoming his own worst enemy when overwhelmed by situations that involved excessive stress. Ensuing paragraphs will tell the story of how contingency combined with the

sort of unhealthy imaginings he described in a way that ultimately led to his own undoing. His personal destiny fundamentally and irrevocably altered individual and collective futures within his immediate family. It also touched more distant relatives linked by ties of kinship to the complex network comprised of Lanes, Buells, and Davies. Policies pursued during Andrew Jackson's second term as President intertwined with, and provided the backdrop for, this extended family's personal tragedy.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Old and New Enemies, the Green-eyed Monster, and the Coronation

Lieutenant John Foote Lane began the 1830s with a new duty assignment near Washington, D.C. The previous summer he had been transferred from West Point to Fort McHenry, Maryland, where he assumed a position within the army's Quartermaster Department. After a brief period of settling into his new duties, John returned home for a Christmas leave. It was his first opportunity in some time to renew relationships with his parents, brothers, and especially two older and recently married sisters. Also important was making the acquaintance of some new in-laws, including Arthur St. Clair, who only the year before had been appointed register of the federal land office at Indianapolis.¹

Arthur, as one of many who owed their livelihoods to the patronage system ushered in by the new presidential administration, held the distinction of being the Lane family's earliest public supporter of Andrew Jackson. Yet, even as the new order brought the extended family into a growing circle of colleagues and political allies, it alienated former friends and associates in the ranks of the National Republicans. Some of the latter once held the positions of those who now replaced them. Arthur St. Clair, for example, became register of the public land office at Indianapolis by displacing Noah Noble, the very person Amos Lane had endorsed for the same position only a few years earlier. Moreover, the marital alliance recently forged between the Lanes and St. Clairs added fuel to the ill feeling between Amos Lane and James Dill that had festered for over two decades by the 1830s.²

In a country that had been independent for little more than fifty years, the St. Clair family still commanded considerable respect among citizens old enough to remember the days when Indiana was a part of the Northwest Territory. Mary Lane St. Clair's new husband, Arthur St.

Clair III, was the grandson of the Northwest Territory's first governor, and the son of its first attorney general. By the time of Arthur St. Clair II's death in the early 1820s, the family had become a mainstay of fashionable Cincinnati society. Meanwhile, James Dill had married Elizabeth St. Clair Lawrence, the youngest Arthur's widowed aunt and daughter of Arthur St. Clair I, of Revolutionary War fame.³

That James and Elizabeth St. Clair Lawrence Dill named the only child by their marriage after Alexander Hamilton sent an unmistakable signal about the father's political suasion. It also indicated that the bad feelings between the Dills and Lanes held the potential for assuming an intergenerational dimension. The situation must have caused James Dill no small measure of humiliation to see new nephews acquired through his marriage to Elizabeth become entwined with a family that he still scorned as political interlopers. Whether he liked it or not, the Lanes were destined to become his relatives twice over.⁴

Arthur St. Clair III was not the only St. Clair to marry into the Lane family. Amos Lane, before returning home in 1826, made time to visit a sister who resided near the Susquehanna River at Unadilla, New York. As an offshoot of that visit, a niece, Ann Crooker, accompanied him back to Lawrenceburg to see her Ohio River cousins, including, of course, recently-married Mary Lane St. Clair.⁵

The original arrangement called for broadening Ann's education by spending a year under the tutelage of her aunt and uncle at their home on the Ohio. Once in Lawrenceburg, however, she met John St. Clair, Arthur's younger brother. Cupid intervened to change all the plans. A relative noted that "ere the year of her stay had waned Ann Crooker and John St. Clair were lovers and in due time she returned to New York for the happy event that was to follow." By the end of the 1820s, Amos and Mary Lane had acquired both a St. Clair son-in-law and a St.

Clair nephew, respectively, Arthur and John. The latter managed to steer clear of politics, but that Arthur was an avid Andrew Jackson supporter, accentuated the perennial gulf that separated Amos Lane and James Dill. After Dill's wife died in 1825 no one survived in Lawrenceburg to temper the abiding familial acrimony.⁶

After Lieutenant John Lane returned from his Christmas leave early in 1830 to resume his duties at Fort McHenry, his father drifted farther into the political galaxy of Andrew Jackson. The last days of June occasioned what may have been the first face-to-face encounter between President Jackson and Amos Lane. As Mary Lane recorded in her diary,

This last week on Tuesday morning we were told the President of the United States was to descend the river on the way to Tennessee. We hoped to have the gratification of seeing him perhaps—had not even the expectation that he would land—but about six in the evening the cannon roar about two miles above town announced his approach. A beautiful boat with streamers hove in sight. Next followed two [more boats] lashed together that rounded towards the shore. The inhabitants [of Lawrenceburg] lined the shore for some distance, and cold must be the heart that does not swell with gratitude when the Hero of the West—the President of the United States—deign[s] to set foot on our shores. He was conducted to the hotel by a numerous concourse of citizens. I in my humble dwelling was honored with a call of 10 or 15 minutes.⁷

Mary was also much impressed with the bearing and demeanor of the president. “His person was tall and well made,” she continued, “his features the best I ever saw. Strongly marked, finely proportioned...the expression sufficiently indicative of the mind to [be] interesting & still give you reason to [believe] that much is contained there that is not expressed.” In a matter of weeks, Amos Lane publicly proclaimed his support for President Jackson.⁸

These weighty events of 1830 transpired more than a year before Lieutenant Lane reached his majority, and shortly after his younger brother, James Henry, turned sixteen. In the

ensuing months, their father proved himself to be a team player in the burgeoning Jacksonian wing of Indiana's Democratic party. In September, the Lawrenceburg *Indiana Palladium* published his "Appeal to the People of the State of Indiana," in which Amos Lane defended his political record, personal character, and evolving party allegiances. Three months later, he played an active part in an Indianapolis caucus convened by Jacksonian movers and shakers in the state legislature. Shortly thereafter, in the first quarter of the new year, he entered the lists as a candidate for the twenty-second U.S. Congress but withdrew in deference to fellow Jacksonian Jonathan McCarty for the sake of party unity.⁹

On the first day of November, 1831, Amos Lane again left Lawrenceburg, this time for Indianapolis. He was slated to argue a case before the state supreme court, which was scheduled to convene on the seventh. Afterward, he would attend a wedding, then leave for New Orleans, where more legal business awaited. His wife, Mary, meanwhile, remained in Lawrenceburg, harboring considerable doubts about the benefits of any impending appointment that might require her husband's absence from the family hearth for extended periods. "I am not," she wrote her son John, "anxious [that Amos] should get the appointment talked of. I would almost as soon bury him as to have him go that distance." Shortly after Mary Lane penned those words, John received a letter from his sister, Mary Lane St. Clair, who inquired whether he knew "anything certain about Pa's wished-for appointment."¹⁰

Letters mailed by friends and relatives to John revealed considerable interest in political matters, and also the extent to which the extended family's political loyalties had turned away from Henry Clay's National Republicans and towards an active partisanship in favor of Andrew Jackson. "Mr. Clay will be [in Indianapolis] next week," wrote Mary Lane St. Clair on October 30, 1831. "He is making a tour through the state. I think if he wants to be elected he had better

stay at home. He has two of his son's with him." This was the same letter in which Mary expressed the wish that her brother was a "Jackson man."¹¹ About a week later, John received an update on Henry Clay from another Indianapolis correspondent:

I have something else to tell you. Henry Clay *himself*, the gamester of Kentucky as well as the glutton of the world, has been expected at this place a few days back. But lo! And behold! He journeyed as far [as] Terre Haute, to see his beloved son in whom he was well pleased; when finding our Indiana roads not fitted to his reception (particularly in his carriage) and a scarcity of provisions in the land he returned from whence he came. There was a Clay committee partly composed of Jackson men who refused to serve. Your father is here and will remain until after the wedding.¹²

The letter left unspecified whether Amos Lane numbered among the Jackson men who refused to serve, but any meeting between the two former political allies would have been awkward at best.

In any event, with or without Henry Clay, Indiana's National Republicans met at the state capitol on November 7, 1831, named delegates to attend the party's national convention in Baltimore the following month, then adjourned. Meanwhile, the Jacksonians scheduled their national convention for May 1832, also to be held in Baltimore. Though ostensibly serving his country in a strictly apolitical capacity, Lieutenant John F. Lane in the waning months of 1831 found himself at a geographical hub of presidential campaign politics. John's father, meanwhile, stuck with his original plan of attending a wedding in Indianapolis and departing for New Orleans immediately after the nuptial celebrations.¹³

Notwithstanding all the political turmoil in the closing weeks of 1831, relatives also kept John Lane advised on a range of sensitive family issues. Foremost among these was his younger sister's health. Jane Lane's parents and siblings fretted continually over her chronic illnesses. This was especially true of her mother, who acted as the family's ultimate decision-maker in

determining where Jane would reside. In the winter of 1831-1832, Mary Foote Lane informed John that she had “consented to let Jane stay with Mary [in Indianapolis] till her father returns [from New Orleans].” Owing to an extremely severe winter, that would not happen until March. Jane, meanwhile, was approaching her fourteenth birthday in April. Her older brother at Fort McHenry was especially solicitous of her health. A perceived necessity for acting as her moral steward also weighed heavily on his mind.¹⁴

Shortly after John Foote Lane graduated from West Point, he decided temporarily to sacrifice his search for a prospective marriage partner in order to achieve a higher purpose: the well-being of the collective family. In his view, eschewing all new relationships outside the Lane family circle would buy additional time for his baby sister, Jane, to acquire a more developed “sense of herself.” In what he thought of as a kind of “rule substitution” in the game of life, instead of getting married, he would “take hold of study as I would a wife...so help me God...until I find that I cannot succeed—which will be when life is spent in cultivating the base theme of my own gains.” In other words, for the near term, John Foote Lane would consider himself married to the army.¹⁵

Such personal preoccupations, although invisible to Lieutenant Lane’s peers and superiors in the military, were potentially powerful enough to eclipse all considerations of career advancement. As Jane approached her fifteenth birthday, he felt personally responsible for inculcating his little sister with principles and values that would serve her as a lifelong moral compass. He expressed concern to Ann Lane Buell over Jane’s strength of character, as compared to her older married sisters. In sum, he believed that Jane was growing up far too fast.¹⁶ Thus it was that during the first week of April in 1831 he penned a rambling letter intended to convey his insights on feminine character and deportment. It covered a spectrum of

subjects that ranged from the art of making polite conversation to the cultivation of good dental hygiene:

As I do not consider you a *mauvais sujet*—who has faults to hide—but an amiable and intelligent girl—whose good qualities are to be allowed to manifest themselves, I shall have only to guard you against errors. But first of all, dearest Sis—if on the closest scrutiny you detect a single habit however apparently trifling—that is coarse or callous—a single train or habitude of thought that is impure, dispense with it at once. Teach yourself to act at every instant when alone or in society as if the eyes of all those whose opinions you value *were upon you*...even though Father & Mother, Sister & Brother may not know at each instant your purity of thought and propriety of conduct, yet they will soon be manifest in the high opinion & added affection with which you are regarded. They are seen in the countenance—the complexion [and other factors reveal] whether a lady is gross in her food or negligent in her habits...the expression gives a history of her thought.¹⁷

If the “letter on manners” written to his younger sister gave scant attention to religion, it was perhaps because Lieutenant Lane was himself a doubter. Notwithstanding his mother’s lifelong attempt to convert John to Methodism, he felt that heavy-handed attempts at indoctrination could backfire. “Too great an [effort] to instill religious principles,” he wrote earlier, “when not rewarded with success, is apt to produce an effect precisely the reverse of that intended... That a good character may be formed without the aid of religion is true.” He confided to his sister Mary, “I trust I shall never look upon [the subject] favorably.” The same, however, could not be said for his siblings.¹⁸

In the early part of November 1831, John Lane received no less than three letters from family members advising him that a brother and sister--Ann Lane Buell and James Henry Lane—had joined the Methodist Church. A revival was going on in Lawrenceburg, and Mary Lane wrote her son that “nothing [is] transpiring in town so important as the uncommon attention to religion.” Her youngest surviving son, James Henry, at this time was seventeen years old.

Critics would take him to task in later years for insincerity in his religious beliefs. If his 1831 conversion was feigned, however, he had his mother fooled.¹⁹

Speaking of the revival, she told John, “Nearly a hundred have joined [the church] at Nordensburg & a great many here—among whom [are] your sister Ann and brother Henry. The latter seems much altered and very sincere. I know you will do everything to encourage him in a correct course.” Henry’s brother George was more recalcitrant. He included in his mother’s letter to John a note that read, “I have been waiting rather impatiently to hear from you. All the boys have been caught with the religious net, but I was too far off and was not hauled in.” What he and almost everyone else in the Lane household were eager to hear about was news of Amos Lane’s impending appointment.²⁰

As 1831 came to a close, Amos may have been the least concerned among all his family members about either religion or a possible future in a federal land office. He had already given the effort his best shot, and such things still remained in the realm of the intangible. For the present, there was plenty of tangible work close at hand in the worldly city of New Orleans, where he thoroughly enjoyed himself while preparing to argue a case before the federal district court. In a letter penned to John from the Crescent City on the twentieth of December, he could hardly contain his enthusiasm for the place. “In short,” he wrote, “it is the Eden of the world. [New Orleans] surpasses all my expectations in size, in beauty, in business, and above all, in the...politeness and hospitality of its citizens.” Neither did Amos overlook the local constabulary and judicial infrastructure: “Its police is of the best, the soundest and most efficient in the U.S. Hence life, liberty, and property are all safe. Their judiciary is sound, their laws wise...and executed with promptness.”²¹

Society's capacity to protect life, liberty, and property lay at the core of Amos Lane's belief system. After advising John of his business calendar, the elder Lane broached the subject of a career change for his son:

Should you finally conclude to leave the Army here and here alone is the place to practice law. All courts established...spend each winter with your mother and sister...Press your law studies and the French and Spanish languages. They are essential to general laws [here]. I have no hesitation in saying we can make more clear money than all the bar of Indiana...Youth is the time for action and every manly preparation for happiness, and cry of pain for usefulness to help [is beneficial.] And above all...remember that honor and property of land and a well-regulated code of morals is the foundation of true greatness, and that wisdom and money [are] the means to attain it.²²

This would not be the last time that Amos Lane encouraged his son to leave the army. The elder Lane wanted to bring another family member into his legal practice, and John ranked foremost among his siblings and in-laws as a candidate for meeting this need. In the coming months, Amos Lane kept up a persistent paternal drumbeat that encouraged his son to take up law for a profession.²³

While the elder Lane passed his time pleasantly in New Orleans, his allies began to assemble in Washington in early December 1831, just as the first session of the 22nd Congress was about to convene. Apparently in those days parameters of professional military etiquette were flexible enough to allow an active discourse among a young army officer, elected public officials, and even members of the president's cabinet. For a time, John F. Lane served as an intermediary between the Washington political establishment and his family back home in Lawrenceburg as he gamely sought information about how Congress would decide the issue of his father's impending appointment. A Democratic party stalwart from back home informed Lieutenant Lane from Washington that "I have visited this city on the subject of the land office...

I have seen Boon and McCarty today on the subject of your father's appointment. They will do all they can for him...I therefore think he will succeed...General Cass arrived here this morning. I passed your father's briefings to him. He will be friendly."²⁴

On December 21, 1831, John Lane's sister, Mary St. Clair, wrote in a similar vein from Indianapolis. She began by wishing her brother a happy twenty-first birthday, inquired if he felt decrepit because of his advanced age, and suggested that perhaps the time was ripe for him to consider marriage. After explaining that their father would be in New Orleans indefinitely, that sister Jane would spend the winter with her in Indianapolis until he returned, and that both she and Jane had come down with very bad colds, Mary finally turned to the subject of Amos Lane's appointment: "General Marshall, Colonel Tappen, and Senator Tipton will be in Baltimore soon; they are all friends of Mr. St. Clair & Pa." Up to that point favorable consideration of Amos Lane's appointment by the Senate seemed likely.²⁵

In the next ten days, family hopes for a speedy confirmation had been dashed. A new and disturbing turn of events occasioned a letter from George Lane advising his older brother of "a debt which we owe to Father and to ourselves which we have not discharged...we are all three of us [George, James Henry, and John] nearly men, though two of us not so in experience. With your counsel we wish to act."²⁶ Hostile pamphlets suddenly surfaced in Washington that contained allegations highly damaging to Amos Lane's reputation and character. Their source was no great mystery: "These Dills," wrote George Lane, "have for years been in the habit of sending these pamphlets before Father, wherever he went, directing them to taverns, etc., etc. on the road. And there can be no doubt [that] they have been sent to Washington." Old ghosts of bad feelings between the two families that predated the War of 1812 arose once more to stalk the halls of Congress and sabotage Lane's aspirations for a land office appointment.²⁷

Although the family had no intention of taking this turn of events lying down, the two brothers in Lawrenceburg were momentarily at a loss about a precise course of action. They knew only, as George explained, that “the circulation of these d—n pamphlets...has gone far enough. Stopped they must be—they are not only injuring Father but they must [also] injure us.” Exactly how to go about stopping them George and James Henry left to the discretion of their older brother on the scene at Fort McHenry. George’s letter, written on Christmas day 1831, is unique for containing what is probably the oldest surviving note penned by James Henry Lane. “You see by this,” he wrote, “that the Dills are still at their old business. George and I have concluded it was time to stop them, but wishing to have your judgment on the subject we have put it off. Write us immediately and if you think it is necessary to punish them we will find the means.”²⁸

A week after George and James Henry apprised John of this bad news, their mother, Mary Foote Lane, wrote to wish her son a happy new year. Although she had heard nothing from her husband in New Orleans for some time, she was well aware that prospects for congressional approval of Amos’ appointment had dimmed. Still, she told John, “I am determined at all events it shall not give me a moment’s uneasiness.” Perhaps because he was only a few weeks away from counseling his sister that “sensible people restrain their passions,” John pursued a Fabian course in response to James Dill’s attack on the Lane family reputation. Whether effectual or not, a written rebuttal offered a means of redress that seemed both measured and nonviolent.²⁹

Lieutenant Lane wrote a scathing letter directed generally to the members of Congress. It refuted everything in Dill’s “slanderous pamphlets” and branded their foe a “sottish miscreant...sinking under the infamy of disgrace and depth of his own vices & the score of his

malevolent attempts to injure my father.” John cast Amos Lane as “one who is active & engaged—active and successfully influential in your cause; one universally acknowledged to be among the first—if not *the* first—lawyers in our state.” In his letter, John asked that justice be done to his father, but demanded that the hostile pamphlets either be handed over to him or returned to their original sender.³⁰

Despite the strident tone of John’s letter, his best efforts fell short of winning his father’s longed-for appointment. Perhaps to the secret relief of Mary Foote Lane, a federal land office position was not in the cards for her husband. This writer found nothing in the historical record to indicate that James Dill suffered anything like retribution as a result of his actions. He continued to serve as Dearborn County recorder in Lawrenceburg until 1837 when he died, still in office, of natural causes. He had strong allies in Indiana, where the state legislature did not mirror the Jacksonian ascendancy in national politics. Amos Lane, for his part, still looked forward to a bright future. The new year heralded yet another presidential campaign, and the year after that, Indiana’s four congressional seats would also be up for grabs. Meanwhile, both the weather and national events intervened to keep everyone’s attention focused on more immediately pressing challenges.³¹

By January 1832, the frozen Ohio River had been closed to steamboat traffic for over a month. The younger members of the Lane family, both in Indianapolis and Lawrenceburg, found the season invigorating. They enjoyed what their mother termed “fine sleighing weather,” which sometimes allowed brief forays on the burgeoning national road network that now sprawled westward from the Ohio border. John’s sister Mary wrote from Indianapolis that she and Jane had just returned from a sleigh-ride “4 or 5 miles out on the Cumberland Road.” In March, spring rains combined with a melting snow-pack to cause major flooding in Dearborn

County. With her husband still absent, Mrs. Lane had little choice but to leave Lawrenceburg for a time and join her daughters at the St. Clair residence in Indianapolis. Meanwhile, brothers George and James Henry Lane, both now approaching adulthood, boarded at the Buell farm, where they could keep watch over their family's property.³²

The first day of May found Amos Lane back from his sojourn in New Orleans, temporarily living alone and busy making repairs on his house and outbuildings. He expected the return of his wife and youngest daughter from Indianapolis in a matter of days. In a letter to John he availed himself of another opportunity to encourage his eldest son to leave the army. "That you and I could do a good [legal] business," he wrote, "I have no doubt." He then added that his support of Andrew Jackson was "more sound than ever."³³

Although surviving documents suggest that that Amos felt strongly that the time had come for his son to change careers, Lieutenant Lane remained unconvinced, and somehow managed to discern indecision in his father's entreaties. As he often did in times of stress, John turned to his older sister for advice. His own words betray mixed feelings about his next move:

Father has written me about leaving but seems undecided. It is this indecision I fear. I cannot change my plan. If I leave the Army I have but one path & I should perseveringly pursue it. But if father or you or all of you should find me less able—less successful than you had hoped—farewell to good feeling. Remember that I have no means of judging of any success at the bar—I shall commence sharply—notwithstanding a diffidence I certainly do feel, & perhaps in the end I may be useful & not [a burden]. But there must be nothing of doubt & indecision on Father's part... Write me my dear Sis—write & advise. You know how all feel & think—You can judge far better than I & Mr. Buell—better than either of us. I wrote him the other day when [I was] at Washington. When he answers...let him speak of this matter.³⁴

John may well have been suffering a bout of deep depression as he framed his thoughts to his sister. Family and friends had kept him abreast of details pertaining to the Lawrenceburg

flood, and he felt anxious about their well-being. All the bad news from home took its toll on his spirits. A letter received in mid-March 1832 from a friend in Indianapolis contained a note obviously intended to cheer up the young lieutenant. Beginning with the greeting, “J.J.,” it read:

The green-eyed monster has got you in tow, has he? I verily begin to think that the great Leviathan of the Deep...that ever and anon so frights the good people of these peaceful dominions, is none other than an inhabitant of the mind—that converts the little animal cub into a huge serpent. [It] turns all our pleasures and brightest hopes into presages of ill—a mental microscope that magnifies the veriest trifle, the least annoyance, into an insurmountable calamity—preying upon the vitals, [and weighing] down the spirits.³⁵

The author concluded, “We wish you were here—now that [amounts to saying]...that we are all very fond of you.” The words of encouragement were probably welcome, coming as they did at a time when John Lane openly sought reassurance.³⁶

Knowing that his tenure as a staff functionary inside the quartermaster’s office at Fort McHenry was drawing to a close may have added to Lieutenant J.F. Lane’s sense of distress. Perhaps Ann’s husband, George P. Buell, counseled caution; or perhaps it simply struck Lane as foolhardy to launch headlong into a new legal career with no prior experience. In any event, he was still young. Maintaining his present course offered new opportunities in the guise of field duty, and did not rule out a career change if future events warranted. Finally, John Lane had made connections within the Quartermaster Department who could act as mentors in making his next tour of duty palatable. He decided to stay in the army, at least for the time being.³⁷

Two years earlier, President Jackson had signed the Indian Removal Act into law.³⁸ The legislation affected the Lane family in more than one way. In a June 1, 1832, letter that incidentally mentioned Lawrenceburg’s return to its pre-flood condition, Mary Foote Lane asked her son if he had “heard of the depredations of the Indians...Many different families in different parts of the frontier have been massacred.” The conflict between native peoples and Anglo-

European settlers, known to history as the Black Hawk War, had just broken out, and exaggerated reports of death and destruction were making their way to Lawrenceburg. Although the conflict's geographical epicenter remained exclusively within Illinois, a number of other states, including Indiana, lent their support by mobilizing militia units. "700 volunteers started from Indianapolis last Saturday," Mary continued. "General Drake commands one [detachment]. Arthur has gone. And all the young and married men of the first standing have gone." Certain it is that Mary would have applied the cognomen "men of first standing" to members of her own household.³⁹

Amos Lane, well into his fifties with no prior military experience, remained immersed in his private legal practice. The immediate family's youngest male member, James Henry Lane, was two weeks away from his eighteenth birthday. The present writer found no evidence that Jim Lane longed to joined the ranks of the Indiana militia. Still, that hardly ruled out a material interest in the Black Hawk War's outcome. Meanwhile, because Indian removal continued without letup during the conflict, the family's other two sons of military age found other fields to conquer. John, of course, already served on active duty. His new assignment placed him in a position to invite his younger brother, George, on a journey that took both of them farther west than any member of the family had yet ventured.⁴⁰

By early spring 1832, plans were already in motion to move three bands of native peoples, including some members of the Ottawa tribe, from their homes in central Ohio to locations west of the Mississippi River. Thus Mary Foote Lane later recorded in her diary that in late August John returned home from Baltimore with orders to take "the Ohio Indians to their place of destination." The designated superintendent of this expedition was Colonel James G. Gardiner of Bedford, Ohio.⁴¹

Gardiner and Lieutenant John Foote Lane apparently became acquainted while both were stationed at Fort McHenry. Lane was to serve as the removal expedition's dispersing agent, an office whose authority perhaps exceeded a level of responsibility that some contemporaries considered appropriate for a relatively junior officer. It inherently entailed making decisions about selecting and paying contractors, paying annuities to the Indian populations being escorted, and playing an administrative shell-game that "matched faces with spaces" by keeping the expedition's personnel strength aligned with staffing parameters established by the War Department. In other words, an expedition's disbursing agent controlled a measure of patronage.⁴²

A small feat of administrative legerdemain John performed in order to insure George's presence on the expedition illustrated the breadth of his prerogatives. Daniel R. Dunihue, a colleague with whom John was on fairly good terms during the removal, observed that

Lieut. Lane has orders to furnish provisions for my red brethren... The Lieut's Commissaries and Asst. Coms. have been turned adrift by the War Department—he has retained four of them however under a different cognomen—calling three *Dispersing Agents*, being one to each detachment of Indians; and the other his brother of 16 *Disbursing Asst's Clerk*—They all appear to be pretty fine *Hoozhurs* (sic.)⁴³

If Dunihue got George's age wrong (the latter was actually nineteen when the expedition started), he forbore questioning the lieutenant's power to make administrative adjustments that shuffled people and personnel authorizations to meet the short-term needs of the expedition. All concerned considered it a legitimate dimension of a disbursing agent's authority.⁴⁴

It did not take very long for loyalty issues to surface involving Colonel Gardiner and his disbursing agent. While in Washington, John Lane had become friends with one William Van Horne, another member of the removal team. Problems developed in the last week of July as

Gardiner assembled his men at the expedition's starting point about forty miles northwest of present-day Columbus, Ohio. Gardiner did not trust Van Horne. Referring to the latter, he wrote, "I suspect Billy for a little meanness, if not *slander* and *treachery*. One thing is certain, *some one* has been poisoning the mind of Lane against me, by some slander, or by making him believe I wanted to govern him in his [personnel] appointments."⁴⁵

Any rift between a removal expedition's superintendent and its disbursing agent did not bode well for a successful outcome. Close cooperation between the two in placing qualified individuals in key positions could ordinarily be assumed. Gardiner predictably had some thoughts on people he considered best qualified to act as commissaries, so he was chagrined at the lieutenant's response. "[Lane] said nothing *then*—but sometime afterwards, observed that he intended to 'manage his affairs altogether according to *his own judgment*, without advice from anyone'...I begin to despise this little kind of meanness and want of candor; and I anticipate no cordiality or satisfaction in [my] association [with] *Lieut. Lane*." That said, Gardiner was determined to play the hand he had been dealt, and make do with the staff assigned by the War Department. Where Lieutenant Lane was concerned, the expedition superintendent decided to "*keep him in his own place*, and [I] will not *openly* break with him if I can...avoid it."⁴⁶

The irony in this sad state of affairs, at least from the superintendent's point of view, was that John F. Lane had enlisted Colonel Gardiner's help in wrangling the disbursing agent position in the first place. "In Washington," said Gardiner, "he was *humble*, and in the posture of a *supplicant*. He asked many favours of me, *to get him an office*." Gardiner judged his subaltern to be an officer who "*feels his importance wonderfully*, and is vain, proud, self-sufficient, and insufficiently dandified." Things only went downhill from that point. Gardiner's effort to avoid

an open break with his dispersing agent failed, and during the course of the four-month-long trek to the Mississippi, his initial misgivings about Lane degenerated into a self-fulfilling prophecy.⁴⁷

While Lieutenant Lane's Indian removal duties demanded his full attention during the latter half of 1832, members of his immediate and extended families made their contributions to bringing the Black Hawk War to a swift conclusion. Some, as it turned out, were only prospective family members at the time. Indianapolis in the midst of the Black Hawk War would seem an unlikely place for romance to blossom. Yet, young Jane Lane had spent the previous winter there with her sister Mary and brother-in-law Arthur St. Clair. The pair saw to it that her world was anything but a social vacuum. It was probably through Arthur that she met a young attorney named Elisha Mills Huntington. Born in 1806, Huntington had studied law in Canandaigua County, New York, until the age of fifteen, when he joined his brother, Nathaniel, in southern Indiana.⁴⁸

After gaining admission to the Indiana bar in 1827, Huntington worked in a private law firm for a few years. Fortune seemed to smile when the state legislature appointed him prosecuting attorney for Indiana's seventh judicial circuit. Still, mid-June 1832 found him at what he perceived a low point in his career. As he phrased it, he had "just been cast from the position of Prosecuting Attorney." This setback occurred only shortly after he had become quite smitten with fifteen-year-old Jane Lane, who departed Indianapolis when spring came in order to rejoin her parents in Lawrenceburg. Meanwhile, still in his mid-twenties, Arthur viewed the Black Hawk war as an opportunity to acquire military credentials. There was nothing to keep him from plying his writing, legal, and administrative skills by serving as some senior officer's aide-de-camp.⁴⁹

The Indiana volunteers, after mustering at Indianapolis, reached the western portion of their state in fairly good order. They pushed on as far as Lafayette where they halted, pitched camp, and awaited further instructions. While there, the bustle of camp life slackened sufficiently to allow at least a little time for personal diversions. For Elisha Huntington, that usually meant putting pen to paper. “By the stay of the troops here,” he wrote to Jane Lane, “I am enabled to devote a few moments to a subject of far deeper interest to myself than wars and rumors of war.” He expressed regret at not writing earlier from Indianapolis, but his “mind and body [had] been constantly harassed by military excitement which filled the town for several days.” Huntington was actually trying to express in written form intimate thoughts and feelings the pair had shared while they were still together in Indianapolis.⁵⁰

In sum, Huntington’s letter to Jane Lane was nothing less than a full-blown proposal of marriage. After going into some detail about his ambitions and apologizing for not being on a sounder professional and financial footing, he asked for her hand. “All I can offer you is my character (which I trust is unsullied), and my heart, my whole heart...To say that in you I have seen all that my fancy and judgment most approves in woman, is but a faint impression of my feelings.” After mentioning to Jane that her brother-in-law, Arthur St. Clair, was both near at hand, and in “fine health and spirits,” Huntington could not resist closing his letter with a martial flourish: “from the best intelligence I fear we shall have to return [home] without fleshing our maiden swords or reaping any laurels.”⁵¹

On June 14, 1832--the day before Elisha Huntington penned his letter to Jane--James Henry Lane turned eighteen. As the Black Hawk War ran its course, Jim Lane was plausibly more focused on accumulating capital than wielding swords or winning laurels. For the past two years, he and his brother George had been working in a Lawrenceburg business owned by his

brother-in-law, George C. Buell, Sr. Buell was a major player in a lucrative Ohio River produce trade that eventually would make nineteenth-century Cincinnati famous as the pork-packing capitol of the nation. In early 1832, Lane's mother had written, "Mr. Buell is doing a great business in the pork line. He is putting it up for a Mr. Smith in Cincinnati." In that context, Jim Lane's eighteenth birthday brought a mercantile dimension to a personal milestone. As of the fourteenth of June, Lane was no longer simply a store-worker but a full-blown partner in George Buell's produce operation. Income from any source whatever could be turned to commercial advantage, and for Jim Lane the Black Hawk War abruptly surfaced as an unforeseen, once-in-a-lifetime business opportunity. At Indian treaty negotiations, settlers often submitted claims for land formerly occupied by native peoples, since land patents practically equated to currency. Soldiers were not the only ones conditioned to ride toward the sound of the firing.⁵²

For awhile it seemed as if the three Lane brothers—John, George, and James Henry—might cross paths somewhere near Terre Haute. George and John, traveling together under the auspices of the Ohio Indian removal expedition, had been at its designated starting point—Bellefontaine, Ohio—since the end of July. They languished there for the balance of the summer awaiting final clearance from authorities in Washington to begin moving westward. Henry was heading on his own hook from southeast to northwest across Indiana toward Terre Haute, where he planned to remain until receiving word that the peace negotiations were underway. It was in Terre Haute that Elisha Huntington sent another letter to Jane. Following professions of continued affection, he advised her, "Tomorrow morning I start for the Treaty, where I hope to hear from you through Mr. St. Clair." No surviving records confirm that the Lane kin succeeded in meeting together during the Black Hawk War.⁵³

In early November 1832, Mary Foote Lane and her daughter Jane remained at the St. Clair residence in Indianapolis, where they had been staying since the onset of hostilities. On November 2, Jane penned a letter to her sister Ann Lane Buell in Lawrenceburg to say that nothing had been heard “from John or George since they left.” Neither had James Henry Lane returned from the treaty negotiations. Unbeknownst to the family, the removal expedition had by that time reached Belleville, Illinois, only fourteen miles southeast of St. Louis. Word had filtered back, however, about a cholera epidemic in St. Louis that gave the Lanes cause for concern. “We feel quite uneasy about John,” Jane confided to her sister, “as he was quite sick when he left, but he must have improved or he would have written before this. I do hope they will not be compelled to go through St. Louis as the Cholera is raging so violently there.”⁵⁴

Expedition leaders were taking proactive measures to avoid the blight. Daniel R. Dunihue, who kept a journal of occurrences during the trek, noted earlier, “the Cholera is in St. Louis. We shall cross above that place in order to avoid it.”⁵⁵ He later wrote from Belleville:

We shall cross the Mississippi at St. Genevieve, 40 miles S. of here; and the others will cross it about 20 miles above St. Louis, at Alton. We all avoid St. Louis to keep out of the way of the Cholera, which, a few days ago, [came close to] depopulating the City. About a third of the inhabitants have left the place, and a large number have gone to the other world.⁵⁶

Shortly after expressing these concerns, Dunihue risked venturing into the city, where he was pleased to find that the epidemic had abated somewhat. Cincinnati and Louisville had not been so fortunate. Despite all the concerns expressed by family members, John and George Lane eventually returned from the expedition in good health.⁵⁷

Their brother, James Henry Lane, emerged from the treaty negotiations that ended the Black Hawk War not only in good health, but also with reason to celebrate. Mary Foote Lane advised her husband in early November that although Henry had yet to return to the vicinity of

Terre Haute, most of their Lawrenceburg neighbors had done so, and a treaty had indeed been concluded. Moreover, she wrote, “H[enry] has had a claim allowed in which he receives upward of \$2000.”⁵⁸ A year later, writing to bring her diary up to date, Mary recorded that Henry had been “in business for himself a year since.”⁵⁹ Jim Lane later noted in his “Autobiography,” published in a Kansas newspaper, that at the age of seventeen he “went into business with his brother-in-law, and for thirteen consecutive years, was industriously engaged in commercial pursuits—packing pork, slaughtering hogs, selling goods, building, speculating and forwarding produce down the [Ohio] river.”⁶⁰ It is reasonable to suggest that Jim Lane used the two-thousand-dollar claim garnered from the Black Hawk War to forge a successful partnership with George C. Buell.

While bringing her diary up to date late in 1833, Mary Lane also recorded that her son John had returned “from his western tour with the Indians of Ohio” during the previous January. “He took them to their place of destination,” she continued, “for which he received the approbation of government.”⁶¹ Indeed he probably did receive approbation from some quarters in Washington, but tales making the rounds in the nation’s capitol offered varying interpretations of the expedition’s outcome. As mentioned earlier, the Ohio Indian Removal of 1832 endured rough sailing, in part because of ongoing friction between Lieutenant John Foote Lane and the expedition superintendent, Colonel James B. Gardiner. What should have been a partnership in reality was little more than an ongoing feud that grew worse with time.⁶²

The emigration’s lead contingent had traveled no farther west than Richmond, Indiana—about ten days out on their trek—when its assistant conductor, Daniel Dunihue, learned that Colonel Gardiner and Lieutenant Lane “had, a few days ago, a severe quarrel in which one struck the other—which struck I know not.” Fortunately, neither officer sustained any injuries in the

altercation. Dunihue expected Lane to be fired shortly thereafter. That the lieutenant was not subsequently relieved from his position may indicate the measure of Lane's influence inside the War Department.⁶³

In any event, details of the row soon made their way into official army records under the heading, "Lane-James B. Gardiner Disagreement."⁶⁴ So rancorous became the relationship between the two feuding officers that authorities in Washington dispatched Colonel John T. Abert, of the army's topographical engineers, to untangle the mess. Armed with sufficient authority to take whatever measures he felt the situation warranted, Abert assumed personal command of the expedition. A rather amazed Daniel Dunihue recorded his interpretation of Colonel Abert's arrival and attempts to set things right:

He advised [Lieutenant Lane and Colonel Gardiner] to compromise. They were (or at least, the Col. was) unwilling to do so. Col A[bert] then assumed the direction of the emigration and gave Col. G. *leave of absence* to return to Ohio and report from thence to the War Department for *further orders!!* He ordered Lt. L[ane] to proceed to St. Louis and from thence to Washington City to settle up his [disbursing agent] accounts, and report for orders!! He requested [Colonel Gardiner] to accompany him to the Mississippi...which proposition the Col. Has acceded to.⁶⁵

The unpleasantness with Colonel Gardiner and other duties that attended his Indian removal responsibilities kept John Lane too busy to write home very much during the course of the expedition. In January 1833, however, after escorting the column to its destination west of the Mississippi, he made a brief stop in Lawrenceburg before proceeding on to Washington. Thereafter, his letters assumed a markedly different tone. Lane seems to have emerged from the imbroglio with his career intact, and remained in the good graces of the army brass, for the time being. That said, he sometimes displayed an unfortunate tendency to alienate the very superiors

and co-workers on whom his success depended. Neither Lieutenant John Foote Lane nor other members of his family had heard the last of James B. Gardiner.⁶⁶

The new year of 1833 began on a somber note for Mary Lane. “Nothing now lies with so much weight on my mind,” she wrote in her diary, “as the affairs of our nation.”⁶⁷ Mary, like many of her contemporaries, feared what appeared to be an impending national schism. The root of their concern was a constitutional crisis centered on the limits of state and federal power. It had been brewing since 1828, when Congress passed a tariff that many Southerners believed placed them under an intolerable tax burden. Later that same year an ostensibly anonymous document called “The South Carolina Exposition and Protest” began to circulate in Washington political circles.⁶⁸ In part, it denied the authority of the national legislature to impose what some had dubbed the “Tariff of Abominations.”

The crisis came to a head at about the time John Lane wrapped up his trans-Mississippi Indian removal adventure and prepared to resume his duties in the army’s quartermaster department in Washington. In November, 1832 the South Carolina legislature passed an ordinance of nullification that not only set aside the federal tariff, but also raised the specter of secession. The ordinance provided that if the central government resorted to coercion, South Carolina would be at liberty “to organize a separate government, and do all other acts and things which sovereign and independent States may of right do.”⁶⁹ John and George Lane had not yet returned home when Andrew Jackson, in December, countered with a presidential proclamation that denied the legality of South Carolina’s nullification law and warned its people against further defiance of federal authority.⁷⁰

As South Carolina mobilized its state militia and President Jackson prepared to meet force with force, Mary Foote Howse Lane numbered among the many Hoosiers who believed

their country stood at the brink of civil war. It was small wonder that early 1833 found the Lane family caught up in the prevailing spirit of crisis. Mary Lane's first diary entry for that year contained a supplication to the Almighty: "Oh, must our dear-bought liberties so soon be trampled, or must the strong chain that bound us [together] now be rent asunder—forbid it, heaven forbid it—& may this year be a year of peace and not of war."⁷¹ If things looked bleak when she penned her words, the ensuing months would quail the worst of her fears.

Once John Foote Lane returned to Washington, he found more time for letter-writing than field duty formerly permitted. He, too, was preoccupied with the nullification crisis, but believed that legislation crafted to force South Carolina's compliance with national law was sure to win congressional approval. A unique aspect of the family's extended kinship network during this period was the inclusion of Elisha Mills Huntington within its collective circle of correspondents. Although Jane Lane had rebuffed Huntington's initial proposal of marriage, he persisted in his entreaties, and the pair used the public mails to maintain a dialogue that extended over a period of months.⁷²

Huntington kept another channel of communication open with the movers and shakers within Indiana political circles. If the nullification crisis filled Hoosiers with a sense of foreboding, it also inspired a rare consensus among Jacksonians and National Republicans. Elisha Huntington represented a case in point. He would admit to anyone that he was not a supporter of Andrew Jackson. That notwithstanding, he showed no reticence in writing to U.S. Senator John Tipton even before the president's December 1832 proclamation. Huntington exhorted Indiana state leaders to "resist nullification unto blood, if necessary, to save the Union."⁷³ He was hardly alone, explained Indiana historian Donald Carmony, in urging "that partisan politics be forgotten and the rebellion in South Carolina be crushed." Although not yet a

member of the Lane family, the views expressed in Huntington's letter to Tipton reflected the essence of the extended family's consensus on the twin subjects of nullification and disunion.⁷⁴

This is the context necessary for understanding the stand taken decades later by Huntington's future brother-in-law, James Henry Lane, before, during, and after the Civil War. Jim Lane was still eighteen at the peak of the nullification crisis, but the arguments he advanced after arriving in Kansas in 1855 are not fundamentally different from those Jackson used in his Second Inaugural Address in 1833:

... of incalculable importance is the union of these States, and the sacred duty of all to contribute to its preservation by a liberal support of the General Government in the exercise of its just powers. You have been wisely admonished to "accustom yourselves to think and speak of the Union as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts." Without union our independence and liberty would never have been achieved; without union they can never be maintained.⁷⁵

Jim Lane's belief in the indivisibility of the Union almost precisely matched the view expressed by Jackson. They never changed after he reached Kansas. That he held to them for the duration of his life tends to refute the stereotypical view of Lane as little more than a political chameleon.

It is equally important to note that for all the contemporary hyperbole in Indiana that attended the nullification controversy, very little of it had to do with slavery per se, or with making any fundamental adjustments to relations between the races, as they existed at the time. That the public discourse on nullification in 1832 skirted the slavery issue explains the inherent difficulty in attempting to cast James Henry Lane in the political or philosophical mold of an

antislavery radical. He never remained focused for very long on the fate of populations held in bondage. His interest in the well-being of black people, slave or free, waxed and waned according to contributions they could make to the overriding necessity for preserving the Union. Whatever talents he displayed as a smooth operator within the shadowy realm of political expediency, both before and after he immigrated to Kansas territory, Lane demonstrated considerable consistency over time in assigning the lot of bondsmen a priority of only secondary importance.⁷⁶

Beginning in January 1833, a new spirit infused the letters that John Foote Lane sent from Fort McHenry to friends and relatives in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, and other climes. In sum, they were far less altruistic than political. Gone were the days when a sister might wish wistfully that he were a “Jackson Man.” John now wrote as a full-blown Jacksonian. Perhaps he had taken Mary Lane St. Clair’s entreaties to heart; perhaps his father’s counsel in favor of leaving the army was having an effect; or perhaps John’s experiences of the past year had wrought a personal revelation.⁷⁷

In any event, a letter written by Lieutenant Lane to his brother-in-law, George C. Buell, during the first quarter of the new year wreaked of political savvy and a distinct inclination toward self promotion that reflected an altered view of his duties as a disinterested steward of public funds and resources. “Come & see the ‘Coronation,’” it began, in an obvious reference to President Jackson’s imminent second inaugural ceremony. Of Washington’s political scene, Lane averred that “strange changes are afoot.” After briefly speculating on what the immediate future held for such notables as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, and Martin Van Buren, John opined, “The [compromise] tariff bill is sure to pass,” and “the Enforcement bill is likely to succeed.” That John’s father, Amos Lane, had recently decided to run for Congress was

apparently both common knowledge and a topic of keen interest among family members. “What you advise as to father,” wrote John F. Lane, “I have already done.” Moreover, John enjoined his brother-in-law to “exert yourself to the utmost in [Father’s] election.”⁷⁸ Finally, after vaguely stating an intent to be on-hand in Lawrenceburg to lend a hand with the campaign, Lieutenant Lane shared some inside information with Buell.

John had gotten word from some source in the War Department that another Indian removal undertaking was in the works. He intended to be part of the action. Cautioning George Buell to “say nothing of this—for all may be defeated,” Lane confided “something of my business and prospects.” What followed was a clear indication that the feud between Lane and James B. Gardiner, the leader of the previous year’s removal expedition, had entered a new phase after both returned to Washington. “I have been obstinate in requiring an official contradiction of Gardiner’s statements & am about to reap the fruits—The removal of the Pottawattamy (sic) Indians commences this spring & I shall have a good deal of patronage & some profitable contracts—5,000 are to be removed—‘twill last three years.” Certainly, John’s comment concerning the probability of patronage and profitable contracts would have piqued the interest of a brother-in-law who made his living by operating a produce business.⁷⁹

That John Lane perceived a potential for Gardiner to wield a malevolent influence on the outcome of events explains the lieutenant’s desire to keep the information he was sharing confidential. “Curse these scoundrels,” he continued, “I am wary of them & am every day more and more determined to settle myself in some place or other.” It was the second time in the same letter that Lane dropped a less than subtle hint that he was giving serious consideration to leaving the army. A few lines earlier, relative to the proposed Pottawatomie removal, he wrote, “This will enable to me to look around and to locate myself.” Lane had definitely decided to embark

on a course that would allow him to keep his professional options open. The closing words of his letter suggested the degree to which the family as a whole was beginning to view the world through a political lens. Elisha Huntington had also just arrived in Washington—presumably to personally savor the experience of attending a “coronation.” Lane wanted George P. Buell present as well.⁸⁰

Huntington’s visit to Washington at the beginning of 1833 also confirmed that plans were being laid for more than just political campaigns and Indian removal expeditions. His romantic relationship with Jane Lane was still ongoing, and a marriage between the pair loomed as a likely prospect. Although the historical record is blank with regard to Buell’s proposed attendance at Jackson’s inauguration, it does confirm that Lieutenant John Foote Lane walked a fine line of propriety that separated his official duties in the quartermaster department from a species of patronage grounded in nepotism.⁸¹

By April 5, 1833, Elisha Huntington had returned to Terre Haute. In another letter to George Buell written on that date, John Lane revealed that he had actively intervened on Huntington’s behalf to insure that the latter received the highest pay possible for services rendered during the Black Hawk War. “I enclose a check for \$175.00,” he wrote James Henry, to pay for Huntington’s “services as aide—I tried to get \$6 per day and at length agreed to accept \$5—[and] to my surprise got it.” John had originally doubted whether Huntington would receive anything, but placed “the account into good hands in the Quartermaster’s Department.” The effort literally paid off. John advised his brother Jim to turn the enclosed check over to their future brother-in-law, adding that Huntington “can cash it more easily in Cincinnati than at Terre Haute.”⁸²

Lieutenant Lane's April letter to his brother-in-law also confirmed the former's active and early involvement in behalf of his father's congressional election campaign:

I hope you will not think I have acted imprudently in speaking out so decidedly...in letters [I wrote] to Shaw, etc. I have spoken as I think and trust 'twill infuse some life into the good folks. I have no individual purpose to accomplish—I might only say that I have no hope to gratify—except Father's election. I have suffered so much by the slanders uttered by two enemies that to present a refutation would be a motive sufficient to impel me to [do all in my power] to ensure success...I can look with tolerable calmness on the map of the first years—and I...apprise you that it is of *incalculable advantage* to you and... myself that Father should be elected.⁸³

John Lane did not identify the “two enemies” who uttered the alleged slanders, but the run-in with James Dill and John's more recent unpleasantness with Colonel Gardiner suggest those individuals as prime objects of familial wrath. Without question, Lane was totally committed to his father's congressional campaign. That he characterized Amos Lane's election as being of “incalculable advantage” to himself and his two brothers requires no further elaboration. By early spring 1833, the extended Lane family was a hybrid entity. On the surface it appeared to be a robust network of affluent nineteenth-century Americans of Anglo-European heritage. When circumstances warranted, however, it could assume the guise of a political juggernaut fully prepared to repel hostile boarders. As the line between public responsibility and private ambition became ever more blurred, politics emerged as the Lane family's most potentially lucrative business venture. Its members who came of age in the mid-1830s stood ready for the fray and willing to exploit any advantage that chance might bring.

CHAPTER EIGHT

An Election, a Wedding, and a Wagon Stuck in the Slough

Confidentially Lieutenant John Foote Lane had revealed his prospects for the coming year to his brother-in-law in Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Lane's letters to family and friends in the first half of 1833 clearly show an earnest determination to get his father elected to Congress. Although he fully expected to serve as a disbursing agent in an Indian removal expedition during the late summer and early fall, the unsteady sands of the army's Washington bureaucracy inconveniently kept shifting under his feet. Lane well knew that Indiana farmers clamored for lands in the northwest corner of their state, only recently laid open to white settlement by the Black Hawk War. It was true that the conflict produced a predictable groundswell of public opinion that favored accelerating the forced emigration of native peoples from their tribal homelands near the Wabash River to a destination somewhere west of the Mississippi. It was equally true that the same demand prompted planning inside the War Department to achieve that objective. John Lane had been wrong, however, in guessing that he would serve as a disbursing agent in the ensuing Pottawatomie removal expedition.¹

Still, the army's queue of scheduled annual removals proved more than sufficient to stress its small pool of qualified and experienced disbursing agents. Such officers were always in short supply and high demand. Certainly more expeditions were in the works. Moreover, in the context of his burning desire to be on-hand in his hometown of Lawrenceburg, for the upcoming congressional elections, timing mattered more than anything else to John Lane. It was the essential factor that determined the attractiveness of any potential assignment for the young officer. A rather cryptic entry made by Lieutenant Lane's mother in her diary captures the

essence of what happened. In November 1833, she recalled that “in July [John] was appointed disbursing agent to take the Choctaws, who refused going.” Letters that passed among family members during the summer of that year confirm that he was able to make good his formerly stated intention to be present in Lawrenceburg for the August vote. Less than two months prior to the canvass, John’s younger brother, James Henry Lane, incidentally celebrated his nineteenth birthday.²

Jim Lane’s own statements made years later during Kansas’ territorial period suggest that by 1832 his father was not the only family member to swing into line behind the Jacksonian wing of Indiana’s Democratic Party. In his *New York Times* “autobiography” published in 1858, he recalled making his first political speech in support of General Jackson in 1832, when Lane was yet eighteen. Although Lane also recalled that at that particular juncture in his life he was still engaged in his brother-in-law’s produce business, he was nonetheless “equally interested in public affairs.” It was only a short-time after James Henry delivered his pro-Jackson campaign address in 1832 that his older brother, John, invited George Pearson Buell, to “come and see [Jackson’s] ‘Coronation’” in Washington.³

On May 15, 1833, the army acting commissary general of subsistence, J. H. Hook, dispatched orders to Lieutenant John Foote Lane, directing him to report to Washington immediately for an assignment that involved an impending Indian removal expedition. Ten days later, Lane assumed duties as dispersing agent for a removal of Choctaw Indians in late summer. Best of all, in light of John’s aforementioned personal priorities, was the designated reporting date reflected in his orders: General Gibson directed Lane to be in Nashville no later than August 10, 1833. Bearing in mind that Indiana’s congressional elections were scheduled a mere five days earlier, Lieutenant Lane was more than happy to comply.⁴

John Lane's new Indian removal assignment lent credence to predictions he made earlier to George P. Buell that his efforts to neutralize the effect of critical statements made by James B. Gardiner were coming to fruition. Those statements cast a negative light on the nature of Lane's performance during the previous year's Ohio Indian removal. Lane believed that Gardiner had disgraced him "in the public eye" in dispatches sent to the commissary general for subsistence. In vain had the lieutenant subsequently requested a formal investigation. "All that I can ask," said Lane at the time, "is a searching examination...The injury is public, the remedy, even if effectual, will be limited."⁵

The president of the United States, the secretary of war, and General Alexander Macomb, the commanding general of the Army, were all in accord in believing that the whole business could best be settled internally within Lieutenant Lane's chain of command. This meant that the responsibility for settling matters related to the Lane-Gardiner dispute devolved upon the army's commissary general for subsistence. Thus it was that on April 6, 1833, Lieutenant Lane sought redress from General Gibson "as the person whose judgment would be decisive. As all my acts, from the commencement to the close of the emigration, are now...before you, I respectfully and earnestly ask a full and conclusive decision as to their correctness."⁶ The commissary general lost little time framing a favorable response. A week later Gibson wrote,

I have received yours of the 6th instant, stating that your accounts are closed, and asking the expression of my opinion respecting your acts in connexion with the emigration of the Ohio Indians. It gives me pleasure to say that, as far as a close and scrutinizing investigation into your accounts, and the examination of all the evidences in my possession in relation to the public transactions in which you were engaged, your conduct meets my approbation.⁷

Months later, when Mary Lane recorded in her diary that John “returned from his western tour with the Indians of Ohio...for which he received the approbation of government,” she may have precisely chosen her words. In any case, that John was subsequently assigned a second tour of Indian removal duties suggests that his scrape with Gardiner actually enhanced his professional standing within the army’s officer corps. Lane still worked for the commissary general for subsistence. Gardiner meanwhile returned to Indiana, where he held a position as examiner of federal land offices.⁸

Two goals preoccupied John Foote Lane during the summer of 1833: getting his father elected to Congress, and concurrently enlisting the help of family and friends in support of the rapidly approaching Choctaw removal mission. John made his first appeal shortly after the congressional canvass had been completed in early August. So recently had the election been held that John had yet to be apprised of its outcome. He was already on the Ohio River in nearby Louisville, Kentucky, headed toward Nashville, Tennessee in compliance with his orders. He asked his brother-in-law, George P. Buell, to “let me hear quickly about the election.” Lane also wanted to know Buell’s opinion of the advice John had provided earlier relative to submitting bids for government contracts associated with the removal.⁹

Lane was going south, first toward a rendezvous point in eastern Mississippi, and secondly to the Kansas River, to Arkansas Territory, or both. Guidance he provided to Buell included logistical details and recommendations concerning current market prices for foodstuffs and commodities:

In respect to your bid for Army supplies—you must make them out separately for each post—starting price per barrel—pork & flour—same for beans & each by turn. \$18.36 - \$13.00 are given for pork and 7 ¼ for flour at Fort Gibson. This year the contracts...made an excellent bargain for transportation paying \$1.00 per bbl from Pittsburg to Fort Gibson. By chartering the steamboat and taking charge of it yourself you could

do it for less than this... I think the lowest bids will be \$6.50 for flour [and] \$12.50 for pork. Can you do the business at this [price]? If so I'd drop it a few cents; say 6.37 ½ and 12.37 ½. The produce trade up the Arkansas will be excellent. A recent flood has destroyed all their crops. I would go to work immediately. Produce can now (I suppose) be engaged very low.¹⁰

John Lane also encouraged his brother-in-law to be in Washington, D.C. by October 1, 1833 with character references and letters of recommendation in-hand. In this regard, John promised that he personally would “write...to all whom it may benefit you to know.”¹¹

Snap judgments about John Lane's efforts to help friends and relatives win lucrative army subsistence and transportation contracts run the risk of projecting twenty-first century sensibilities backwards onto a historically unique and emotionally charged nineteenth century political environment. In the early 1830s many considered patronage a legitimate form of recognition for dependability, demonstrated loyalty, and services faithfully rendered. That said, in this particular instance it is also important to note that the aforementioned Colonel James B. Gardiner, while still in charge of the first removal expedition on which Lane served as a disbursing agent, believed he had been victimized by an unseemly tendency on Lane's part to combine army duties with heavy-handed business practices. “We have been shamefully imposed upon,” Gardiner opined to General George Gibson during the Ohio emigration, “in the cost of rations heretofore furnished. At least one fourth more [in expenditures] has been given than was necessary.” After explaining the measures he had taken to curtail such practices, Gardiner promised to show irrefutable proof of Lane's malfeasance in future letters to the commissary general.¹²

Gardiner further confided that he was determined to defeat “a settled plan of extortion connived at and encouraged by the Disbursing Agent among his family connections.” Yet what one man viewed as extortion, another might consider no more than common political courtesy

inherent in a proactive approach to looming requirements. Lane's connections, moreover, were not limited to family. Before the emigration got underway, he advised Senator John Tipton of Indiana, of an appointment "worth three or four dollars per d'y, [which] I shall hold subject to your recommendation...Please write me at Urbana, Ohio—I shall keep the appointment open as long as possible & shall promptly notify the individual [you recommend] of the result." Horace Bassett, who received the appointment, was a loyal political supporter of Senator Tipton. John Lane succeeded in frustrating Gardiner's efforts to derail the junior officer's plans for filling positions and purchasing rations. This, combined with the ranking agent's early departure from the expedition, meant that Lane had won the first round in their dispute. However, it also sewed the seeds of a long-standing feud between the two officers wherein each sought to destroy the reputation and professional standing of the other.¹³

One thing was certain: any personal and professional agendas set in motion by Lieutenant John Lane during both his assignments as an army disbursing agent would hardly have escaped the attention of an observant younger brother immersed in George Buell's Ohio produce trade and simultaneously cultivating a profound interest in everything related to politics. The nature of his older brother's involvement in coordinating and executing Indian removals amounted to a learning laboratory for James Henry Lane. When synthesized with the political acumen embodied in his father, it taught the younger sibling, then in transition from late teen to young adult, one of his first practical lessons about patronage, nepotism, and the fine line separating public duty from private gain. This early experience in his life may also help explain a dash of paranoia Jim Lane sometimes exhibited in Kansas when dealing with persons outside a trusted circle of family and close associates.¹⁴ His demonstrated preference for private caucuses and

marking his correspondence “confidential” was plausibly a lesson Jim Lane first learned on the Ohio.

Newly embarked on his southern Choctaw expedition, it took elder brother John Foote Lane only a short time to learn the outcome of Indiana’s congressional elections. They had gone well for the family, inspiring two letters on John’s part—one for public consumption addressed to “Dear Friends” in Lawrenceburg, and another penned exclusively for George Buell. Both were posted almost simultaneously. John began his first letter with the words, “Thank God for the vote in Lawrenceburg.” He then asked to be sent to the devil if his undying gratefulness to “the friends who brought it about” ever faltered.

Turning to the imminent Choctaw removal, he broke the bad news to his friends that superiors in the War Department had deprived him of “the two most lucrative appointments. But there are two [more] of them—my fair ones—which I shall leave at *your* disposal.” In addition to discussing patronage, Lane continued in a vein that rehearsed advice on submitting bids similar to that covered in his earlier letter to Buell. John also revealed something of the destination Washington authorities had in mind for the removal expedition. “Read you again my letters in reference to rations at Fort Gibson,” he told his Lawrenceburg associates, urging them to advise him when they were ready to submit their proposals. John suggested W.J. Brown, a family political ally in the local Democratic party, as a possible candidate to help lead the expedition. In closing Lane pointedly sent greetings to a “Major” Dunn who had been instrumental in bringing about his father’s election victory.¹⁵

John Lane’s special mention of Dunn is significant for underscoring the importance of tacit understandings among relatives who occasionally made it possible to bridge gaping intra-family political divides that resulted from Andrew Jackson’s rise to the U.S. presidency. George

H. Dunn, ostensibly at least, numbered among Amos Lane's National Republican opponents in Lawrenceburg. Dunn's parents, however, had been extremely close to the Lane family since the latter's early nineteenth-century arrival in Lawrenceburg. So close was Frances Piatt Dunn to Lieutenant Lane's mother, Mary Foote Howse Lane, that they were like sisters. Both were nearly the same age, had married their respective husbands within two years of each other, and shared common experiences during the hard times that predated Indiana's statehood. One of Frances' sons, John Dunn, in the early 1830s married Joanna Buell, a younger sister of the same George Pearson Buell who was John Lane's brother-in-law and confidential correspondent.¹⁶

The marriage alliance combined with shared business interests to permit the Dunn family's easy assimilation into the Lane's extended kinship network. Because the Dunns incidentally wielded influence within the local anti-Jackson Democratic party establishment, any political goal that Amos Lane aspired to achieve within the environs of Lawrenceburg would require the tacit acquiescence if not outright support of selected members of the Dunn family. The arrangement was, of course, reciprocal. A year before the voters in Indiana's fourth congressional district sent Amos Lane to represent them in the national legislature, they elected George H. Dunn to a seat in the Indiana House of Representatives. A contemporary observer noted at the time that Dunn "acknowledged himself indebted for his election to Jackson votes." Sometimes the Lanes helped elect cousins aligned with the national Democratic party in Indiana; on other occasions, those same cousins returned the compliment by supporting their pro-Jackson relatives. This umbrella of political reciprocity also covered matters relating to Indian removal.¹⁷

The cross-party channel of political rapport that attended the Lane-Dunn marriage alliance served both families well for a number of years. All shared a mutual interest in the Ohio River produce trade as well a common desire to accelerate white settlement of northwest Indiana.

It was hardly surprising that when John Lane told his brother-in-law early in 1833 that “Father’s” election to Congress was of “incalculable” importance, he specifically indicated two people besides himself who would stand first in line to reap the benefits: George Pearson Buell, and George H. Dunn.¹⁸

The second and more confidential message Lieutenant John Lane passed to George Buell on August 13, 1833, besides underscoring George Dunn’s status in the inner circle of family confidants, revealed still more behind-the-scenes maneuvering in advance of what Lane intended to be a very lucrative removal expedition. For those joining him on the initial leg of the journey, he suggested steamships as the most economical mode of transport. He recommended that they travel by water as far as Memphis, bringing their tack with them, which they would then use after purchasing “a cheap horse” once ashore. From Memphis they were to “push on to Columbus,” Mississippi by way of Louisville and Nashville. Clearly, John Lane also wanted his younger brother, George, along for the trip. “I should very much like George to come,” he told Buell, and “if the rest are frightened by cholera, distance, or low pay—give [the appointment] to George.” Lane’s mention of cholera was noteworthy in alluding to the toll taken by the disease on the most recent emigration involving the Choctaws.¹⁹

The expedition planned for 1833 marked the third in a succession of annual southern removals spawned by the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek. Although the details of the first two emigrations lay outside the scope of the present study, it can be briefly stated that the native people under escort suffered terribly on both of them. When 1831 witnessed one of the harshest winters ever recorded in the South, casualties predictably soared from hardship and exposure endured on the trek to Arkansas. The following year, army planners tweaked travel timetables to make better allowance for seasonal inclement weather. Notwithstanding these adjustments, the

same cholera epidemic that vexed John Lane's Ohio removal expedition in 1832 also stalked the Choctaws. According to historian Arthur H. DeRosier, "More Indians had been removed [than in the previous year], but more had died of cholera and exposure; the government had saved money by making the Indians walk...and by cutting their rations, but the saving had been made at the sacrifice of Indian life and strength."²⁰

With an aggregate of roughly six thousand members of the tribe still remaining in Tennessee in 1833, the army persevered in its efforts, hoping to achieve better results the third time around. Planning for what was supposed to be the largest and final annual Choctaw removal anticipated three separate moving columns originating from a corresponding number of Choctaw geographical districts: eastern, western, and southern. In overall charge of the removal for all three districts east of the Mississippi was Captain William Armstrong, already a veteran of previous expeditions. John Lane drew the disbursing agent assignment for the southernmost district. The designated point of departure for Lane's column was a rendezvous location along the Chunky River near present-day Meridian, Mississippi. They were to be underway by mid-September.²¹

At least part of the route would be by water on the Mississippi and White rivers. "As to steamboats [in Arkansas]," Lane confided to George Buell, "I fear the prospect is bad. The water will be too low to allow our going higher [up the White River] than Rock Row." The balance of the trip would be overland by roads recently constructed by the army from Little Rock to Fort Gibson, and southward to a destination on the Red River. Lane cautioned his travel companions against revealing that purchases were being made to support Indian removal. "Tell them to say nothing about [the nature of] their business," he wrote Buell, "as it may do harm and excite unpleasant feeling."²²

John also gave his brother-in-law an indication of the scale of the undertaking: “At Memphis [we] shall want 25 or 30,000 rations of bacon, flour, etc., and ‘tis very possible we will purchase more.” They needed to make sure, moreover, that it was “*good* bacon—middling not hams must be ready by the 10th October at Memphis. Let [them] say nothing of this being for the Indians, but expose [the goods] in market at a good price.”²³

It is likely that congressman-elect Amos Lane was well briefed on the details of his son’s plans. Lieutenant Lane pressed Buell to get to work right away on the bids for Forts Gibson and Smith. “Father will write and I am sure you will get [the contract.],” he concluded. The younger Lane declared himself well-pleased with what advance planning had achieved thus far: “My application paper, my times, requisitions—Government favorable.” He wrote from Nashville of the royal treatment he had received from his prospective travel companions, who had “all been very polite& I have been dined & partied to my more-than-content.” As of mid-August 1833, everything was still on track for a sizable removal set to begin the following month.²⁴

In the days that followed, Lieutenant Lane continued to look with optimism upon the coming expedition. He told General George Gibson that operations would commence on the fifteenth of September “and (I think) with every likelihood of success.” By the time he departed for the southern Choctaw district on September 2, 1833 he was a little less sanguine, but still undeterred. “The band of Captain Post Oak,” he reported to his superiors that day, “has resolved not to emigrate.” Despite this annoyance, a recent incident involving white settlers had ended in the death of an Indian, and Lane hoped the ensuing bad feelings would help the Choctaws see the wisdom of a speedy departure from Mississippi.²⁵

Though John Lane was still game for the journey, a discernible sense of caution infused his next report to authorities in Washington. On September 6, 1833, he promised General

Gibson that he and Captain William Armstrong would “spare no effort that may expedite [the Choctaw] departure. Ignorant and obstinate as [the Indians] are, the certain evils they will incur by remaining are too obvious for them to misunderstand.” The disbursing agent’s closing sentence ominously noted, however, that all arrangements made thus far for the coming expedition were tentative and “conditional so that the refusal to emigrate will occasion but little expense.”²⁶

By the last week of September, the removal mission in the southern Choctaw district had completely unraveled. Lane again provided an update to superiors in Washington:

On the 18th inst. the Choctaws of the Southern District in full council announced through their head men—their unalterable determination to remain. All means have been tried, save force. They have violated the Treaty with a full knowledge of all the possible consequences. They have fled to the swamps & the settlements. The greater part will probably gather around Mobile during the winter. They are poor to destitution & by their thefts have already irritated the whites. Should you think proper to recommend to the President, that strong measures be taken to remove them before the expiration of the period required in the Treaty, I respectfully ask to be permitted to assist in their execution.²⁷

Cooler heads in the lieutenant’s chain of command chose to forbear using force. The only viable option left him was to close out his disbursement books and report himself available for a new duty assignment.²⁸

If the stillborn Choctaw removal of 1833 spread a dark cloud over the plans John Lane made for his immediate future, its termination also brought a dual silver lining. At least the time spent serving alongside William Armstrong proved a positive experience. This expedition, though canceled, was spared the strife and personality clashes that marred his earlier experience with James B. Gardiner while escorting the Ohio Indians. Indeed, Lane complimented

Armstrong's efforts: "He has made every exertion to forward the emigration & has only been baffled by obstinacy which suffering alone [on the Indians' part] can overcome."²⁹

Besides being disappointed, both men were a little taken aback that all their hard work done in preparation had been in vain. They had originally expected that perhaps as many as two thousand Choctaws from the southern district would make the journey to Arkansas. "Until I met the Indians in council," Lane wrote the commissary general, "I had no doubt of collecting a...very large [party.]" Not until the rendezvous held on the fifteenth of September did the officers fully grasp that they faced an outright refusal to emigrate on a scale that warranted aborting the entire mission. The lieutenant, out of patience with his erstwhile charges, resented the trouble they had caused him: "the misguided creatures...dispersed—leaving on my hands the supplies prepared for them."³⁰

As historian Arthur DeRosier explained, a very modest aggregate of just over eight hundred Choctaws departed their ancestral homes en route to Memphis in early October. This rump group, however, was an amalgam made up of Indians drawn from districts other than the one for which Lane bore responsibility. That John Lane had already paid off his assistants and made immediate arrangements for his own return home explains his mother's diary entry made in November 1833: "George went with John on the southern expedition," wrote Mary Lane, "but returned right away." Although their early homecoming was good news for family and friends waiting to receive them, George arrived back in Lawrenceburg well in advance of John.³¹

The previous August, John told George Buell that relatives could find him "in the South: hot, lonesome, and busy." No doubt all three adjectives accurately described John's condition until October, when contingency in the guise of the cancelled expedition abruptly opened an unforeseen window of personal opportunity. During John's absence the long courtship between

his little sister, Jane, and Elisha Mills Huntington had finally run its course. John knew that their wedding was scheduled for late October but was unsure of the exact date. There was an outside chance that en route back to Washington the young lieutenant might just be able to close the distance between Nashville and Lawrenceburg before the nuptial celebrations. He almost made it in time.³²

Immediately upon disembarking at the river-port town of Madison, Indiana in late October 1833, John Lane attempted to notify the family of his imminent arrival. Unfortunately, by the time his message reached its destination, the wedding party had already left Lawrenceburg on a stagecoach bound for Indianapolis. When his family finally learned on twenty-fifth of the month of John's presence in Indiana, the Huntingtons had already been married for three days. The offshoot, however, was an almost instantaneous flurry of dispatches from two brothers-in-law: Mary Lane Sinclair's husband, Arthur, and the new bridegroom, Elisha Mills Huntington. Both conveyed their profound regrets that John was unable to make connections in time to attend the wedding.³³

John's early return home surprised everyone. At about seven-thirty in the evening of October 25, 1833, E.M. Huntington wrote:

Mr. St. Clair has this moment received your letter dated at Madison. I assure you that your return at so early a period was not even hoped for by us, having heard that you would remain in the South some time longer on account of...Indian relations there—you may be sure that we all regretted your absence from home on Tuesday last. Jane especially was anxious that you should be present at our nuptials, and but for some misunderstanding about the period of your return you would have been advised of the day of our marriage in time to be present... We all arrived [in Indianapolis] safe and in fair lively spirits about ½ past 3 o'clock today, and have made our arrangements to leave here tomorrow after dinner for Terre Haute.³⁴

Huntington also invited Lane to visit Terre Haute before returning to Washington. Still, he wrote, "I hardly hope to see you, as you seem anxious to be [there] as early as possible." The

rest consisted mostly of sentimental banter, including a message conveyed through Huntington from John Lane's sister telling him "that if you will forgive her for getting married when you were not at home, she will never do so again." Huntington also noted in a post script "that [Jane] should be glad to get her first letter [received] under her new name from you."³⁵

An hour-and-a-half after Huntington wrote from Indianapolis, John's other brother-in-law revealed a fixation on subjects far removed from marriage and a burgeoning family kinship network. Arthur St. Clair badly wanted Lane to "come out" to Indianapolis. "I have been away [from the land office] so much lately that I cannot possibly come in [to Lawrenceburg]," he explained. St. Clair mentioned the imminent arrival of a mutual friend from back east—Ver Planck Van Antwerp—whose acquaintance with John Lane dated to the time both attended West Point. After leaving the academy without graduating, Van Antwerp subsequently had become a journalist; and family interests now warranted enlisting his ample editorial skills in the service of Amos Lane's congressional career. Arthur St. Clair played a major role in that effort.

Turning to a more somber subject, John's brother-in-law also noted that another family friend and political ally, Samuel Milroy, had just been relieved from his position as receiver at the Crawfordsville land office. Only after reiterating to John Lane that he was "very anxious" to see him did St. Clair close his letter by sending Mary Lane St. Clair's love to her brother.³⁶

The cause of Arthur St. Clair's anxiety probably stemmed from doubts relating to his longevity in office. All parties concerned stood on the verge of finding out the extent to which the security of his own sinecure depended on the collective political fortunes of the greater extended family. While John Lane was still in the process of wrapping up his duties with the ill-starred Choctaw removal expedition, he learned from St. Clair that the latter's position as register of the Indianapolis land office might be in jeopardy. Once again, anonymous allegations libeled

the character of Lane kin. Rumors circulated about both St. Clair and James Drake, another Lane relative who was receiver of public monies at the same land office. Because these rumors had reached the highest levels in Washington, St. Clair had solicited, and obtained, John's advice in early October on how to handle the matter. Thus, acknowledged St. Clair,

I received your very kind letter late last night, too late to do anything. I shall do as you request about writing to Taney. I have written to the President. I am determined to find out what charges have been made against me and prove them false. If [they] are based on the sent musings I shall publish a sharp statement under oath. It is said that it is based on Drake loaning Canby money and that I countenanced it. This is false. I never knew of [Drake] loaning him one cent. He may have done it, however. I never interfered with business in the Receiver's office. I faithfully discharged the duties of my own office.³⁷

Although army life unavoidably came with its own peculiar set of frustrations, it probably occurred to John Lane that there were worse things than field duty in remote locations far removed from tale-bearers in Washington. Just about all of the family members who dabbled in politics occasionally vowed to leave that profession in favor of less discomfiting pursuits. Arthur St. Clair waxed nostalgic, yearning for the good old days as a simple county barrister. "I have too much pride to let [this situation] distress me," he confided to John. "I shall be a candidate for Prosecuting Attorney for this circuit this winter and let politics alone. I regret that I ever left my profession. However, [the present crisis] will stimulate me to more exertion." St. Clair also incidentally asked John if he knew when Congressman-elect Amos Lane planned to leave home en route to Washington, where he was soon to occupy his newly won seat in the House of Representatives.³⁸

St. Clair's attempt to foil the designs of his anonymous detractors came too late. The night of October 25, 1833, again found Arthur, James P. Drake, and the rest of their Lane kindred overtaken by contingency. On the same evening they learned of John Lane's arrival in

Lawrenceburg, the wedding party gathered at Indianapolis received news that was sure to dampen their “fair and lively spirits.” It came in the guise of yet another letter, written by Senator William Hendricks, who only the day before had numbered among the celebrants. Addressed confidentially to Amos Lane, it read, “About one hour ago I received a letter from Washington City telling me that Mr. St. Clair and Gen’l Drake were both removed from office on the 15th, just 10 days ago, and that their successors had not been determined... Little did we think, about this time yesterday, when talking in this room where I now write, of this result.” Hendricks expressed regret at this new misfortune, and indicated that he had written a “strong” letter to President Jackson in St. Clair’s behalf.³⁹

If fate had denied St. Clair the breathing space required to refute the allegations against him, a short time later he solved the mystery behind the family’s most recent political embarrassment. On October 31, 1833 he advised John,

I have no doubt that you have heard that General Drake and myself are removed from office, and that Abner McCarty is appointed Receiver and [William J.] Slaughter Register, and our removal is based on that old drunken rascal and nefant [sic] James B. Gardiner... I have renounced politics. I shall pay off my debts, settle up my business—and pay my whole attention to my profession. Mary [Lane St. Clair] stands my removal well and sends her love to you all [in Lawrenceburg]. I have written a very plain letter to the President, and have written to Major Eaton.⁴⁰

On the face of it, there would appear to be little connection between John Lane’s 1832 dispute with James B. Gardiner and criticism from whatever quarter the following year related to how well James P. Drake and Arthur St. Clair discharged their respective duties as receiver and register of the Indianapolis federal land office. Still, since Gardiner’s primary job when not removing Indians was conducting inspections of Indiana’s five land offices, sooner or later any such facility run by relatives of John Lane would probably become a likely candidate for intense

scrutiny. Inspection reports crafted to reflect negatively on the character of the incumbents could trap them in a political spotlight and conceivably lead to their immediate dismissal. So it was with James Drake and Arthur St. Clair.⁴¹

The episode incidentally goes to prove that nothing which befell one member of this close-knit family network occurred in strict isolation. Consequences of a single incident radiated outward to affect a number of different people in disparate environments. Everything was interconnected. Thus the Lane-Gardiner dispute spawned a cause-and-effect dynamic which linked the ill-starred Ohio immigration of 1832 to St. Clair's dismissal from the Indianapolis land office a year later. By the last quarter of 1833, the feud between the two erstwhile Indian removal colleagues had acquired an outreach capable of insinuating itself into the life of John Lane's little sister. The undying enmity of Lanes, St. Clairs, Huntingtons, and any number of their friends and political allies was the price exacted of Gardiner for any satisfaction he derived from finessing the removal of Arthur St. Clair and James P. Drake. James B. Gardiner had won the second round of his ongoing feud with John F. Lane.⁴²

Their dispute mushroomed in the late summer and autumn of 1832, when Lane fired off the first in a series of official reports to the commissary general's office that impugned Gardiner's character and professionalism. These reports imparted a long second life to the Ohio emigration that arguably became the most noteworthy feature of all the Indian removal efforts undertaken that year. Gardiner was known to consume prodigious quantities of strong drink. Once his drinking habits reached the point of rendering him vulnerable to authorities in Washington, Lane exploited this weakness to maximum advantage. The special agent in charge of the Ohio removal, Lane informed General George Gibson, was "hampered by difficulties" of which he was free. Later the same month, Lane also reported that Gardiner's "incapacity aids his

purpose” in making disbursing agent duties “as difficult and unpleasant as possible.” Finally, by September 25, 1832, John Foote Lane was willing to throw in the towel.⁴³

On that date, he asked to be relieved, and wrote bluntly of Gardiner’s “drunkenness and destitution of character.” Meanwhile, Horace Bassett, who as noted earlier owed his position on the Ohio removal to John Tipton, waded into the fray by sending colorful dispatches to his benefactor in the U.S. Senate. Predictably, they extolled Lane and condemned Gardiner’s failings, particularly stressing the latter’s allegedly frequent and prolonged episodes of insobriety. As if all this were not serious enough, Lane’s correspondence touched on subjects of more violent portent.⁴⁴

The previous chapter briefly mentioned an incident, told in the words of an assistant conductor on the Ohio removal expedition, in which “Colonel Gardiner and Lieutenant Lane had, a few days ago, a severe quarrel in which one struck the other.” It was this altercation that inspired John Lane’s letter to the commissary general asking to be relieved from duty. In his running dialogue with General Gibson, Lane gave his own version of the incident that clarified who received and who delivered the blows. As the junior officer explained at the time, Gardiner’s “duplicity and brutality eventuated today in a personal difficulty, which I have hitherto avoided...[He is] below gentlemanly notice. His age forbids personal chastisement. He has consummated his purpose, by rendering the [disbursing agent] duty disgraceful as well as disagreeable.” Lane’s mention of the code duello clearly signaled that his dispute with Gardiner ran deeper than a candid disagreement between professionals over routine operational details.⁴⁵

Lane’s account implicitly acknowledged a potential for gentlemanly remedies to morph over time to present the offended party a variety of guises and courses of action. In his view,

only parameters established by the code saved Gardiner from a well-deserved thrashing. A duel was inappropriate in this particular situation, in part because of Gardiner's advanced age, but also because, to John's mind, his tormentor's drunkenness relegated Gardiner to a station "below gentlemanly notice." The code, however, lent itself to an ongoing process of interpretation by its subscribers. This time, conditions ruled out physical chastisement. Next time, depending on circumstances, things might be different. Although John Lane probably did not yet realize it, his dispute with Colonel Gardiner lit a slow-burning fuse. For the moment, details of any potential explosion that might ensue remained concealed in the future.⁴⁶

A second factor preventing John F. Lane and James B. Gardiner from settling their disagreement was the exponential growth of its public dimension. By the end of 1833, it had become a scandal. In twenty-first century parlance, their feud had gone viral. During the Ohio Indian emigration, both officers operated under a mandate to keep General Gibson continually updated on the status of the removal effort, and each respectively endeavored to comply with those instructions. That being the case, both no doubt assumed that a record of their disagreement would be filed in the commissary general's office. If matters had rested there, perhaps the Lane-Gardiner dispute would have lapsed quietly inside the army's bureaucracy; but contingency intervened to roil waters already made far too turbulent by the personalities involved.⁴⁷

As already noted, communications relative to the dispute were not limited strictly to letters authored by its two protagonists. Both General Gibson and the man he dispatched to quell the row, Colonel John J. Abert of the Topographical Engineers, agreed that the interests of all parties justified containing the dispute within the walls of the commissary general's department. Doing so would safeguard the confidentiality of their sensitive correspondence and

spare both Lane and Gardiner undue public embarrassment. If that was the intent, their efforts fell short of the mark. Much to the consternation and displeasure of the two senior officers, the most potentially damaging details of the Lane-Gardiner dispute surfaced in Congress. Privileged information that formerly fell within the exclusive provenance of the commissary general's department now morphed into dirty laundry exposed to the tender mercies and cleansing affect of the Washington rumor mill.⁴⁸

Some of the inadvertent "leakage" was especially harmful to James B. Gardiner's reputation. During Colonel Abert's 1832 race to catch up with the column of emigrating Indians that was already in motion and advancing toward central Indiana, he dispatched messages back to headquarters in Washington laced with comments highly critical of Gardiner's character and competence. A note penned by Abert on October 12, 1832 captures the flavor of his ongoing dialogue with General George Gibson:

I...am now a horseman in full chase of the Indians—expect to overtake them at Indianapolis. This Gardiner, from all accounts, is a very weak man; swelled like a toad with his appointment, he falls into all kinds of follies, obstructs and bothers Lane with the object of getting rid of him. That is what I hear—the opinion is universal. Lane is well spoken of everywhere. Gardiner puffs and swells, and calls himself "the Government," to whom all must look with awe. His name is a jest upon the road. His follies are observed by everyone, and he has made himself so obnoxious to the Indians, that from all I can hear, if he don't look out he'll be tumbled over.⁴⁹

Upon deciding later that he had hastily prejudged Gardiner, Abert subsequently recanted much of what he had written to the commissary general. While accompanying Gardiner as far as the Mississippi River, Abert essentially promised the superseded agent that files maintained by the commissary general's office would be screened to insure that unsubstantiated allegations that reflected negatively on Gardiner's character would never see the light of day.⁵⁰

Events in Washington outpaced Abert's good intentions. "Judge, then, of my surprise, judge of my mortification," he apologized to Gardiner in October 1834, "when two or three of these familiar letters [written confidentially to the commissary general] had got upon the official files of General Gibson's office; and before I knew of their existence were actually printed under a late resolve of the Senate, calling on correspondence on Indian affairs to be laid before [that body] at its next session." This breach of confidentiality eliminated once and for all any possibility of reconciliation between Lane and Gardiner.⁵¹

As Lieutenant John Lane and his father Amos prepared to leave Lawrenceburg to take up new duties in Washington, the juiciest details of what was arguably the most contentious and dysfunctional Indian emigration yet became the subject of animated discussion among senators and congressmen. All this occurred in the weeks that immediately followed Jane Lane's marriage to Elisha Mills Huntington. As Colonel Abert noted nine months later in his apology to Gardiner, not all of the congressional discussions were informal. On December 23, 1833, the Senate passed a resolution calling on

the Secretary of War [to] communicate to the Senate the correspondence between the department and the several agents and other persons who have been employed in the removal, or in the arrangement for the removal of the Indian tribes, since the 28th May, 1830; also, all correspondence between the department and other individuals on the subject of Indian affairs, including the names of agents or other persons who have been engaged in making Indian treaties, in the removal of Indians, or in locating the reservations allowed by treaties to Indians.⁵²

The wording of the Senate resolution cast a very broad net that jeopardized the interests of Jackson partisans in Indiana.

Those rendered vulnerable included some very big fish, including Senator John Tipton. For most of the decade that preceded his December 1833 election to the U.S. Senate, Tipton served primarily as a U.S. Indian agent in Indiana. As state historians Dorothy Riker and Nellie

Armstrong explained in the 1940s, Tipton's enemies claimed "that he had used his position as Indian agent...to gain control of some of the most valuable land in the Wabash Valley for himself, that he had retarded its growth by holding his land at high prices,[and] that he had contributed to a pattern of land use and land ownership which was subsequently to be deplored."⁵³ The authors could have added that, John Tipton and Amos Lane were joined at the hip politically.

Both men were loyal Jackson disciples in a state whose legislature remained under the control of anti-Jackson interests. More specifically, both were also ardent supporters of President Jackson's Indian removal program. As Indian agent, Tipton's connection was first-hand and personal. Where the Lanes were concerned, John played the role of a dual surrogate. He embodied not only his father's endorsement of the President's removal policies for the nation, but also Tipton's approval for the state of Indiana. Thus, any contingency that embarrassed the Jackson administration could potentially erode support for John Tipton and Amos Lane within their respective Indiana constituencies. This was especially the case in the realm of Indian removal policies.⁵⁴

Lieutenant John Foote Lane was painfully aware that this political dynamic was in-play. A concern that weighed heavily on his mind long after the Ohio emigration ended was a lingering perception on Lane's part of persistent ill treatment by Gardiner. In April 1833, while still in Washington preparing for his second tour of removal duty, Lane complained to the commissary general for subsistence about Gardiner's continued malevolence. "Since being relieved [from the Ohio removal expedition]," Lane wrote General Gibson, "that gentleman has availed himself of every opportunity to load me with abuse." John penned those words six months after Colonel Abert succeeded Gardiner in command of the Ohio emigration, and six

months before Gardiner arranged the ouster of Arthur St. Clair and James P. Drake from the Indianapolis land office. Almost a full year after the Ohio emigration formally ended, the ill feeling spawned by the Lane-Gardiner dispute retained enough potency to mar the nuptial celebrations of Jane Lane and Elisha Mills Huntington. The brother of the bride naturally viewed the episode as further evidence that confirmed conclusions Lane drew about Gardiner a year earlier. Seared though the episode was in John Lane's memory, for the moment he focused his considerable energies on helping his congressman-elect father get settled in Washington.⁵⁵

The entire affray between Gardiner and Lane left both officers feeling that they had been wronged. Of the two, Lane had come out on top, at least in a professional sense. The proof was in the pudding. He saw the Ohio emigration through to completion, accompanying a column of Senecas to their destination in Arkansas. After closing out his accounts in January 1833, he returned to Washington where, after only a brief interlude, he again embarked on another mission as a disbursing agent. In large measure, Lane had Colonel John Abert to thank for this favorable outcome.⁵⁶

Surviving records suggest that Abert sought to be an honest broker in balancing the interests of Colonel Gardiner and Lieutenant Lane. Still, his decision to assume personal command of the Ohio removal spoke volumes about his true feelings in regard to Gardiner's capacity for seeing the expedition through to completion. Abert clearly believed at the time that circumstances left him few options. Speaking of the sweeping authority the commissary general had vested in him, as the emigration approached its end Colonel Abert informed General Gibson, "I have put my shoulder to the wheel. It was necessary, absolutely necessary, or the wagon would have stuck in the slough." If each party to the dispute felt he had received bad treatment at the hands of the other, the difference between Lane and Gardiner was that Colonel Abert had

sent the expedition superintendent home on leave while he continued to rely heavily on the dispersing agent for help in extracting the mired wagon.⁵⁷

CHAPTER NINE

Congress, a New Assignment, and a Honeymoon on the Ohio

As 1833 drew to a close, the Lane family strove mightily to disentrall itself from dismal preoccupations grounded in its ongoing feud with James B. Gardiner and his political allies. Alternatively, there were plenty of other more positive things to think about, not the least of which was Amos Lane's recent election to the House of Representatives. As November approached, a father and son team made plans to arrive in Washington well before Congress convened in early December. These propitious events not only determined the near-term course charted by Amos Lane and his son John, but also combined with other more personal contingencies to change the comfortable equilibrium that once reigned inside the Lane household.¹

Compiling a list of the past year's most important occurrences, Mary Foote Lane proudly noted the margin of victory that her husband achieved in the August election. "Mr. Lane," she observed on November 10, 1833, was "elected to Congress by a majority of eight hundred, and he departed for Washington three days ago." The same passage also noted that Congressman-elect Lane and Lieutenant John Foote Lane traveled separately to Washington, and on different schedules. Being the first to leave allowed John to act as the elder Lane's proxy in laying the groundwork for a prolonged stay in the nation's capitol. It would also afford him a brief opportunity to serve as point-man for neutralizing any distractions that might interfere with his father's need to focus exclusively on preparing for the Twenty-third Congress, which was formally scheduled to convene on the second day of December.²

Other changes still in the process of unfolding during the last quarter of 1833 fundamentally affected the quality of Mary Lane's life in the years to come. In a variety of

ways, they touched every member of her family. As the foregoing chapter indicated, her youngest daughter, Jane, had only recently wed Elisha Mills Huntington in October. Mary also chronicled the arrival of a new addition to the Buell family during the same month. “My second daughter [Ann],” she observed, “the forepart of October had a fine son named George.” George Pearson Buell, Jr. eventually grew up to accompany his maternal uncle, James Henry Lane, on the latter’s exploits in territorial Kansas. There, young George served a brief stint as the city engineer of Leavenworth immediately following the town’s demographic and political transformation to a free-state community. All that was decades away in late 1833 as George’s grandfather and uncle, respectively Amos Lane and John Foote Lane, prepared to leave for Congress.³

Not all the events chronicled by Mary Lane in the last quarter of 1833 had been positive. “Sister” Frances Piatt Dunn numbered among the lifelong friends that Mary noted had been called “from time to eternity.” Perhaps equally distressing was the sudden looming prospect of a solitary life bereft of a family that constituted the foundation of her existence. As the twenty-eighth anniversary of her marriage to Amos approached, she wrote, “All of my children are now for themselves, and I left alone—almost without care.” Abandoning this matriarch to fend for herself in Lawrenceburg deeply troubled the younger generation of Lanes. Her impending isolation was an unintended consequence of their family’s recent political successes.⁴

Some of the thoughts shared by newlywed Jane Lane Huntington with her older brother during this period echoed many of the same concerns that Mary Foote Lane chronicled in her diary. No sooner had Lieutenant John F. Lane arrived back at his duty station in Washington than Jane alerted him to changes he could expect to encounter on his next visit home. She reminded him that their mother was now the senior occupant in a house whose adult inhabitants

seemed to dwindle by the hour. The Buells, though admittedly close by, lived on a farm some distance from town. Mary Lane St. Clair, after a brief visit home to help her mother serve as midwife to Ann Lane Buell, had since rejoined an embattled husband fighting to retain his land office position in Indianapolis. Most recently Jane—the youngest of the brood to grow up on the Ohio—had set up housekeeping with her new husband in Terre Haute. As those closest to her departed, either to embark on new lives or seek new fields to conquer, the senior family member in Lawrenceburg prepared to shoulder responsibilities as de facto head of household.⁵

Besides Mary, only two members of the immediate family still lived under the paternal roof: George and James Henry respectively aged twenty-one and nineteen. Yet single, they strained to fill the void created by the virtually permanent absence of her husband and three daughters. Jane Lane Huntington lamented to her brother in Washington, “Mother and the boys—George and James [Henry]—are the only ones left in Lawrenceburg.” Accordingly, she believed that as matters now stood the family was “broken up.” Presently, Jane hit upon the idea that the younger generation of Lane women should take turns playing hostess to their mother over the course of a year. She pressed John to encourage Mrs. Lane to schedule a series of visits to her daughters on the Buell farm near Lawrenceburg, to Terre Haute, and also to Indianapolis. “I know she would like to do it very much if Mary [and] you would propose it,” wrote Jane. “I did and she appeared to be gratified.”⁶

The concerns that Jane Lane Huntington confided to her older brother in Washington underscored the closeness that prevailed within the Lane family. Just as John Lane a few years earlier had put his personal life on hold after graduating from West Point in order to guide a kid sister through her formative years, the same sister now stated her intention to forego the relative freedom of a newlywed’s life to meet the needs of an aging parent. Still, if the matriarch in

question embodied the principle of self-effacement, loneliness hardly equated to despondency. Mary Lane derived considerable satisfaction from keeping busy with church and other diversions, which especially included keeping up to date on the accomplishments of her husband and others now within the fold of her extended family. On December 4, 1833, for example, she noted receiving six letters from Amos since he left Lawrenceburg, and another from Mary Lane St. Clair, her firstborn daughter.⁷

Historian Wendell Holmes Stephenson once observed that by the late 1830s, Congressman Amos Lane “had an able political lieutenant in his third son, James H. Lane.” While that may have been true by the time Martin Van Buren assumed office, during the second half of Andrew Jackson’s presidency a lieutenant of a more literal sort stepped forward to fill that role, as two younger brothers looked on from Lawrenceburg, hoping to learn from his example. John Lane was the first in a series of three family members to serve as Amos Lane’s political aide-de-camp. Immediately upon returning to Washington, John exchanged his former bachelor quarters at Fort McHenry for a new residence he shared with his father, Amos. It was not only plush, but within walking distance of the capitol. In mid-December 1833, John crowed to his brother-in-law George Buell, “We have the second floor in one of the best boarding houses.” A suite at “Mrs. Pittman’s” compared quite favorably with Spartan army accommodations in Washington, to say nothing of living under canvas while discharging Indian removal duties.⁸

January 1834 marked the beginning of what was arguably the best year of Lieutenant John Lane’s life. Still in his early twenties, he could celebrate surviving everything that fate and the army had thrown at him over the past decade: the rigors of a West Point education, strenuous field duty, and most especially, vain attempts by the likes of James Dill and James B. Gardiner to

injure if not destroy his family's good name and political standing. He emerged from it all with a reputation unsullied, and looked forward to a range of new assignments with high professional potential. As 1833 ended, these had yet to assume a definite form. Meanwhile, John's desk job in the commissary general's office offered the advantage of a flexible work schedule, with ample time left over to get his father off to a running start in Washington.⁹

Serving as Amos Lane's "able political lieutenant," as Wendell Holmes Stephenson phrased it, did not ensure that father and son always saw eye-to-eye. John's younger sister, Jane Lane Huntington, presciently foresaw a potential for friction between the street-wise politician and idealistic young officer. "Jane doubted how Father and I would get along," John confided to George Buell, adding that she "had good reason. Good God—I almost shudder to think of a few scenes that have passed between father and myself."¹⁰ John's letter suggested that the pair differed most often on matters related to integrity and propriety:

My mind was made up—and so help me, I would have kept it. I would have left him to paddle his own canoe—if he had [deviated] from doing one thing that I [thought proper]. But he has not, though he came not to it at once—still in no single instance has he gone against my advice. But he feels more jealously than affection for me while I am with him. How he hates me to come into his room when he has anything at hand that he thinks I will not approve...He curses but tells me the next day [that] it is not done.¹¹

Such episodes of discord that occasionally roiled the atmosphere on the second floor of Mrs. Pittman's boarding house more frequently gave way to stronger, countervailing feelings of loyalty and solicitude. John admitted to Buell that in almost no time at all father and son reduced their routine in Washington to a fairly smooth-running system.¹²

As fate would have it, their system, for better or worse, would not long endure. On January 28, 1834, Lieutenant Lane received orders for a new assignment. They directed his transfer from the commissary general's office to a position in the army Quartermaster General's

Department headed by Major General Thomas Sidney Jesup.¹³ The historical record does little to show whether Lieutenant Lane's new assignment represented an unwelcome interruption to plans previously made, or alternatively, that he proselytized to obtain a transfer. In any event, when Lane left the commissary general's office he remained in good standing with General George Gibson and other erstwhile colleagues. On January 30, 1834, he conveyed his "high opinion of the ability and rectitude" that had characterized the Bureau of Indian Emigration, and gave thanks for the "kindness" that had been extended to him. Such words are not crafted by someone leaving under a pall of bad feeling. The positive tone of Lieutenant Lane's parting words to Gibson suggests that he was moving on to bigger and better things.¹⁴

By early 1834, the enmity and intrigue that poisoned the atmosphere within the commissary general's office as a result of the previous year's Lane-Gardiner dispute had recently abated. Although the Senate passed a resolution in late December asking the department to turn over the bulk of Indian removal correspondence, a year would pass before a coterie of Senate clerks printed the documents. The intervening months created a space in which tempers could cool, and gave time for Congressman Lane and his son to immerse themselves in the public issues of the day.¹⁵

The priorities that preoccupied the father-son team in the early weeks of 1834 created a bifurcated agenda with a public and private dimension. From her distant vantage point of Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Mary Lane admired the progress of her husband's career in Washington. "Mr. Lane has interested himself in all the important subjects that have appeared before the house of Congress," she glowed. "He has spoke first on the deposit question; second on the pension bill; [and] third on the appropriation for books—The course he pursues warms my heart with gratitude."¹⁶

One of the best reasons Mary Lane and her family had for feeling grateful in early 1834 concerned a public dialogue in which Amos Lane played almost no part. It concerned the construction of a safe harbor in Delaware Bay as part of the nation's coastal defense system. The project promised to stimulate the commercial shipping industry by affording shelter during storms and throughout the harsh winters. Authorities planned a dual structure to protect the waterway: the Delaware Breakwater and Ice-Breaker. On April 26, 1834, the House of Representatives passed a resolution that requested the secretary of war "to report the persons employed in superintending and directing the construction of the Delaware breakwater; the compensation allowed, and the services actually performed by each, from the commencement of the work until the present time." The breakwater was between on-site project officers: the incumbent had departed before General Jesup selected a replacement. The assignment went to John Foote Lane.¹⁷

Work on the breakwater originally began during the closing months of John Quincy Adams' presidency. Over time unforeseen difficulties arose. There were cost overruns, sediment deposits that created potentially hazardous shoals near the breakwater, and perhaps most significant according to a later Corps of Engineers study, "no amount of persuasion could induce [the Engineer in overall charge] to take up residence at Lewes," Delaware, the designated construction site.¹⁸

Because administrative responsibility for the project fell within the purview of the Quartermaster General, General Jesup opted for a man-on-the-scene approach, backed by personnel resources drawn from within his own department. Engineer duties at the construction site, Jesup informed Secretary of War Lewis Cass, were "obviously such as to require the constant and unremitted attention of the individual employed, and unless he devote his whole

time to the direct personal superintendence of the operations confided to him, the public interests must suffer.” Lieutenant John Foote Lane’s transfer to the Quartermaster General Department occurred at the precise moment-in-time when Jesup most needed to assign an assistant engineer to Lewes. Thus Lane became the fourth in a succession of junior officers to assume responsibility for riding herd on virtually all aspects of the Delaware breakwater project.¹⁹

John Lane’s imminent assignment to Lewes, Delaware was in keeping with an army tradition that by the 1830s had become the norm. As historian Richard L. Watson explained,

A custom, subject to much abuse, was that of detached service, whereby an officer or enlisted man was removed from his unit and temporarily attached to the War Department, the General Staff, the Recruiting Service, or any other organization in which his services were needed. This was standard army practice, but it could hardly have been expected that approximately 30 per cent of the available officers should thus be detached.²⁰

Lane embodied the tradition of detached service. Originally commissioned in the 4th Artillery in 1828, by 1834 he had yet to serve with his regiment. Lane’s transfer to Lewes, though, was cost effective, both for the army and for Congress. On the one hand it guaranteed the presence of a technically qualified engineer at the breakwater construction site, while on the other, it obviated the need for superfluous expenditures.²¹

At this juncture, several contingencies surfaced simultaneously to produce effects that were both personally and professionally important to the entire Lane family. That John Lane mailed a “letter of deep interest” to his mother from Philadelphia was probably significant because William Strickland, the absentee official nominally in charge of the breakwater project, resided in that city. Visiting there would afford an opportunity for the chief engineer to confer with his prospective new assistant, thus helping to ensure a smooth transfer of responsibility at the Lewes worksite.²²

Philadelphia's proximity to New York City boded well for reestablishing kinship ties to distant relatives. Visiting New York brought John Lane within reasonable distance of family members who lived in the Hudson River metropolis. Mary Foote Lane's brother and nephew, respectively Samuel Alfred Foote and Henry Ebenezer Davies (who bore the name of his aunt's deceased brother, Ebenezer) only a few years earlier established a Foote-Davies law partnership in New York. More recently, John's cousin, Thomas Alfred Davies, had established a profitable mercantile business in the city after completing a tour of duty with the army at Fort Crawford, in Wisconsin Territory.²³ The two cousins during the mid-1820s studied at West Point together under the tutelage of Thomas' brother, Charles Davies.

Whether Lieutenant Lane sought any legal advice during his sojourn to New York remains a matter of speculation. Either way, this period in his life witnessed a conscious effort to strengthen bonds that linked the Lane family of Lawrenceburg, Indiana to kin who resided east of the Adirondacks. A flurry of correspondence that passed between both groups during the spring and summer of 1834 strongly suggests that this was the case. In this context John's trip to New York in the first quarter of the year could explain how a confluence of contingent events, including his impending Delaware breakwater assignment, played a catalytic role in initiating the process.²⁴

John Lane learned in early April that his mother's sole surviving brother, Samuel Alfred Foote, planned a mid-summer visit to Lawrenceburg. "Uncle Albert," who lived in New York, shared with John, but not Mary Lane, the real purpose that impelled him to visit his Ohio River kin: to introduce a new bride into the family circle. Foote explained to John that he intended to marry "Jane Campbell, of this city," on July 1, 1834, and asked John to accompany the wedding party from Philadelphia to Lawrenceburg. Upon learning, however, that his nephew's presence

would be required all summer at the breakwater worksite, Foote decided to make other arrangements regarding his wedding cruise. Even more gratifying than John's company was the knowledge that he "preferred...duty to home."²⁵

The Delaware breakwater was a public concern that yielded beneficial results both for John Lane, and the family at large. Contrastingly, the removal of Arthur St. Clair and his brother-in-law from their respective positions at the Indianapolis land office produced an effect of a different kind. Even as it riveted family attention on a highly personal matter, insiders knowledgeable of the Washington political scene were well aware that Amos Lane was anything but a disinterested observer. As a champion of the right of instruction, he needed to heed issues of overriding importance to his constituents and to avoid being drawn into a narrow parochial fight that would make him seem an advocate of his own interests. The situation called for tact, and perhaps even a little stealth. Thus it was that where Lane public commentary was concerned, the Indianapolis land office issue became a ghost at the table. It was a subject constantly thought of, but rarely articulated. Congressman Lane needed proxies to fight this battle.²⁶

Any arrangement that resulted in reinstating Drake and St. Clair to their former positions would require the support of at least some members of a proto-Whig opposition then coalescing in congress. In December 1833, John Lane probably exaggerated when telling George Buell that his father "possesses now much more influence than any other member. For almost in the same breath, John admonished his brother-in-law to "say nothing."²⁷

Other enablers within the extended family had their roles to play also. As noted earlier, when Amos Lane left Lawrenceburg for Washington, D.C., son-in-law Elisha Huntington prepared to serve another term in the Indiana House of Representatives. Where the destinies of

Drake and St. Clair were concerned, E.M. Huntington kept a channel of communication open with political friends of the Lane family in Washington as well as Indiana. On Christmas Day, 1833, he told Senator John Tipton:

I feel no little anxiety that General Drake and Mr. St. Clair should be reinstated in office. That they have been turned out by the wicked and premeditated falsehoods of Gardner there can be no doubt... That Drake and St. Clair were faithful and honest officers, no man doubts—That Gardner's [inspection] report is false, no man doubts—That the character of General Jackson and his true friends demand their reinstatement is admitted.²⁸

Huntington proceeded to remind the senator of votes that were cast a year earlier, when a fractious Indiana legislature required no less than nineteen ballots to elect Tipton. "I am your friend," he noted. "You have had evidence of it—It is true that St. Clair is my brother-in-law—He was also your friend."²⁹

The state representative from Vigo County, Indiana, was getting to be quite a professional politician in his own right. In early February 1834, he wrapped up his third successive term in the state legislature. The adjournment of that body, while the first session of the Twenty-third U.S. Congress still had several months left to run, solved a major problem faced by the Lane family. It allowed Huntington to replace his brother-in-law John Foote Lane in Washington when the latter departed to assume his new responsibilities at the Delaware breakwater. After the state legislature adjourned in Indianapolis, Elisha headed for the nation's capitol.³⁰

Before John Lane left for Lewes, another issue surfaced in Congress about which he possessed first-hand knowledge. West Point's role as the nation's premier engineering school periodically came under close and hostile scrutiny. In a way that prefigured James Henry Lane's polemics during the Civil War, the spring of 1834 also witnessed severe criticism of the

institution. In early March, both houses of the Ohio legislature memorialized Congress to abolish the U.S. Military Academy, and to withhold further appropriations intended for its support. The idea that West Point represented a bastion of elite privilege incompatible with the egalitarian spirit of Jacksonian America resonated with many westerners. Lieutenant John Foote Lane stepped forward to refute those allegations.³¹

In an article crafted for publication in the *National Intelligencer*, Lane conceded that the military academy was unpopular in the West, but challenged the notion that it was inherently aristocratic. He defended both the school and the program of instruction implemented by Sylvanus Thayer and his hand-picked faculty. Within the corps of cadets, Lane observed, “the Drummer boy and the President’s son dig at the same ditch and eat at the same table. The only differences, either in the opinions mutually entertained, or in the rank eventually assigned them in the army [mirrored variations in] individual excellence, ascertained by an admirable system, rigidly and impartially applied.” Thus, John Lane concluded, “this institution...is entirely *anti aristocratic*.”³²

Amos Lane’s eldest son also advanced other arguments. It was only proper, he insisted, for congressmen to control appointments from their respective states because “the *people*” retained the prerogative, through the right of instruction, “to prescribe to their representative *any* mode of selection *they may think best*.” As it currently existed, the selection system decreased the likelihood that “dissipated sons and nephews of the wealthy...could spend time and money in Washington...teasing [their influence] into commissions.” John Lane’s closing statement underscored a connection he apparently perceived between choosing the military as a vocation and foregoing material rewards offered by other careers:

The education is an advantage—the commission *not*. Habits early acquired [at West Point] induce young men to remain in the

army—to [exchange] all the expectations of wealth and influence, that numerous...mercantile and professional occupations [offer] them—all the pleasures of a fixed residence, made happy by domestic enjoyment...for a respectable poverty, dignified perhaps by a sense of duty well performed, and relieved by occasional visits to happier friends.³³

Lane thought “a growing stone that gathers no moss” an analogy that best captured what he considered the most daunting reality of army life.³⁴

The *National Intelligencer* finally published John Lane’s defense of West Point in November 1834, more than a half year after it was first drafted. In the intervening months the article became a universal hit among family members, including those who resided east of the Adirondacks. Samuel Alfred Foote, despite preoccupations with his coming wedding, complimented his nephew’s foray into journalism. “The perusal of your letter on...the military academy,” he observed, “has given me no small degree of satisfaction. It is full of good sense and written in a chaste and unpretentious style...I hope and indeed have no doubt that it will produce a benign effect on public opinion in respect to the academy.” John’s mother, besides enjoining her son to remain with his father as long as possible in Washington, assured John that the family in Lawrenceburg had “treasured up” his observations on the military academy. John probably made sure that his maternal cousin at West Point, Charles Davies, also reviewed the pre-publication draft.³⁵

Although the distance between New York City and the St. Lawrence River precluded a visit to kinfolk at Ogdensburg during John Lane’s March visit, this limitation hardly applied to Davies family members who still resided at West Point. At the military academy, spring 1834 found “the professor” at the pinnacle of a dual career as head of the mathematics department and publisher of textbooks that by then were in high demand throughout the United States. In any

event, the lieutenant invited his former West Point mentor to Washington where father and son would show their guest whatever amenities Mrs. Pittman's boarding house could muster.³⁶

Professor Charles Davies declined the offer, partly because of timing, but also for other reasons. "The weather will be so warm before the close of the [annual West Point] examinations," said John's cousin, "and the atmosphere in Washington, both physical and political...so highly charged with choleric, as to render it imprudent for a northern man of low temperature to venture within its influence." Davies was well aware of "Uncle Foote's" planned visit to Indiana in the coming summer, but scrupulously avoided any mention of impending nuptial celebrations. Charles Davies was not one to betray a confidence, if indeed he possessed any foreknowledge of Samuel Foote's marriage.³⁷

As the weeks ticked away before Elisha Huntington replaced his brother-in-law as Amos Lane's political aide-de-camp, a parade of significant political issues passed in review before the father-son team in Washington. Perhaps the most volatile among them was slavery, and more particularly where Amos was concerned, slavery in the District of Columbia. With one or two exceptions, the treatment given this subject by Wendell Holmes Stephenson during the Great Depression requires no further elaboration. It is worth noting, however, that as James Henry Lane observed in his brief New York Times "Autobiography," the early 1830s, marked a time in his life that saw several trips down the Mississippi to New Orleans, made in connection with earning a livelihood in the mercantile trade.³⁸ Meanwhile, the varied experiences of individual members caused the family's collective view of slavery to grow ever more eclectic and vacillating.

Although Stephenson correctly noted that Amos Lane's service on the Committee of the District of Columbia afforded him an "opportunity to acquire first-hand information relative to

the slave trade,” the congressman did not come into possession of this knowledge until his second term in office. Lane apparently had no compelling reason to seek out first-hand information about slavery during the winter of 1831-1832, while stranded in New Orleans. Yet so omnipresent was the largest slave market in North America that it assumed the character of a tourist attraction.³⁹

Insights provided by historian Walter Johnson suggest that the slave pens would have been hard to miss, if for no other reason than their effect on the senses. “The walls surrounding the pens were so high,” wrote Johnson, “that one New Orleans slave trader thought they could keep out the wind.” Such observations also beg the question of whether what was going on inside the slave pens could be contained by barriers of brick and mortar. “Inside those walls,” continued Johnson, “the air must have been thick with overcrowding, smoke, and...the smells of fifty or a hundred people forced to live in a space the size of a home lot.” The busy, well-to-do lawyer from Lawrenceburg probably paid little attention to such unpleasantness. If Amos Lane had taken greater notice of the sights, smells, and sounds of the slave market, he might have had hesitated to pronounce New Orleans “the Eden of the World.”⁴⁰

Notwithstanding any sensibilities about slavery on Amos Lane’s part, a year after he returned to Lawrenceburg, a family friend presented Mrs. Lane with a volume of John Wesley’s work as a new year’s gift. Wesley’s writings, mused Mary Foote Lane in January 1833, were “more heart-searching” than anything she had ever read. Mary, as noted previously, was a devout Methodist. As the acknowledged “father of Methodism” Wesley’s influence reached from the Thames to the Ohio. On his deathbed, he still railed against slavery, calling it “that execrable villainy which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature.” Wesley singled out American slavery as “the vilest that ever saw the sun.” Although Mary Lane’s diary

and correspondence provide scant evidence of her feelings about slavery, her study of Wesley's works probably informed discussions around the same family dinner table where James Henry Lane consumed his daily bread.⁴¹

It was also during the early 1830s that Jim Lane and Abraham Lincoln, who would not cross paths until a quarter-century later, made separate flatboat trips down the Mississippi. The two men drew entirely distinct, albeit reconcilable, conclusions about their respective close encounters with slavery. In contrast with Jim Lane's father, Lincoln made a point of visiting the New Orleans slave market. A relative traveling with Lincoln confirmed, according to Philip Van Doren Stern, that "the sight of a young mulatto girl on the auction block horrified Lincoln and made him resolve that if he ever could he would 'hit slavery and hit it hard.'" Jim Lane's experience and his reaction to it reflect a somewhat different way of thinking.⁴²

Addressing a mixed crowd of his own supporters as well as pro-slavery Missourians on the "neutral ground" of Nebraska City, Nebraska, in September 1856, Lane told of a "store-boat" trip he made down the Mississippi while still engaged in his mercantile business. "I was awakened to investigation of the institution [of slavery]," he told the crowd, "on the coast of the Mississippi," where he and an associate ran low on cash. Seeking work that would finance the next leg of their journey, they happened upon a sugar plantation. Upon finding the owner, Lane did the talking. He introduced his companion as a carpenter "of eminent skill," and suggested that employment on the plantation "would be mutually agreeable to both parties."⁴³

The rebuff they received from the proprietor piqued both travelers. "He laid himself back with his thumbs in the armholes of his vest," recalled Jim Lane, "and with sneering scorn replied, 'I bought two carpenters yesterday!'" Lane immediately recognized the political implications of the plantation owner's attitude. "Great God!" he exclaimed to his Nebraska City audience, "if

such men are buying carpenters, mechanics, [and] engineers, how soon will they sell you and me in their marts of human merchandise!” If the anecdote recounted an incident that occurred decades before James Henry Lane addressed the assemblage at Nebraska City, the message it conveyed still packed sufficient punch to resonate with a crowd of upcountry southern farmers who Lane hoped had wearied of political influence wielded by Missouri River aristocrats.⁴⁴

Perhaps growing up literally within sight of the slaveholding Bluegrass country inured Jim Lane to abuses suffered by its bondsmen. The variant reactions of Lane and Lincoln to their respective personal brushes with slavery mirror in microcosm criticisms later leveled against the institution by major political factions of the day. To Lincoln, a future Whig, slavery warranted constraint or elimination because it represented a moral outrage. Lane, whose father embodied the ascendancy of Jacksonian Democracy in Indiana, viewed slavery as a blight on free labor, and a drag on the national economy.⁴⁵ Still, he was anything but a bleeding heart preoccupied with wrongs inflicted on victims of the slave system.

Residing among the upcountry southerners settled along the Indiana-Kentucky border, the Lanes were inclined to let matters rest, unless the slavery issue manifested a threat to national sovereignty. Meanwhile, given the constitutional guarantees that undergirded the peculiar institution, no compelling justification existed to pick a quarrel with fellow countrymen who dwelled south of the Mason-Dixon Line. Jim Lane, along with most members of his family, retained this view until contingencies that surfaced in the 1850s precipitated a national crisis. At that juncture, James H. Lane clung to the same principles of federal hegemony that stirred him thirty years earlier during the Nullification Crisis.⁴⁶

Although Amos Lane tried to avoid the undertow of public debate on slavery throughout his first term of office, the issue proved hard to ignore. On the same day that the Ohio

legislature's joint resolution condemning West Point was read before the House of Representatives, the citizens of Muskingum County, Ohio—the geographic locus of the Buell family west of the Alleghenies—petitioned Congress to ban slavery in the District of Columbia. A few months earlier, during the winter of 1833-1834, John Foote Lane, with very little fanfare, worked on a scheme that envisioned repatriating former slaves to the land of their ancestors. Through an intermediary, John forwarded a draft bill to propose African colonization.⁴⁷

Opening such a channel of communication must have received the tacit blessing of his father. Lieutenant Lane apparently either formulated or actively championed a plan that advocated deferred emancipation. Given the proclivities of his constituent base, Senator William C. Preston of South Carolina eschewed a public response to Lane's proposals. However the intermediary, a Reverend J. Brukinsly, did indicate that he was "authorized to say [that] all overtures toward the private consideration of the subject... [would be met with] kindness and politeness" on the senator's part. The divine, it turned out, held strong opinions of his own. While concurring in part with Lane's logic, Brukinsly regarded some components of the draft legislation as self defeating, and likely to provoke resentment within the population it purported to help:

I am convinced that slaves will never go to Africa if they are to spend eight or ten years there [prior to emancipation]. It has been somewhat difficult to get any but the most enlightened to go now, with freedom guaranteed at once. Bounaparte wished a general war, rather than allow Malta to be seven years in foreign hands, saying [that] seven years make a political forever; and how shall we call ten years of human life?⁴⁸

John's obvious purpose in concocting his plan was to entice slaves to emigrate in greater numbers. Yet, his colleague in the cause of colonization argued that too much focus on incentives to emigrate downplayed the most important consideration of all: finances. "The

greatest difficulty in the enterprise,” averred Brukinsly, “has...been...to get funds. Let the press and the spirit of the age and the gospel of God [do their work] and this will give you emigrants, if you will help us with the means.”⁴⁹

It may be that the inspiration behind John Lane’s proposal derived from the more parochial need to address the slavery issue within the District of Columbia. That such was the case is suggested by Brukinsly’s contention that “slavery ought to be abolished in the District...irrespective of the course of colonization...The District should exhibit the spirit of the nation in such a time; and the nation is decidedly anti-slave.” Brukinsly was unsure of how abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia might affect the overall course of the colonization movement. Of one thing, however, he was certain: transporting every slave from the District to Liberia would do more harm than good if it preserved “the absurd and sinful claim of the master to his slave’s body” after reaching the port of debarkation in Africa.⁵⁰

The Lanes perhaps believed that insights they gained as New England expatriates living in a southern culture uniquely qualified them to act as honest brokers in balancing northern and southern interests. If so, it is equally possible that they viewed organizations like the American Colonization Society as the best hope for producing a political panacea potentially capable of resolving the nation’s sectional differences. Without question, however, during their stay in Washington the Lane team maintained an open dialogue with proslavery advocates who viewed the peculiar institution as a cornerstone of American culture, as well as with sectarian partisans who looked favorably upon black colonization as a metaphorical Noah’s ark to rescue hapless victims of the slave system.⁵¹

Certainly, to John Lane’s mind, the broad array of issues that confronted the Lane team during the Twenty-third Congress underscored the need to keep Amos Lane well connected to

his constituent base in Indiana. As the previous chapter briefly noted, they met that challenge through the agency of New York native Isaac Ver Planck Van Antwerp. A politically friendly newspaper was needed to articulate arguments to local audiences. Arthur St. Clair helped make this strategy into a reality by becoming part owner of the Indianapolis *Indiana Democrat* at about the same time that he assumed duty as receiver of the Indianapolis land office.⁵²

As early as May 1829, William Marshall, who eventually succeeded John Tipton as Indian Agent at Logansville, Indiana, opined to the future U.S. senator, “every effort [should] be made to support the present administration and...I agree with you that we ought to have a press at [Indianapolis].” The press in question soon took the name of the *Indiana Democrat*. On August 14, 1830, the pro-Jackson newspaper published its first issue under the editorship of A.F. Morrison, another close friend of the Lane family. Moreover it was hardly an accident that “friends of the Administration” chose the Indianapolis land office as the site to convene their newspaper’s first organizational meeting. That one of the paper’s co-founders was a son-in-law of Congressman Amos Lane guaranteed the Lane family a major role in influencing its operations.⁵³

Shortly after Ver Planck Van Antwerp arrived in Indianapolis, in the final weeks of 1833, Lieutenant John Foote Lane made enquiries regarding how well the new editor had taken to his responsibilities. From his vantage point in Washington, Lane enjoined George P. Buell of Lawrenceburg, “Have the boys do all they can to get subscriptions [to the newspaper.] ‘Twill be a powerful instrument. I will go to great length for our friends.” John then briefly proposed a strategy for fending off political attacks on his father:

I wish you would send me my paper that contains aught that should be answered from here. It were better honor [if] all attacks...should be answered by the *Democrat* and then dwelt on and added to by the *Globe*. I am not anxious to bring father’s

name into the eastern papers until he is advantageously known to the public—through the medium of his handbill.⁵⁴

Van Antwerp's job was to choreograph a multifaceted pro-Lane campaign, to be waged, initially at least, throughout the congressman's home state of Indiana.

Comments made by Van Antwerp's contemporaries convey the impression of a man of high character and multiple talents who perhaps had missed his calling. That the Lanes placed their trust in his hands is shown clearly by the advance knowledge he possessed early in 1834 of John's imminent transfer to the Delaware breakwater. The contractor designated to make deliveries of building-stone at Lewes told Lane, "Your friend Van Antwerp is a worthy man and deserving of your [confidence] but I am of the opinion that he is not in a business which suits or gratifies his aspirations."⁵⁵

That Van Antwerp's aspirations, like more than one of his friends in Washington and Lawrenceburg, probably ran to politics is strongly suggested by an observation made by Mary Foote Lane. His judgment, she opined, "was immediately warped by party feeling." Perhaps for that reason Van Antwerp received mixed reviews that varied among individual family members. Mary Lane also discerned something formal in his demeanor that tended to put off native Hoosiers: an apparent inability to "bend his manners to the familiarities of the western people."⁵⁶ Still, she believed that people could not help but like Van Antwerp, whose family accompanied him to a new home in the West.

The fondness he and his wife demonstrated for Mary Lane St. Clair was warmly reciprocated. Things did not go that smoothly with the Huntingtons, who Mrs. Lane noted were "not very partial to [Van Antwerp's] judgment." Over time, however, a bonding grew, probably thanks in part to Mrs. Van Antwerp's skills as a chess-player. By his own admission, she made a formidable opponent for Elisha Huntington. In time, the Huntingtons and Van Antwerps

occupied rooms in the same Indianapolis boarding-house. Eventually, Ver Planck Van Antwerp joined James Henry Lane in Kansas. During the early 1830s, his family shared the twists and turns of Lane fortunes in Indiana.⁵⁷

The intra-family changing-of-the-guard in Washington occurred on schedule. The Quartermaster General Department pressured Lieutenant John Foote Lane to post himself at Lewes as soon as possible. While John made preparations to leave the capitol, Elisha Huntington wrapped up his business in the Indiana House of Representatives, settled personal affairs at home, and reached Washington by the third week in June. Amos Lane, meanwhile, had taken to Washington like a fish to water. This was especially true of his social calendar. Soon after Lane arrived in the city, his son remarked that, back in Lawrenceburg, “[Father’s] taste for society had no opportunity of indulgence. Here it has.” Elisha Huntington corroborated John Lane’s assessment by calling his father-in-law “the greatest gallant in Washington society.”⁵⁸

Neither John Lane nor Elisha Huntington was particularly impressed with the infighting and self-promotion they found in the capitol. John told George Buell, “If you knew the number of appointments from our state you would laugh. The whole state—Clay and Jackson [men alike] are applicants. . . . An honest man who has a living is a fool to take public office.”⁵⁹ On some occasions, Huntington echoed the sentiment expressed by his brother-in-law; on others he seemed less certain of his position:

It is true there must be moments in the life of a politician of exquisite happiness, but there are *hours* of misery. His temporary triumphs are so studded with defects that in his whole life there are but few spots upon which the memory loves to repose. In the main it is a dreary picture—with here and there a green and sunny spot, like an oasis in the desert. Yet after all, and while our judgments constantly admonish us of its perils, we rush headlong into the battle, trusting to fate for victory, and the chances of history for a respectable epitaph. [Yet] history is false, and with one truth it mingles two falsehoods.⁶⁰

Despite the dismal picture he painted of Washington society, Elisha could not quite bring himself to foreswear political ambition. “We are all fond of distinction,” he admitted. For Huntington, an appointive position, such as prosecuting attorney or a judgeship, represented the best of both worlds: compelling enough to hold his interest, but above the fray of partisan infighting. Anticipating such an appointment, he decided to sit out the Indiana elections scheduled for late summer.⁶¹

Elisha Huntington arrived in Washington at a moment when the political fates of Arthur St. Clair and James P. Drake still hung in the balance. Elisha lost little time in seeking the movers and shakers who could bring about their reinstatement. While a more experienced political operator than his brother-in-law, Huntington nonetheless missed his company, noting to Jane Lane Huntington, “John stands very high here.” Perhaps more forgiving than either John or Amos Lane, Elisha extended an olive branch to those who opposed reinstating Drake and St. Clair to their former positions in Indianapolis.⁶²

The Democratic party remained one entity in those days, despite the fact that the loci of its support bifurcated into two groups that rallied round the personalities and policies of President Andrew Jackson and Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky. No hard and fast lines separated these two groups, who respectively styled themselves Democratic Republicans and National Republicans. The Lanes claimed friends in both camps. Maneuvering as best they could within the confused political milieu of the day, Elisha Huntington and his Lane relatives could not always be certain of their friends.⁶³

Huntington hardly considered himself a Jacksonian in the same sense that set Arthur St. Clair and Amos Lane apart from pro-Clay partisans. He also believed that St. Clair’s reinstatement depended on the help of Clay supporters in the Senate. Given that reality, he

believed that St. Clair's predicament derived in part from a political wound that Indiana Jacksonians had inflicted on themselves. In the wake of St. Clair's removal from office, Jackson supporters in Indianapolis held what Huntington condemned as a "villainous protest meeting in which they denounced the Clay men in the Senate as a corrupt faction." To Huntington's mind, this very meeting inspired the core of opposition that barred St. Clair's path to reinstatement. "Mr. Clay and those who act with him," contended Huntington, "do not understand how it is that they are first proclaimed traitors and knaves, and then are asked for an office by the person who thus denounces them. . .if Arthur had no better friends than his Jackson brethren, he would be in a bad way."⁶⁴ Clearly, some serious fence-mending was in order with national Democrats to augment the support Drake and St. Clair hoped to receive from pro-Jackson colleagues.

Senators Henry Clay and Daniel Webster topped the list of notables whom Elisha Huntington approached on St. Clair's behalf. On June 18, 1834, Huntington told his wife, "Yesterday I saw Mr. Clay and had a conversation with him in regard to Arthur's nomination. He at first told me that nothing I could say could move him to vote for [St. Clair]." Yet, the senator from Kentucky at least did Huntington the courtesy of hearing him out. Accordingly, Huntington continued, "He subsequently seemed disposed to change his opinion in some degree. His ears have been filled with reports from Indianapolis."⁶⁵

Neither did Elisha Huntington hesitate to pull strings within a western family kinship network whose reach extended as far as Connecticut. He shared his last name with a cousin who happened to be a congressman from Litchfield. Thus did Jabez W. Huntington team with counterpart Horace Binney of Philadelphia, to enlist the aid of Senator Daniel Webster in returning Drake and St. Clair to their positions at the Indianapolis land office. Elisha followed up his friends' initial probe by obtaining an audience with Webster at the latter's residence in

Washington. Although Huntington drew little encouragement from this meeting, he did act on Webster's suggestion to draft a letter to Senator William Hendricks, a Lane family friend and former governor of Indiana, to be read before the U.S. Senate.⁶⁶

This study noted earlier the close alliance between Amos Lane and Senator John Tipton of Indiana. Representative Jonathan McCarty was among Tipton's bitterest enemies in the U.S. Congress. As one of the founders of the pro-Jackson organizational structure in Indiana politics, McCarty unsuccessfully ran against Tipton in December 1832, when the state legislature met to choose a U.S. senator. Although McCarty's backers alleged that Tipton lacked credentials as "a thoroughgoing Jacksonian," historian Donald Carmony rightly observed that in the early decades of Indiana statehood "intrigue and manipulation within party ranks were at times more bitter than between rivals of both major parties."⁶⁷ The Tipton-McCarty rivalry provides a case-in-point.

As an Indiana presidential elector, Amos Lane had thrown his political weight into the balance to help Tipton secure the coveted senate seat. Although ostensibly a Jackson supporter like Lane, McCarty cast his lot with the Clay faction arrayed against Tipton. Elisha Huntington may well have had Jonathan McCarty in mind when he suggested that if Arthur St. Clair needed to depend exclusively on support from "Jacksonian brethren" to win back his Indianapolis land office position, he had no need of enemies. Enmity between Lane and McCarty ensued as a by-product of the 1832 senatorial contest. No bond of collegiality connected the two men.⁶⁸

As the first session of the Twenty-third Congress prepared to adjourn just prior to the 4th of July holiday in 1834, Amos Lane delayed his own departure from Washington until he could be sure that Jonathan McCarty had left the city. Clearly, Lane believed that McCarty's activities and whereabouts needed to be monitored closely as a precaution against political foul play. That said, by the last week in June, the two-man Lane contingent was more than ready to leave the

capitol, notwithstanding that the Arthur St. Clair – James P. Drake affair relative to the Indianapolis land office had yet to be resolved. Elisha Huntington told his wife that he was “getting into notice fast;” perhaps even fast enough to draw a little too much attention from Amos Lane’s political enemies. Still, he considered the venture worth the risk. “If Arthur’s neck is saved,” Elisha confided to Jane Lane Huntington, “I shall be satisfied if I endanger my own a little. I shall wait the result of this business and then be off.”⁶⁹

Although Huntington had some say regarding when he could “be off,” he was hardly a free agent. Selecting a specific departure date depended partly on the schedule of a father-in-law who needed him to “arrange the times and little things necessary to make his departure decent, respectful, and comfortable.” Another variable in the equation was Huntington’s desire to visit his brother-in-law, John Lane, at the Delaware breakwater. Meanwhile Elisha grew more impatient by the hour. “I am sick, sick, sick of this place,” he told his wife. “Mr. Lane... will be prepared to start home as soon as I return from the Breakwater. I cannot consent to go first without seeing John... I am sure he would not forgive me were I to go [home] without seeing him.”⁷⁰

Elisha advised Jane to expect both him and her father back in Lawrenceburg by mid-July, meaning that their arrival would be timed to coincide with the visit of Samuel Alfred Foote and his wedding entourage from New York. Jane’s husband further exhorted her to be diligent in communicating with her lonely older brother in Lewes, Delaware: “Don’t fail for... you know, my dear, that [John] is mortified that you do not write him.” Thus as Amos Lane and Elisha Huntington arranged for their imminent departure from Washington, Lieutenant John Foote Lane soldiered on at the Delaware breakwater without benefit of family or close friends. Meanwhile, preparations for the trans-Allegheny family reunion continued apace in Lawrenceburg.⁷¹

On the third day of July, Huntington finally came into possession of good news that surely went far in relieving the anxiety of his Lawrenceburg kin. Just before adjourning for the summer, the Senate resolved the issue involving Drake and St. Clair, to the complete satisfaction of the Lane family. “You will all be delighted to hear,” Elisha apprised his wife, “of Arthur’s success. It was almost a miracle.” St. Clair got his old job back at Indianapolis land office, while Drake won a new position as receiver of public monies at Vincennes. While emotionally declaring “this is fine,” and that “everything has gone straight since I came on [to Washington],” Huntington was careful to give due credit to his father-in-law, who he characterized as a “magician” of political diplomacy. Elisha also acknowledged the benevolent influence of Vice President Martin Van Buren, with whom he dined the evening before. If Amos Lane was a “magician,” continued Huntington, then Van Buren played the part of “master magician.” Elisha concluded the update to his wife with the tongue-in-cheek observation that Van Buren’s wine “was capitol.”⁷²

In his elation over the reinstatement of his in-laws to their land office positions, Elisha Huntington overlooked a seemingly nondescript resolution that passed the Senate just prior to its summer adjournment. On June 30, 1834, it asked the secretary of war to continue printing, and to turn over to the Senate, a report originally requested the previous Christmas. Since December 23, 1833, a modest task force of printers and clerks had been collecting, collating, and preparing a massive volume of documents for publication. The end-product would be Senate Document 512, entitled “Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th November, 1831, and 27th December, 1833.” Opponents of Andrew Jackson’s Indian removal policy wanted to keep the presses running throughout the months that spanned the congressional recess. Accordingly, the resolution of June 30 guaranteed continuity of the printing effort. Because it was merely an

administrative measure, passage generated hardly any discussion in a chamber whose members were anxious to leave Washington. Substantive debate on the subject had, after all, run its course a half-year earlier.⁷³

As the first session of the Twenty-third Congress entered its final days, Elisha Huntington's attention grew ever more focused on the new bride waiting him in Indiana. "Now," he said after breaking the news of St. Clair's good fortune, "I feel like coming home." Unfortunately, a last-minute schedule change eliminated the possibility of visiting the brother-in-law toiling away at Lewes, Delaware. Huntington told his wife, "Mr. Lane wants me to assist him for a day or two, and therefore I shall not go to see John." Thus while Lieutenant John Lane stoically remained at his post on the breakwater construction site, his father and brother-in-law headed directly for the family reunion in Lawrenceburg.⁷⁴

For another brother-in-law, George P. Buell, Sr., the summer was one of mixed emotions. Buell, who drew from his own resources to help George and James Henry Lane get their start in the Ohio River mercantile trade, had recently suffered a serious financial setback. When a friend's business folded, Buell felt obligated to repay hefty loans that totaled between four and five thousand dollars. While enduring personal losses on a scale sufficient to qualify as a life-changing event, Buell trimmed his financial sails, made necessary adjustments, and focused on new priorities. "My intention," he advised John Lane, "is to remain through life endeavoring to make my wife happy, to educate my children, [and] finally leave them a comfortable home." Accomplishing that feat, while maintaining the effort to keep John Lane's two younger brothers in business, would require considerable belt-tightening for the foreseeable future.⁷⁵

So strapped for cash was George Buell that he asked John Lane to return a fine watch the latter had borrowed to perform engineering work. Buell, however, was not completely

downcast. Unlike John, he had ample company nearby to cheer him up. Clans were gathering. A mixed contingent of Huntingtons, Lanes, Buells, and St. Clairs had assembled in Lawrenceburg to greet the arrival of their trans-Allegheny kinfolk. Accordingly, as George informed his brother-in-law in Delaware, “Arthur, Mary, and Jane are at our house where they will remain for some time. The three sisters spend [their time] very pleasantly together, which gives me much satisfaction.” If personal business fortunes were at low ebb, Buell still retained enough of his natural good humor to tell John that he approved of his brother-in-law’s “determination to be a quarryman.”⁷⁶

By August 3, 1834, Mary Foote Lane could report to her eldest son that “the long expected visit is at an end.” The recently minted newlyweds from New York—Samuel Alfred Foote and the former Jane Campbell—had just passed a pleasant two weeks with their Ohio River relatives, renewing old acquaintances and meeting several members of the extended family for the first time. This was true in spite of a medical contingency that changed travel plans and initially gave Mary Lane some cause for concern. “Alfred,” she told her son, “had been detained by ill health.” By the time he and his wife arrived on the twentieth of July, Elisha Huntington was no longer on hand to meet them. The stay in Washington had created a backlog of court cases in his Terre Haute legal office that demanded immediate attention.⁷⁷

Lieutenant John Lane, like Huntington, could only be present in spirit. Throughout her brother’s stay, Mary Lane lamented to her son, “I wished your seat in the family filled.” Despite these two notable absences, those remaining did all in their power to make the visitors feel welcome. Jane Campbell Foote hit it off very well with the Lane family. When the paddle-wheeler carrying the newlyweds first put into port at Lawrenceburg, recalled Mrs. Lane, “Mary [St. Clair] and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Buell, George, Henry, and Jane were all

introduced...in the course of an hour, and all took tea with [the guests] the first evening. His wife we all love...an amiable, confiding woman...a perfect model of goodness and amiability.”⁷⁸

That first meeting set the tone for the remainder of the visit. Alfred’s physical resemblance to Mary Lane’s older brother, deceased since 1814, brought back bittersweet memories. “As Alfred grows older,” she observed, “how much he reminds me of Ebenezer!” A miniature facsimile of Ebenezer, conveyed on behalf of a sister who still resided on the St. Lawrence, only intensified such feelings. The token was, as Mary explained, to be kept “while I live, then to descend to my eldest daughter.” The gesture inspired her to exhort John to write “Sister Scovil” in Ogdensburg, since “she was much hurt that you did not visit them in New York” earlier that year.⁷⁹

Also on hand to meet the Footes was James Henry Lane, who had only celebrated his twentieth birthday a month prior to their arrival in Lawrenceburg. Jim Lane’s description of his maternal uncle essentially amounted to a critique of Alfred’s qualities as a politician:

Uncle A[lfred] is about such a man as I expected to see with this exception, that he was not as particular as I had supposed...He is without a doubt a man of stout integrity—a politician intuitively—but he can never succeed before the people of any county. He may have supporters—yes, friends—but not warm friends—those that would serve him at all hazards—but this may be because he has found his interest in his present course.⁸⁰

Even at the early age of twenty James Henry Lane had evidently already decided that the measure of a politician involved a species of personal charisma that inspired disciples to render service at all hazards.

On balance, the months that intervened between the two sessions of the Twenty-third Congress in the latter half of 1834 witnessed what in all probability was the high watermark of Lane family fortunes during the antebellum period. This was true in a personal as well as

political context. “Oh! That I could only remain in such a frame of mind as this,” Mary Lane confided to her diary in early May.⁸¹ The members of her immediate family might well have agreed with the sentiment. All were in reasonably good health. Her three daughters were married and comfortably situated. Thanks in part to the miracle of steam transportation, she was witnessing the reunification of a far-flung, intergenerational family unit that time and space had long separated.

Where Mary Lane’s husband and eldest son were concerned, professional prospects never looked brighter. People across Indiana now recognized Congressman Amos Lane as a “wheel-horse” of the Democratic Party. Lieutenant John Lane’s reputation seemed to grow in tandem with his father’s. The Delaware breakwater project was one of the most prestigious and high-visibility assignments that the army could proffer. Finally, both father and son had been instrumental in restoring other family members to positions of high responsibility in the federal government.⁸² If things could only remain as they seemed to be in the summer of 1834; yet dame fortune too often proved a fickle companion. Holding fast to her Methodist creed, Mary Foote Lane looked to the future with guarded optimism.

CHAPTER TEN

Hubris and Nemesis: Wages of the Gentleman's Code

George Buell's jest congratulating his brother-in-law on his decision to become "a quarryman" displeased John Lane. Lane may have taken himself too seriously when he suggested that military service was a vocation requiring a vow of poverty as a precondition for admittance:

You spoke of my *pleasant* situation. Ay—pleasant...I suppose for the Government; labor 14 hours [a day] out of the 24; perform services which they would find it difficult to hire at any price; and for a comparative pittance. Had I labored for myself as I labor for the Gov't. in almost any civil avocation I should be rich. But for money as money only, I care not and never shall...Just think of it, Man—I'm absolutely worth \$1300.00!! A FORTUNE ISN'T IT—the reward of 10 years service.¹

Lieutenant Lane, as always, still took considerable pride in keeping his correspondence current with family and friends, and often reproved them for failing to meet his standard. On one particular Sunday he advised his brother-in-law, "this is my ninth letter today—this besides brushing-up my Spanish lesson and going once to church...so forgive me if I have said nothing very famous." Moreover, he sarcastically upbraided Buell for being "at least three or 4 [letters] in my debt. I stopped writing because I thought you were engaged with more important matters, and did not think it worthwhile to reply."²

Lane's criticism in this sphere extended even to his mother, although Mary Foote Lane, a master of repartee, frequently gave as good as she got. Occasionally she added a measure of guilt that only a mother could impart. "I wonder not that you find fault with our correspondence," she conceded to her son. Still, "I have had considerable ill health this season...[and] have not got so trained as yet to make chills and fever perfectly agreeable. I have

had attacks since warm weather. Am now able to move about, but weak.” She asked John’s forbearance where his siblings were concerned: “like me I doubt not but each have their excuse [for not writing,] and perhaps too a reasonable one.”³

If John Lane was financially embarrassed, lonely, and out of humor from not hearing from his Lawrenceburg relatives more often, the pressing nature of his duties left little time for brooding. The fourteen-hour grind he complained of reflected a work-pace that was probably unique to the construction site at Lewes, Delaware. Mother Nature herself toyed with the work timetable. The Delaware River flowed into the ocean, even as tides from the Atlantic swept toward the harbor entrance. Breakwater designers never anticipated that sediment deposits left by the countervailing currents near the manmade site would build large shoals capable of posing a danger to mariners. Lane arrived on-station just as his superiors in the War Department redoubled their efforts to overcome this unexpected engineering challenge.⁴

Meanwhile the time approached for Congress to provide funding for the coming year. Assembling and collating the raw data needed to furnish the lawmakers with accurate cost estimates entailed, as civilian engineer William Strickland explained, taking depth soundings and other measurements to determine the “alteration and change in the bottom of the harbor and sea sides adjacent to the work” that had occurred since the previous construction season. Predictably, such duties inhered with Lane’s responsibilities as the newest in a series of on-site military supervisors.⁵

Strickland, the ranking civilian official in overall charge of the project, forwarded data submitted by Lieutenant Lane to the Quartermaster General Department in Washington. There Lane’s departmental head, General Thomas Sidney Jesup, scaled back his initial estimate for funding the breakwater project through 1835 to a mere hundred thousand dollars. Believing that

he needed to gather still more information, Jesup sought to buy time by curtailing construction. “At all events,” contended Jesup, “it would be safer to suspend...our operations, in order to test the effects of the tides and the currents upon the harbor.” In part because John Lane’s computations provided the basis for Jesup’s argument, they soon came under the scrutiny of the secretary of war. Before formally presenting General Jesup’s recommendation to Congress, Lewis Cass wanted a board of experts to confirm the conclusions of his War Department staff.⁶

On October 25, 1834, the war secretary instructed a newly formed committee to “repair to the Delaware breakwater without unnecessary delay, and examine and report the condition of that work.” Three of the army’s most distinguished officers comprised the board of examiners: Jesup, the quartermaster general himself; Joseph F. Totten, who later became the army’s chief engineer during the Mexican War; and Sylvanus Thayer, widely known as the “father” of the U.S. Military Academy. This trio of engineering mavens ultimately based their findings on calculations either made or certified by Lieutenant Lane. If John Lane decried low pay and a Draconian work schedule, he could hardly complain that his efforts went unnoticed. Any project successes scored during Lane’s watch were sure to garner the favorable attention of movers and shakers at the highest echelons of the War Department. He could then enlist their help in securing a sound professional future.⁷

As Lane brought his considerable energies to bear on efforts underway at Lewes, erstwhile Washington colleagues within the commissary general of subsistence office toiled away at a major project of their own. By mid-1834 a new routine had taken hold: amassing and cataloging a prodigious quantity of documents requested by the Senate the previous December. Buried within the reams of paper turned over to Congress were scandalous details of John’s run-in with James B. Gardiner during the 1832 removal of Ohio Indians. In contrast with the

favorable prospects that attended his current assignment, any re-hash of the old unpleasantness with Gardiner could conceivably endanger Lane's ambitious career plans.⁸

Thus it was that two scenarios of great interest to the Lane family played out simultaneously over the winter of 1835, one benign, the other potentially catastrophic. Because they combined to affect not only the subsequent trajectory of John Lane's life, but also the respective futures of family and friends closest to him, understanding the relationship between the two scenarios may help answer Professor Etcheson's question, "What did James H. Lane represent?"⁹

While the Twenty-third Congress was in recess during the summer and fall of 1834, an ad hoc task force of Senate clerks worked feverishly to convert the raw material furnished by the commissary general's office into a formally published document. Before year's end, they brought out the first increment of a printing project that ultimately ran to five volumes. During this same period, Colonel James J. Abert personally notified Gardiner that all efforts to forestall publication of material potentially damaging to Gardiner's reputation had been to no avail. As Abert remarked to General George Gibson in early October, "It will hardly be possible to suppress the private letters [pertaining to the Ohio Indian removal expedition] from me to you, as they are already generally known."¹⁰ If, indeed, contents of the letters were already common knowledge around Washington in the last quarter of 1834, it is virtually certain that everyone in Congressman Amos Lane's family, especially his eldest son serving in Delaware, also knew of the swirling rumors.

Though mortifying, any embarrassment John Lane might suffer would be mild compared to what lay in store for James Gardiner. Just as Lane approached the pinnacle of his army career, the enemy he made two years earlier stared into an abyss of profound public humiliation. From

Gardiner's vantage point, the process promised to be a slow torture that would unfold over several months. The second session of the Twenty-third Congress was scheduled to convene on the first day of December. Not until the following February would the hapless staff of Senate clerks finally complete the rest of their gargantuan printing project.¹¹ Yet, despite the impending release of information (or misinformation) so damaging to Gardiner's reputation, his temperament was ill-suited for a role as shrinking violet. He and other Lane enemies, both public and private, were hardly inclined to let matters rest.

Gardiner, though out of favor with the War Department, still possessed the means of redressing grievances. He yet held the coveted position of Ohio state printer, even as he discharged federal responsibilities as examiner of Indiana land offices. Moreover, he retained political connections throughout Indiana and Ohio with supporters of William Henry Harrison and Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky. Although the present writer found no evidence that directly linked Gardiner to legislation introduced by Indiana's Congressman Jonathan McCarty in January 1835, it would have been characteristic of Gardiner to make good use of his proto-Whig political connections after receiving the dreadful news that Colonel Abert conveyed to him the previous fall.¹²

As noted earlier, Clay loyalists continued to wield power in Indiana despite the wave of popular support that early in the 1830s swept Amos Lane and a number of other Jackson disciples into national office. Gardiner's own political fortunes would improve in inverse proportion to any loss of support Lane suffered within his local Hoosier constituency. If that was Gardiner's game, he could count on help from several prospective allies in Congress, especially two representatives from Lane's home state. By early 1835, he had, after all, nothing to lose.¹³

The surest path to eroding Amos Lane's base of constituent support lay through embarrassing one on his staunchest Indiana allies, namely Senator John Tipton. Allegations of shady dealings in connection with his tenure as Indian agent in the days that predated President Jackson's Indian removal program still dogged Tipton three years after his 1832 election to the U.S. Senate. Jonathan McCarty, who figured prominently as a source of the allegations, now occupied a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was a longtime enemy of both Lane and Tipton. Although McCarty ran for office as a Jacksonian in 1833, his support for the president's policies was anything but consistent.¹⁴

Serving alongside McCarty from another Indiana district was John Ewing, an unabashed Clay supporter who defeated his nearest Jacksonian rival by a whopping margin of two votes in the 1833 congressional elections. During the second session of the Twenty-third Congress, these two representatives from Indiana joined forces to attack the shortcomings of Andrew Jackson's Indian removal program. That Senator John Tipton still served as a U.S. Indian agent when the program began in 1832 meshed well with their plans; so too did his current membership on the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. Regardless of whether James Gardiner sought political revenge for what passed between him and John Lane during the 1832 Ohio Indian Removal expedition, the course pursued two years later by Representatives McCarty and Ewing could hardly have been better calculated to settle old scores. Predictably standing athwart their path in early 1835 were Amos Lane and several other pro-Jackson members of Congress.¹⁵

At the Delaware breakwater, Lieutenant John Foote Lane was far too busy during the fall and early winter of 1834-1835 to ruminate on past feuds that once plagued the Indian removal program. Results of the inspection conducted by General Jesup and his two colleagues promised to keep Lane busy for the foreseeable future. After completing their assessment in the latter part

of October, committee members packaged a final set of findings and recommendations that they submitted to the secretary of war on the tenth of the following month.¹⁶

In sum, the engineering experts proposed that planned additions to the breakwater structure not already protruding above the ocean's surface should be deferred until after the 1835 construction season. The interlude would create a space wherein "very careful and numerous observations [could be made] to determine the precise amount of enlargement...of all the shoals" that continued to accumulate in the vicinity of the construction site. Of particular interest to John Lane was a recommendation to plot "the direction of the flood and ebb currents" on a *map*. Despite the artillery insignia displayed on his uniform, Lane's credentials as a West Point graduate made him the only technically qualified topographical engineer residing at the breakwater. Accordingly, responsibility for complying with recommendations mandated by the committee's findings soon devolved upon him. During the last quarter of 1834, Lane designed and implemented the new system for making "very careful and numerous observations" called for by the committee. Before the end of January, he felt justified in advancing a number of tentative conclusions.¹⁷

In its own right, the report John Lane subsequently forwarded to General Jesup makes for a unique study in early nineteenth-century civil-military relations. Besides making a plea for congressional perseverance in support of the breakwater construction effort, it incidentally revealed a selective tendency on Lane's part to become emotionally vested in assigned duties. In addition to citing numbers and categories of seagoing vessels that recently "found shelter in the harbor," his report argued that:

it would be a cause of deep regret should the difficulties developed by the recent examination create a prejudice against [completing] the harbor. In a work of such magnitude, involving novel and complicate considerations, time and careful investigation are

essential to its successful prosecution. Fortunately the work [completed to date does not] prevent...such modification of the original plan as...may...be necessary.¹⁸

Secretary of War Lewis Cass, after reviewing Lane's report, attached it to Jesup's recommendations and the findings rendered by the handpicked committee of examiners. Cass then forwarded the entire package to the speaker of the House of Representatives.¹⁹

On February 13, 1835, a Committee of the Whole House gave Lane's administrative spadework on the Delaware breakwater project a permanent place in records maintained by Congress. The need to pass legislation underwriting the project before the House adjourned in early March provided Lane with a pretext for visiting the capitol. The trip marked the high point of his military career. This was just the sort of apolitical Washington notoriety Lieutenant John Foote Lane needed to undergird his professional future. Sadly, less than two weeks later, an unexpected turn of events generated a variety of public recognition far less conducive to career enhancement. It ensued from an unseemly lapse of judgment that stemmed from Lane's perceived obligations under the "gentleman's code."²⁰

In the 1850s, James Henry Lane once faced down a proslavery heckler in Kansas by shouting, "I am a Kentuckian, and recognize the code. Now step off twenty paces and give me my choice of weapons!" If some contemporaries disputed Jim Lane's claim to a Kentucky birthright, his older brother's Bluegrass origins were beyond dispute. It is equally certain that after leaving New York the Lane family adapted well to the customs and mores of the Ohio River country, where they made their new home. In any event, the example set by John in the mid-1830s quite probably reached out from the grave to influence his younger sibling's behavior in Kansas twenty years later. It is hardly surprising that in serial fashion the two brothers

embraced the same code extolled by their father. Congressman Amos Lane, despite his upstate New York origins, went out of his way to cultivate a reputation as a dueler.²¹

Perhaps the elder Lane's bluster about the code duello, both before and after his election to Congress, reflected genuinely held values. It is equally plausible, however, that the example set by Amos Lane amounted to little more than fluff; a variety of showmanship required of a Jacksonian era politician whose constituency was comprised largely of upland southerners only recently settled along the northern shore of the Ohio River. As historian Nicole Etcheson observes, "Since southern emigrants assessed political candidates based on reputation, a politician's most difficult public task was to maintain his good name." Etcheson also incidentally noted the sensitivity of Amos Lane's political ally, Senator John Tipton, to a perceived need to project a public image of "unsullied Honour."²² As a transplanted northerner, the elder Lane self-consciously strove to maintain his good name among upcountry southern neighbors who populated his congressional district. It was only to be expected that his sons acquired values that prevailed both at home and throughout their native region.

With ample justification, historian W. H. Stephenson, writing a half-century before Etcheson, emphasized dueling in his portrayal of Amos Lane's colorful behavior in Congress. "[Representative Henry A.] Wise knows he can gain nothing by picking a quarrel with the member from Indiana," Stephenson records a Mississippian as saying, "for he is known to be a man 'familiar with the fight' in all its shapes, from the Kentucky hug to the ten paces with pistols. He handles his fist and rifle equally well, and is the most thorough and regular bred *tongue lasher* in Congress." Despite a paucity of evidence confirming that Amos Lane ever fought a duel, he was not above alluding to the code in speeches before the House of Representatives.²³ In the long run, such behavior won him little advantage. It ran the risk of

setting volatile dynamics in play that were both unintentional and well beyond the pale of political expediency.

Stephenson averred that “on at least one occasion [Amos] Lane was very unfortunate in the outcome of a personal altercation.” In fact, the historian could have been referring to either of two altercations. One was a running series of verbal exchanges that played out during the last week of January and the first week of February 1835 between Lane and his two aforementioned Indiana colleagues in the House of Representatives. The other was a street-fight that subsequently occurred when John Foote Lane and Congressman John Ewing, an active participant in the earlier House debate involving John’s father, happened to meet on Pennsylvania Avenue.²⁴

For purposes of the present study, the real heart of the matter is whether the later incident ensued as an offshoot of the first. By inferring that such was the case, Stephenson accepted at face value the account left by Ewing, who predictably cast himself as victim and Lieutenant John Lane as perpetrator. Stephenson discounted the possibility that John’s motives might have run deeper than the House debate. Stephenson was partly right in observing that the congressional discussion concerned “an investigation of alleged frauds committed by Indian agents.” Yet, he focused scholarly attention exclusively on the exchange that occurred after the discourse involving Amos Lane sank into a morass of polemics and mutual recrimination. Because the brawl on Pennsylvania Avenue occurred about three weeks after the verbal battle in the House of Representatives, Stephenson, along with several contemporaries of the 1830s, apparently never questioned the presumption that one led to the other.²⁵

At first glance, the connection seems logical. In the heat of debate on January 27, 1835, Amos Lane warned his two home-state tormentors that “when he desired ‘to impugn [their]

motives'...he would do it elsewhere than in that House; he would do it as a gentleman, and not in a manner to protect himself with the splendid walls of that hall." Amos had already been called to order earlier the same day for suggesting that anyone who contradicted his "statement of facts as they existed" would do so at their "peril." Still, historians have hardly noticed that by the time Amos Lane made these bellicose remarks, discussion of Jonathan McCarty's "Indian Reservations" bill had already intermittently dragged on for a week.²⁶

Ironically, all the heat and light subsequently generated by press coverage of the affray on February 26, 1835, wherein canes replaced words as weapons of choice, diverted public attention away from Amos Lane's original substantive objections to McCarty's proposed legislation. A closer reading of those objections lends credence to John Lane's contention that his quarrel with Ewing derived exclusively from private motives that had nothing to do with the rancorous debate in Congress that involved his father.²⁷ That is not to suggest, however, that the younger Lane had no personal interest at stake in the success or failure of McCarty's bill.

In the days before Amos Lane's political grandstanding goaded his two Indiana rivals into retaliation on the House floor, other representatives assumed the lead in opposing McCarty's proposed legislation. The previous year's Senate measure inspired Mississippi Congressman Franklin E. Plummer to speak of redundancy:

At the last session of Congress a call was made by a resolution of the Senate, for part, at least, of the information called for by [McCarty's] resolution...Subsequent to that, a call was made to the same department—the Bureau of Indian Affairs—for the very same correspondence, and the same documents [requested] by the present resolution. That call was made on the 23d of December 1833, and it took...the clerks employed in that department not only [the remainder of] the last session, but also the whole of the recess to respond to it.²⁸

Congressman Plummer observed that the earlier Senate request took up virtually “all the time that could be spared by the four regular clerks in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.” This was not to mention costs that resulted from hiring additional workers to lighten the burden of the small administrative staff who found themselves awash in a sea of Indian removal documents. Plummer further noted that the impending Senate publication, “not yet completed, would comprise six large volumes of upwards of six thousand pages.” Finally, because McCarty wanted the General Land Office to furnish surveys of land located on Indian reservations, his proposed bill exceeded the scope of the 1833 legislation passed by the Senate, and portended publishing an even larger volume of documents. Plummer spoke for Amos Lane and others in concluding “that this call cannot possibly be answered during the present session, nor probably during the recess, without the employment of much additional clerk hire,” and incurring all the attendant costs.²⁹

When supporters of McCarty’s bill countered that money should be no object if the end result was to ferret out individuals who used their official positions to profit from Indian land sales, Representative Jesse A. Bynum of North Carolina averred that “the mass of documents here proposed to be printed... would never be read by ten members” of the House. Samuel W. Mardis of Alabama also weighed in by observing that “Congress has not the power to [turn] itself into a court of chancery for the purpose of [certifying the validity of Indian] contracts... transactions of this nature are properly referable to the judicial tribunals of the country.”³⁰

During the initial discussions of McCarty’s bill, arguments advanced by Plummer, Bynum, and Mardis captured the essence of all the objections Amos Lane cared to raise in a public forum. It only remained for him to swing into line in support of their positions. When McCarty subsequently agreed to refer his bill to the House Committee on Indian Affairs, Amos

declared himself satisfied. This was because, as he explained, “the committee would first enquire if any frauds had been committed, by whom and where, and then call for [only] such papers and information as alone should be indispensable.”³¹ If Lane’s rationale sufficed to serve his public interests in the open forum of Congress, it conveniently obviated any need to address concerns of a more private nature.

From Amos Lane’s personal perspective, channeling prospective fraud allegations through the Committee on Indian Affairs went far in neutralizing the threat that McCarty’s bill posed to Lane family interests. The committee, as an administrative vehicle, would diffuse congressional scrutiny among all the states collectively, thus blunting any designs to focus specifically on Indiana, where Lane’s ally, Senator John Tipton, only recently completed a long tenure as Indian agent. A nuanced committee approach that entailed gathering only “such papers...indispensable” to investigating specific allegations would also drastically diminish chances of John Lane suffering further embarrassment related to his 1832 dispute with James B. Gardiner.³²

During the last two days of February 1835, the seat in Congress normally occupied by John Ewing was conspicuously vacant. On Saturday the twenty-eighth, Ewing penned a public letter to the speaker of the House explaining his absence. Part apology and part indictment, it accused Lieutenant John Foote Lane of assault and battery:

While on my way to my boarding house, after adjournment on the evening of the 26th instant, I was waylaid and assaulted in the most outrageous and dastardly manner, by John F. Lane, a lieutenant in the army, and son of the honorable A. Lane, of Indiana, for no other known cause than for words spoken in debate some weeks since, in reply to his father, on the floor of the House of Representatives... A blow from an iron cane, with a leaden head, accompanied the first notice of his intention to attack me, and was repeated by several others with a violence which, I regret to say...has entirely disabled me from taking my seat.³³

That the *Army-Navy Chronicle* shortly thereafter styled the cane fight on Pennsylvania Avenue an “unpleasant *rencontre*” at least implied a potential that interpretations of the incident might vary. Several distinguished passers-by witnessed the melee, which occurred only five days before Congress adjourned. The timing only increased pressure on prospective members of a very hastily assembled investigating committee.³⁴

In actuality, two separate branches of government—legislative and executive—scrambled to initiate enquiries as the clock ticked down on the Twenty-third Congress. Both moved with commendable alacrity. Another Indiana native, Edward A. Hannegan, chaired the House select committee. Hannegan’s choice of words in announcing that the committee’s purpose was “to investigate and report the facts to the House...of an assault upon the Hon. John Ewing” suggests what may have been a collective inclination to pre-judge the outcome of the inquiry. Even as witnesses were being sworn and deposed, the chairman began drafting his formal report.³⁵

Two singular features marked the select committee’s deliberations. The first was that, although Lieutenant Lane was afforded the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses and present evidence in his own defense, he “gave the committee to understand that he did not feel himself bound to introduce any evidence going to show what his private motives were for the assault upon Mr. Ewing.” Equally singular was the select committee’s decision to forbear making a substantive recommendation relative to whether Lane’s behavior merited punishment. After giving a summary of the affray that closely matched Ewing’s version, Hannegan concluded, “This brief statement embraces the material facts the committee have been able to collect, the brief time allowed not permitting them to proceed further; and as but a few hours of the session [of Congress] remain, they have declined suggesting any steps for the consideration and adoption

of the House.”³⁶ With that, the select committee dropped the matter, leaving the army to wrestle with the awkward issues of guilt, innocence, and justice in Lane’s case.

This probably worked to Lane’s advantage, in part because the military court suffered neither the handicap of imminent adjournment nor the prospect that its members would soon leave Washington. Comprised of three general officers, with Major General Winfield Scott serving as president, the army court of inquiry continued to hear evidence throughout the first week of March. Predictably, its deliberations, as John Lane remarked in so many words, were more thorough and deliberate than the rushed proceedings held under the auspices of the House select committee.³⁷

That the army court convened while the House select committee was still in session speaks for itself relative to the priority assigned it by the country’s top military leaders. Until Congress adjourned, witnesses could shuttle back and forth between their offices in the capitol and Gadsby’s hotel, where the military inquiry was held. In that regard, because John Lane was the focus of both investigations, he was almost obliged to be in two locations at once. The army court adjusted its schedule accordingly, to afford Lane the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses.³⁸

As with most incidents witnessed by several observers, varying versions of “the truth” emerged in the days that followed. Yet, by the end of the first week of March, John Lane struggled under a disadvantage. He already stood convicted in the court of public opinion. Before a summary setting forth his side of the story appeared in the *Washington Globe*, Ewing’s accusatory letter to the House of Representatives had already become a matter of public record. The House select committee report, bearing the same date as Ewing’s letter and entitled “Assault on Mr. Ewing,” made a simultaneous appearance in the national press. Some newspapers, by

subsequently appropriating the by-line, inadvertently tainted Lane in advance with the stigma of aggressor. Before reaching the midpoint of their week-long deliberations on Lane's case, court of inquiry members were already painfully aware that Lieutenant Lane had lost the public information campaign he waged against John Ewing.³⁹

The essential weakness in John Lane's case, before both the select committee and the army court of inquiry, was his refusal to divulge details of the personal cause that impelled him to confront Ewing. In a statement he read to the court on March 6, 1835, Lane averred, "Whatever censure I might deserve should be undiminished by any cause that I did not feel willing to exhibit." More than that, he reminded his auditors "Since the [affray] I have spoken to no one of the causes."⁴⁰ Yet, Lane's insistence that private considerations alone determined his actions is significant.

Any suggestion that personal motives affected John Lane's behavior toward Ewing contradicts the notion that their encounter resulted exclusively from words exchanged between the latter and Lane's father in the House of Representatives. One of two witnesses that testified in support of John Lane, Congressman Robert T. Lytle of Ohio, indicated that Lane had requested him prior to the incident "to present a note to Mr. Ewing...demanding an explanation, or rather a withdrawal, of certain offensive language said to have been used in reference to absent members of his family." The basis of Lane's complaint, continued Lytle, concerned "matters different from the difficulty then supposed to exist between his father and Mr. Ewing."⁴¹

Speaking in the third person, Lane emphasized the same point in his cross-examination of Congressman Lytle: "Did the witness understand from Lt. Lane at the time, that any part of his resentment or complaint against Mr. Ewing, was founded on anything said or done by the latter

in his [capacity] as a member of Congress?” Lytle answered, “Neither from the tenor of the note that was presented to me by Lt. Lane, nor from any explanation which he gave me, could I fairly infer that such was the fact.” When a member of the court then inquired if Lytle had “reason to believe, that the supposed assault...was in consequence of the alleged offensive language of Mr. Ewing against the absent member of Lane’s family,” the Congressman responded that he knew of no other reason behind the confrontation.⁴²

Beyond denying that the affray had nothing to do with any congressional debates involving his father, John Foote Lane tried to convince the military court that he acted solely out of self-defense. The meeting with Ewing, he argued, was a chance encounter. While admitting an intent “to obtain explanation or atonement” for remarks that Ewing made earlier, Lane argued that he merely availed himself...of an accidental personal meeting to ask it.” He had, in other words, approached Ewing on impulse. Since Ewing was known to carry a pistol, when he reached inside his surtout, Lane thought he was reaching for a weapon. At that juncture, said Lane, he first used his cane then his bare hands to ward off repeated thrusts Ewing made with a cane-sword.⁴³

The judgment handed down by the court suggests that Lieutenant Lane’s line of argument, together with witness accounts, worked to his advantage. Still, his actions had tarnished the army’s public image, and simultaneously placed the president in an awkward predicament. General Scott averred, “the court, in common no doubt, with the whole army, probably including lieut. Lane himself, deeply regret the rash transaction.” Although John felt reassured that “the high rank and public consideration of the court, place them above political influence,” its members rejected his contention that his behavior involved “no violation of congressional privilege.”⁴⁴

Regardless of John Lane's intent, his actions misfired in a way that General Scott felt was inconsistent with "the highest importance the people and the states attach to the uninterrupted services of their representatives in...Congress." Thus speaking for the court, Scott allowed that Lane's actions ran counter to "the *spirit*, if not the letter of the Constitution," as well as an article of war that stipulated, "No officer shall use disrespectful words against the Congress of the United States, under the penalty of being severely punished by a court martial." Yet, the court of inquiry would go no farther. It balked at ruling that constitutional constraints prohibiting disrespect towards Congress extended to the circumstances surrounding Lane's case.⁴⁵

At the end of the day, the army's military justice system proved no less phlegmatic than the House select committee's investigation of "the assault on Mr. Ewing." Seeking refuge in the discretionary powers inherent in presidential authority, the court sidestepped the difficult choice of deciding whether Lieutenant John Foote Lane should stand trial by court martial. As General Scott explained,

It may not be proper or expected, that this court should say, that, in its opinion, there is, or is not, ground for sending the case to a general court martial; but whatever may be the impression on this point, it is sincerely hoped that nothing similar will ever again occur for legal investigation, or public censure.⁴⁶

With that wish, officially expressed on March 7, 1835, the army court of inquiry adjourned *sine die* and forwarded John Lane's case to the president of the United States.

Lieutenant Lane's future now rested in the hands of Andrew Jackson. The broader political implications of John Lane's street brawl with John Ewing explain both Jackson's interest in the case and the factors that limited his options. In some respects, what passed between Ewing and Lane in 1835 seemed like an odd caricature of an encounter three years earlier between Sam Houston of Texas and Congressman William Stanbery of Ohio. Although

some aspects of the Houston-Stanberry incident fall outside the scope of the present study, others bear an uncanny similarity to the Lane-Ewing affray. One Indiana historian noted that in 1832 “it was alleged that Jackson had used language relative to the assault made by Houston on Representative Stanbery that was ‘calculated to encourage assaults upon other members of Congress, for words spoken in debate.’”⁴⁷

Although they occurred three years apart, contemporary newspaper accounts parlayed the significance of both episodes into issues of national importance. Following the Houston-Stanberry brawl, the editor of the *United States Telegraph* averred,

What gives more importance to this transaction is the known relation that Houston bears to the President of the United States...although the proof that he contemplated a fraud upon the government is conclusive, yet...he is still received at the Executive Mansion and treated with the kindness and hospitality of an old favorite...We have long since seen that tactics of the Nashville school were to be transferred to Washington and that the voice of truth was to be silenced by the dread of the assassin. But we have not yet taken fear as our counselor.⁴⁸

Three years later, as in 1832, similar journalistic dynamics were in play.

Another relevant similarity between the two incidents was the embarrassment visited on the president by supposed allies who failed to anticipate the public consequences of acting on private impulses.⁴⁹ Well into Jackson’s second term of office, the Lane-Ewing affray came as an untimely surprise. With a fractious presidential campaign looming, Jackson could ill afford even the appearance of condoning violence directed against members of Congress. Whatever paternal affection the president may have felt for John Lane, he had little choice but to distance himself from Lane’s misguided attempt to redress a private grievance by accosting a congressman on the streets of Washington.

Regardless of Lieutenant Lane's undisclosed private motives, he had wandered into a venue where he was out of his depth, where sophism and political intrigue counted for much more than adherence to finer points of the gentleman's code. Houston's 1832 trial in the House of Representatives amounted to little more than a medium for demonstrating his elocutionary skills, and actually helped rejuvenate his flagging political career. Although found "guilty of a contempt in violation of the privileges of this House," he suffered no penalty beyond a formal reprimand.⁵⁰ John Lane, however, was no Sam Houston. He had strayed onto the national stage and stumbled; he must now pay the price.

It was common knowledge that President Jackson was no stranger to dueling. Ironically, his hands were effectively tied by an interpretation of the gentleman's code that, to John Lane's mind, ruled out divulging the private issues that impelled him to accost Ewing on a public street. Lane's recalcitrance left Jackson few options but to admit, "Be the cause what it may, the attack of a military officer...on a member of Congress, during its session, was highly improper, and deserves reproof." Yet, if John's actions limited the president's options, the conservative stance taken earlier by both the House select committee and the army's board of inquiry fortuitously created a modicum of administrative space in which Jackson found room for leniency.⁵¹

The president, through a deft application of his discretionary power, did all that could be done for the hapless lieutenant. The challenge was to insure that Lane received a punishment proportional to his misdeeds. It assumed the guise of a public reprimand and career setback.

Accordingly, Jackson announced:

As neither the committee of the House of Representatives, nor the court of inquiry, by whom the whole matter have been examined, have thought the conduct of lieut. Lane deserving further investigation, the Secretary of War will cause the result to be made known, by general orders, as a public reprimand to lieut. Lane, and

direct him to be relieved from his present duty, and report to his regiment.⁵²

Thus, with the stroke of a pen, the upward momentum of John Lane's professional trajectory stalled, and for the moment at least, his once exemplary career floundered.

Back home in Lawrenceburg James Henry Lane verged on celebrating his twenty-first birthday. As a young adult, he closely monitored the progress of his father's political career and the military exploits of his older brother. These two senior members of the Lane household were role models who inevitably affected his view of the world, and fueled his appetite for adventure, political intrigue, and high achievement.⁵³

Behind Jim Lane's Kansas boast that his Kentucky origins enabled him to understand the code lay the hard lesson learned thirty years earlier when his older brother's pursuit of honor went badly awry. Although no loss of life ensued from John's encounter with Congressman Ewing, his strict adherence to the gentleman's code wrecked his career and caused profound embarrassment to the very family members whose interests he sought to protect. Perhaps this grievous outcome tempered Jim Lane's behavior decades later when Kansas adversaries offended his sense of honor. It would have been typical of John Lane, in his quiet moments, to believe he could hear James B. Gardiner's laughter ringing in the background. John would never live it down.⁵⁴

In future years, recalling March 3, 1835, surely evoked bittersweet memories for the surviving patriarch of the Lane family. On that date, four days after the House select committee announced the result of its investigation into "The Assault on Mr. Ewing," and four days before the army court of inquiry delivered its opinion on John's case, Congress adjourned. Among the laws passed by Congress on its last day in session was an act that provided "additional appropriations for the Delaware Breakwater...for the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-

five.” Shortly thereafter, ever sensitive to congressional interest in curtailing costs, the U.S. attorney general swiftly issued a ruling on the new law. It listed thirteen strictures that would take effect immediately, including a prohibition of “per diem [formerly paid] to the Assistant Engineer at the Delaware Breakwater.” The ruling came only a few days before President Jackson made pay at the breakwater a moot point for one young lieutenant. So it was that John Lane packed his gear at Lewes and returned to a nondescript desk job in Washington. His recent heady days as resident officer in charge of the Delaware breakwater project rapidly faded into nothing more than a golden memory.⁵⁵

If John Lane sacrificed his career on the altar of chivalry and the gentleman’s code, he was hardly bereft of mentors, who continued to demonstrate confidence both in his abilities and potential for making future contributions to the army. That he remained for a time in Washington rather than being ordered immediately to field duty suggests that General Jesup intervened actively in his behalf. At least one strand of continuity linked John’s new assignment with bygone glory days at the Delaware breakwater. While he yet served there, John began turning a novel idea of General Jesup’s into a practical reality. Jesup wanted to explore the potential of inflatable rubber boats for breaching water obstacles. As John later recalled, “On the recommendation of Major General Jesup...the Secretary of War permitted me to make an experimental investigation, which I began in September, 1835.”⁵⁶ It was a sphere of activity that seemed tailor-made to redeem a flagging career. Over the next several months Lane made the most of yet another golden opportunity.

As John Lane set about the daunting task of rebuilding his future in the army, a disgruntled lieutenant colonel of infantry with a very long memory nursed a grudge in the remote reaches of Michigan territory. Zachary Taylor brooded over a perceived miscarriage of justice

so vile as to conjure up the specter of bloody civil war. At Fort Crawford, near present-day Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, Taylor envisioned a near-term future wherein the defenders of constitutional government would be arrayed on one side, against on the other, usurpers who favored concentrating unlimited power in the hands of the nation's chief executive. "I consider it not at all improbable," Taylor explained to Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky, that "a great struggle will take place...at no distant day throughout the country, in which I fear the sword will decide, whether the constitution, or the will of the chief magistrate of the nation, is to be the supreme law of the land." The outcome of John Lane's court of inquiry, Taylor believed, was emblematic of "the manner in which our national affairs have been managed for the last two or three years, without any prospect or even hope of a change for the better."⁵⁷

Colonel Taylor's concern illustrated how seriously some of John Lane's contemporaries, especially including fellow officers, viewed his altercation with Ewing. Taylor obviously thought that it boded ill for the army as well as the nation at large. He interpreted the light punishment Lane received as proof that Andrew Jackson abused his powers as chief executive. Colonel Taylor suggested to Senator Crittenden that the details of John Lane's case should give Henry Clay and his supporters cause for alarm. Clay had recently averred that he "considered the army sound to the core."⁵⁸ Taylor argued that Lane's brashness, together with the verdict subsequently handed down by the officers who heard his case, proved Clay's assessment to be fundamentally flawed. To Zachary Taylor's mind, the judgments rendered by the military court:

were made or given principally with the...intention of pleasing the incumbent of the white house. The merits of the case...were in a great measure, if not entirely lost sight of, or overlooked by the court; and I have not a doubt had Lt. L[ane] assaulted any other member of the opposition, under the same or any other circumstances, he would have been protected, if not justified, by said court [in order to avoid] the president's displeasure. It is therefore time for such members [of Congress] who do not support

the measures of the [Jackson] administration to...be at all times prepared, to protect themselves from similar outrages.⁵⁹

Thus did Taylor's misgivings in late 1835 echo allegations made three years earlier in the aftermath of the scandal precipitated by Sam Houston. After predicting that Martin Van Buren's election to the presidency in 1836 might be the last peaceful canvass the country would see for a long while, Taylor averred that no one could predict the final outcome of events.⁶⁰ By the time James Henry Lane and Zachary Taylor crossed paths during the Mexican War, Jim's older brother would be long dead. The intervening span of years would surely be too short for Taylor to forget his initial impressions of the Lane family. They were all negative, perhaps to the extent of influencing how he perceived events in the later conflict.

Scandal or no scandal, life plodded on as usual in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, where in 1835, Jane Lane Huntington informed her husband, "There is nothing in town to interest anyone. They vegetate, and that is all."⁶¹ Still, in the political space occupied by the extended Lane family, identifying what constituted normalcy posed certain challenges. The St. Clairs, of course, were highly pleased that Arthur had resumed his former duties as register of the Indianapolis land office. Elisha Mills Huntington, ensconced in his Terre Haute legal practice, faced an uncertain political future.

A year earlier Elisha told Jane that he was "more and more inclined to abjure politics, for some years, at any rate. I would rather be at the head of a bar than of Congress." For a time, the prospect of a judicial appointment by Indiana's pro-Clay governor, Noah Noble, seemed so bright that he sat out the August 1834 Indiana state elections. However, with the election season come and gone, Huntington learned that the prosecuting attorney job went to another candidate.⁶²

In the months that followed Elisha's marriage to Jane Lane in October 1833, Huntington spent time in Washington serving as a de facto political adjutant to his father-in-law. While in

the capitol, Elisha's efforts to have Arthur St. Clair reinstated at the Indianapolis land office may well have cost him his coveted appointment. Vainly he struggled to straddle fences at a time when Indiana politics was rapidly polarizing into factions that either supported or opposed Andrew Jackson's presidency. About two weeks after the elections of August 1834, Huntington shared his feelings with his new brother-in-law, John Lane:

I am not in the [state] legislature at this coming season. I declined another election with a view to take the office of prosecuting Attorney for my circuit—and because I have somewhat wearied with the strife of politics. Gov. Noble, however, after delaying the appointment until the election [was] over, conferred it on another, after twice solemnly promising to give it to me. I believe... Gov. N. has been determined from the time of my connection with your family, I have no doubt, to give me a thrust, but yet I had some confidence in him. I have made it a rule never to receive such a blow unrequited—a blow of that kind—and the time will come when if he has any conscience, I can make him feel the sting of remorse.⁶³

On balance, family fortunes improved the following year, and prospects at a personal level proved especially gratifying. Elisha Huntington divided his time between a thriving legal practice in Terre Haute, and periodic trips to Lawrenceburg or Indianapolis where respectively Jane spent months under the watchful care of a mother and sister determined to protect her perennially delicate health. As noted earlier, the St. Clairs thrived once again, in consequence of Arthur's reinstatement to his land office position. By August 1835, Huntington was no longer disposed to wait on the governor's good pleasure for an appointive office. Instead, he ran for another term in the Indiana House of Representatives. His father-in-law, meanwhile, was up for reelection to Congress.⁶⁴

Both Amos Lane and his son-in-law attained their political goals. Jane Lane Huntington observed beforehand that the elder Lane, "very sanguine of his election," thought he would get a "larger majority than in the first election." Omnipresent in everyone's mind was the knowledge

that John Ewing was also running for reelection in his district. “How is Ewing’s election,” Jane asked her husband. “Will he be defeated? I hope so, and will you be elected?”⁶⁵ Elisha waxed both candid and philosophical in his response. On election eve he mused,

Unless I am greatly deceived, I am safe. Should however the event show that I am mistaken, I have made up my mind to bear it with as good a grace as I can. I confess I should feel mortified, but after all it would be but an unimportant matter so far as the world is concerned, and perhaps so far as you and I are concerned. Tomorrow! Alas, how many high hopes will be forever cut down by the events of tomorrow! Tomorrow will be a warm day with us, but I trust that the sun will go down [with] the “fortunes of our house” still advancing.⁶⁶

Just as he formerly sought Arthur St. Clair’s reinstatement at the expense of his own political prospects, in 1835 Huntington assigned Amos Lane’s election a priority of transcendent importance in advancing long-term family interests:

I have thought deeply upon the result of your father’s election. I trust that he is safe, for were I to surrender up either, I would gladly encounter defeat myself to ensure his reelection. To be sure if he is beaten, it will be nothing more than one of the accidents that all political men are subject to; but it would be *more* than gratifying to see success again perch upon his banner. After that, he can control his own political destiny as he pleases. *My* defeat would do me no other harm than to mortify me a little—perhaps a good deal, but I could get over that you know.⁶⁷

Surely James Henry Lane, less than two months after celebrating his twenty-first birthday in 1835, swelled with pride that August upon learning that not only had his father been reelected to Congress, but also that his kid sister’s new husband had won a fourth term in the lower house of the Indiana legislature. All six incumbent Democrats won reelection to Congress, while John Ewing, the sole proto-Whig candidate, (pejoratively referred to as “Old Knoax” by his opponents) went down to defeat in his home district. Amos Lane’s victory in the district that

included Dearborn County proved that his son's altercation with Ewing the previous winter produced no lasting ill effects among his own local constituents.⁶⁸

As the summer of 1835 shaded into fall, Lieutenant John Foote Lane learned that the Huntingtons were expecting their first child. Meanwhile the Buells also anticipated another addition to their growing family. In October 1835, John Foote Lane became a godfather to the Buell's fifth child, John Foote Lane Buell. That happy event, coupled with the fact that his kid sister was expecting, probably cheered John Lane and precipitated a thaw in relations with his family. The chill had persisted since the debacle with Ewing the previous February.⁶⁹

Lane perhaps felt that the altercation tainted the family name; or sensed that the timing of the affray coincidentally jeopardized his father's and brother-in-law's chances of being elected. At any rate, over the winter and spring of 1835, Lane's communications with his Indiana kin came so near to a standstill that in June his sister complained, "We have heard nothing from John. He never has written home since the difficulty with Ewing."⁷⁰ Things brightened considerably in the fall glow of victorious elections and extended family preparations for two new additions.

Unfortunately this happy season endured for only a short time. Perennially strapped for cash, John demurred sending a baby gift to mark John Foote Lane Buell's arrival in the world. The boy's father then made the mistake of commenting on his brother-in-law's chronic financial embarrassment. At that point Lieutenant Lane probably overreacted, chiding George Buell for his seeming insensitivity:

You richly deserve a scolding for twitting me with my poverty—for converting my pleasantness on my own want of means into a bitter sarcasm; on my inability to make even the usual trifling present to an infant namesake. You are right, though. Perhaps I deserve it—poor devil that I am—whom the most careful self-denying economy only enables to get through the year.⁷¹

John provided his Lawrenceburg kin further insight into his state of mind by venting even darker thoughts. “I am sorry,” he told Buell, that “you regret having named your son after one so undeserving of such a kind recognition... whose only claim to it is the affection he bears to your wife and yourself.” John then suggested that George and Ann Lane Buell should consider changing “the name of your little son if another would suit you better. It was a compliment I did not merit—one which... my own impertinence and importunity wrung from my sister—I shall not regard him with... less affection.”⁷² He was in Boston at the time, but promised to give a more thorough exposition on a whole range of topics upon returning to Washington.⁷³ However, contingency soon preempted Lieutenant Lane’s plans, along with those of friends and detractors alike. All were overtaken by news that a new and unexpected Indian war had broken out in Florida.

Well might John Lane have identified with its root cause: an acceleration of President Jackson’s Indian removal program.⁷⁴ The Florida Seminoles were highly indignant over the white man’s interpretation of a removal timetable vaguely alluded to in the Treaty of Payne’s Landing and the Treaty of Fort Gibson. They balked when officials within Jackson’s administration insisted on their immediate departure for designated lands west of the Mississippi. The war began in December 1835, when a combined force of Seminoles and erstwhile black slaves successfully ambushed a column of U.S. soldiers attempting to reinforce a small garrison near present-day Ocala, Florida. Only four of over a hundred troopers survived.⁷⁵

The imminent prospect of a protracted guerrilla conflict temporarily eclipsed Andrew Jackson’s Indian removal policies. For the time being, the country’s senior military leaders focused virtually all of their attention on the army’s Department of the South. By early spring

1836, the groundwork had already been laid for organizing a new regiment of dragoons tailored to carry the fight to a stealthy opponent ideally adapted to operating in the most forbidding terrain imaginable. Competition was predictably fierce among the army's small corps of regular officers to fill the limited number of prospective regimental positions.⁷⁶ General Thomas Jesup had not forgotten Lieutenant Lane.

Jesup's mentorship aside, other factors also contributed to John Lane's selection for a captaincy. These included an ability to handle a horse, nurtured from his youth, and refined during his tenure as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy; his undeniable credentials as an engineer whose most recent invention promised to give the army an advantage in bridging water obstacles in the Florida swamps; and practical experience gained during the aborted 1832 removal of Choctaw Indians. On June 15, 1836, the army adjutant general's office published General Orders No. 38, formally creating the Second Regiment of United States Dragoons. It designated J.F. Lane as the commander of Company C. He was subsequently appointed as Jesup's aide-de-camp. Mid-June found Jesup in the field in Florida.⁷⁷ John Foote Lane was there with him.

So caught up was John Lane in the swirl of events that attended the outbreak of the Second Seminole War that he once again temporarily lost contact with family and friends back in Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Nonetheless a personal tragedy soon unfolded there that determined, perhaps even more than the war itself, the remaining course of his life's trajectory. After an entry made on May 21, 1834, a yawning gap appears in the diary kept by John's mother. Three-and-a-half-years later, finally taking pen-in-hand again in January 1838, Mary Foote Howse Lane explained, "such has been the change in my family I have waited for strength to put it on paper."⁷⁸

April 1836, the incidental mid-point in the diary's interregnum, was the month that Jane Lane Huntington's pregnancy came to term. Following the 1835 elections she and Elisha kept house in Indianapolis until the state legislature adjourned in February. Then, according to her mother, they "returned to the paternal roof." Meanwhile, her husband along with the rest of the Lane men journeyed to Washington, where Amos Lane had just begun serving his second term in Congress. Jane was troubled by the prospect of being separated from Elisha that late in her pregnancy. Her mother believed that she "had a presentiment that she would not survive her confinement."⁷⁹

On April 22, 1836, Jane celebrated her nineteenth birthday. By that time, her husband had returned from his trip to Washington, but almost immediately left for Terre Haute again to confront an accumulating backlog of legal cases. On the twenty-seventh, according to Mary Lane, Jane "became the mother of a promising daughter." About a week later, however, she fell ill. Her condition seemed to improve for a few days until May 17, 1836, when she suddenly suffered a final relapse. Jane Lane Huntington died before the family had time to summon a physician, leaving, as her mother recalled, "an infant daughter one day less than three weeks old." James Henry Lane incidentally had returned from his first trip to Washington just in time to be on-hand for the death of his younger sister. He would turn twenty-two in less than a month.⁸⁰

Several weeks passed before Lieutenant John Foote Lane, then serving with the army somewhere in Alabama, learned of Jane's death. The tragedy occurred, by Mary Lane's account, at about the time "John had a call to go to Florida with General Jesup." By his mother's reckoning, "it was nearly two months ere he received the shocking intelligence." The shock probably came sometime during the last week of July, in the midst of a career comeback best

described as meteoric. John Lane began 1836 as a lieutenant; by mid-year he was a captain of dragoons, and by early fall, as a brevet lieutenant colonel, he assumed command of a volunteer regiment of mounted Creek Indians.⁸¹

Late August found Lane on the banks of the Tallapoosa River, near Tallassee, Alabama. There he formally demonstrated his new pontoon bridge invention to an army board of officers chaired by a general Tennessee volunteers. The examining board declared Lane's creation "far superior to all former [pontoon] equipages about which they have any knowledge of information." A second demonstration ensued in mid-September about sixty miles further east, on the Chattahoochee River, near Columbus, Georgia.⁸²

What most impressed the two boards about Lane's bridge was its obvious superiority to anything in the contemporary inventory of British bridging equipment. The English version then in use required seventeen four-horse wagons to carry the necessary components, "while the whole of Col. Lane's was conveyed in a single wagon." That his bridge could be assembled by only a few men was a second advantage. Official observers unanimously agreed "that provisions be made for [the pontoon bridge's] introduction into the military service of the United States."⁸³

It was unfortunate for not only his personal legacy, but also for the future of the army, that by his own hand John Lane consigned his technological brain-child to oblivion. Although he informed the Tallassee examining board of his intent "to present [the invention] to foreign military services...as soon as my duties in the field will permit," it was not to be.⁸⁴ The October 26, 1836 issue of the *Charleston Courier* reported,

Lieut. Col. Lane, commanding the detachment of friendly 750 Creek Warriors, arrived at Tampa Bay, fought his way to the Withlacoochee, having had two skirmishes with the Seminoles and burnt their villages—was ordered to Fort Drane by Governor Call, and two hours after arrival there, (about the 20th instant) committed suicide by putting the hilt of his sword on the ground, and running

the point through the corner of the eye into the brain—no cause assigned—Lieut. Col. Brown will succeed him.⁸⁵

Except for a nominal variance in dates, other contemporary accounts essentially corroborate the details published in the *Courier*. Mary Lane, of course, kept precise track of the dates involved. John Lane, she recorded, took his own life on October 19, 1836, five months and two days after his sister died.⁸⁶

Given the gruesome nature of the incident, it is small wonder that Mary Lane noted that John “followed his sister—by a death so calamitous—a mother’s pen must pass it by. A cloud of mystery envelopes it—and so it must remain until the secrets of all hearts are laid open.” In light of his recent achievements, Lieutenant Lane’s death made little sense to his colleagues. *Niles’ Weekly Register* ventured “no conjecture...as to the cause.” A centennial history of West Point simply stated that “John F. Lane, Second Dragoons, while serving as colonel of the regiment of Creek volunteers, killed himself by falling on his sword during a fit of temporary insanity.” Perhaps, however, the musings of people who were emotionally closest to John Lane in life should weigh more heavily than others in ascribing the actual cause of his death.⁸⁷

Twenty-first century historian Ian Spurgeon notes that John’s younger brother, George W. Lane, “was convinced...based on accounts [he] had obtained...that John had accidentally collapsed on his own sword during a headache-induced fainting spell, from which he had been known to suffer.”⁸⁸ Mary Lane’s account is perhaps more convincing, if formerly invisible to historians. The turn-of-phrase she used to describe how John “followed his sister” to the grave is significant. For their mother further observed that “after [Jane’s death] was made known to him, he wrote to his father that so strong was his attachment to [Jane] that he could not bear to think of his sister roaming alone in an unknown world without a brother to guard her.”⁸⁹ Lieutenant

John Foote Lane, ever protective and solicitous of his kid sister's welfare in life, joined her in the spirit realm for a final, unceasing tour on guard duty.

A few weeks after his death, *Niles Weekly Register* published a retrospective of John's career. In part it read,

Col. Lane was a young man of high attainments and promise—was indefatigable in his pursuits, and full of mental and personal energy. He had the entire confidence of his commander, Gen. Jesup, who entrusted him with the delicate and highly responsible separate command which he led into Florida. This dreadful termination of his career is still a heavier blow to his unhappy father, the Hon. Amos Lane, who had received intelligence of the death of an accomplished daughter, just before the close of the last session of Congress.⁹⁰

John Lane and Jane Lane Huntington were both gone, but their memories remained omnipresent in the minds of grieving family members. This was especially true of James Henry Lane. The deaths of Jane and John bracketed his twenty-second birthday, leaving an emotional scar that never healed. More than once Jim Lane told Kansas audiences of the older sibling who “fell” during the Seminole War, and was like a son to President Andrew Jackson. Yet, Jim really knew the details of how his brother died in Florida. In July 1866 observers noted that in the days leading up to his own suicide, Lane babbled unintelligibly about the way John's life ended thirty years earlier. After the searing twin tragedies of 1836, things would never be the same.⁹¹

CHAPTER ELEVEN

The Great Transition: 1836 – 1845

The deaths in 1836 of Amos Lane's eldest son and youngest daughter both decimated and devastated his family, understandably leaving his wife, Mary, inconsolable. The abrupt and prolonged lapse in diary entries and paucity of letters that formerly flowed so freely from her pen testified to the toll taken by the twin tragedies on Mary Lane's emotions. It was bad enough that Jane died from the risks that sadly inhered with childbirth in the early 1830s; but John Lane's death in the field while engaged in a military campaign meant burial in the faraway wilds of Florida, "where a mother's tears can never moisten the sod that covers him." That, together with the knowledge that he had committed suicide, magnified Mary's sense of grief. If her observation that John "ended a life so dear to all who knew him" might only be expected from a grieving mother, surviving evidence suggests that his mourners included a circle of friends and colleagues that extended well beyond the bounds of immediate family.¹

The mourners were not all white. The exigencies of the Second Seminole War left little time for sentiment. Yet an army officer present at Lieutenant Colonel Lane's funeral recalled the words spoken by a Creek chief whom soldiers called Jim Boy:

It was to be regretted that their white brother had left them so soon but there was no use lamenting his decease, for all here below, the white man as well as the red, had a certain race to be fulfilled, and these must be accomplished. Their white brother had fulfilled his, and now the Great Spirit had called him away from among them.²

John Lane committed suicide only a short time after leading his regiment of Creek Indian auxiliaries in a brief but violent engagement at Tampa Bay. There, according to one account, "He was much exposed during the action, and his life was at one time probably saved by a Mr.

Kelley, of the regulars, who, seeing an Indian taking aim at the Colonel, threw himself before his officer, and received the [bullet] in his own body.” If Kelley’s sacrifice is any indication, John Lane was well thought of by his subordinates. In the years that followed, Mary Lane penned more than one eulogy to her lost son; she remembered to mention Kelley of the regulars.³

Among those left behind whose races in life had yet to be run were three young men then residing in Dearborn County, Indiana. Two were John’s younger brothers, George and Jim, both in their early twenties at the time of his death. A third, Don Carlos Buell, was destined to become a Union general in the Civil War. Since youth, Carlos had resided on a farm just outside Lawrenceburg with his uncle, George Pearson Buell. The latter, as previously noted, had married Amos Lane’s daughter, Ann, and raised a sizeable family. Since the three boys, Don Carlos Buell, George Lane, and Jim Lane, all lived in close proximity to Lawrenceburg, Don Carlos for all practical purposes belonged to two households simultaneously, those of his paternal uncle and Amos Lane. Because that was true, Don Carlos would have possessed first-hand knowledge regarding the turbulent course of Lieutenant John Lane’s ill-starred military career during his last eighteen months on earth. At the time of John’s death in the mid-1830s, the three surviving young men of the two combined households had all reached a ripe age for choosing their respective life vocations.⁴

George, the second male child born to Amos and Mary Foote Howse Lane, in 1835 moved a few miles downriver to Aurora, Indiana after a three-year stint as a partner in George Buell’s mercantile business. Soon after arriving in Aurora, he immersed himself in efforts to construct a rail line that eventually connected Lawrenceburg to the state capitol in Indianapolis. About a year after George Lane took up railroading, Jim Lane and George Buell mutually agreed to dissolve the mercantile partnership they established in the aftermath of the Black Hawk War.

By early 1836, perhaps wary of the army because of difficulties that bedeviled his older brother's career, Jim Lane followed his father's example by gravitating toward the related professions of law and politics. It is perhaps also significant that he chose politics after making his first trip to Washington in early 1836, just as Amos Lane embarked on a second term as U.S. Congressman. Yet Jim Lane eschewed spending his entire visit in the nation's capitol. In the weeks that immediately preceded his sister's death, Jim and his brother George made a side trip to New York, where they renewed acquaintances with their trans-Adirondack Davies kin.⁵

Don Carlos Buell, related by marriage to the Lane family through a stepmother only about ten years older than himself, was halfway through his eighteenth year of life in October 1836 when John Lane died. As historian Stephen D. Engle observed, "It was during these years that either Buell began to think about the military or his uncle considered it for him." Although Don Carlos clerked at a Lawrenceburg mercantile establishment owned by John P. Dunn, another Lane relative, between 1834 and 1837, something about army life apparently appealed to young Buell. Engle suggested that Carlos' interest reflected either "a pathetic search for the family he never had," or alternatively, that George Buell "may have wanted his nephew to have the advantages of a college education and the discipline of military life."⁶ The circumstances surrounding both John's living example, and his untimely death, offer additional insight into why Carlos decided to attend the U.S. Military Academy. Only a short span of time separated the two events. Amos Lane forwarded a letter formally recommending Carlos' admittance to West Point roughly two months after John's demise.⁷

This study has already shown that by the time of his death, John Lane was well known throughout the army, in part because of the scandal that surrounded his affray with Congressman John Ewing in February 1835, but also because of the notoriety garnered by demonstrating his

pontoon bridge-train invention during the Second Seminole War. Since Lane's graduation from West Point in 1828, his cousin, Charles Davies, closely monitored the progress of John's stormy career, just as he tracked the careers of other former prodigies who once taught in his math department.⁸

No sooner had John Lane graduated than, thanks largely to his uncle's influence, he became part of the mathematics faculty at West Point. Both men left their mark on the army. By the last quarter of 1836, Charles Davies had reached the pinnacle of a decade-and-a-half tenure at the academy, having published eight mathematics textbooks in eleven years. A Davies family history, though probably true in what it relates, does not tell quite the whole truth in noting that,

In the year 1836 his health, which had been much impaired by close attention to his duties, and by overwork, required that he should for a time abandon active labor. He resigned his position at West Point and traveled to Europe, partly for rest and recreation, and also for the purpose of studying to advantage the latest advances of the science in which he was interested, and of investigating the best foreign methods of instruction.⁹

A more recent West Point history similarly suggests that "not surprisingly, the effort of producing eight books in eleven years left Davies exhausted. He resigned in May of 1837 to tour Europe, restore his health, and then 'continue to write and revise wildly successful mathematics textbooks.'"¹⁰

Indeed by the end of 1836, mental exhaustion probably did compromise Charles Davies's physical condition. However, neither the West Point study nor the Davies family memoir considers the possibility that the death of a favorite cousin may have been a factor that contributed to the totality of Davies' mental impairment. In October 1836, news of John's death struck the head of the academy's math department like a bolt out of the blue. He surely knew of the bitter professional fruits John Lane reaped from the 1835 caning incident involving

Congressman John Ewing. Davies also would have been apprised of Jane Lane Huntington's passing, which occurred only shortly after George and Henry Lane visited New York. In late 1836, John Lane's ignominious self-inflicted death in the midst of a seemingly amazing career comeback proved too much for a solicitous cousin to bear. It was probably more than mere coincidence that Amos Lane's letter to the acting secretary of war, requesting Don Carlos Buell's admission to West Point, arrived in Washington after John Lane's death but before Charles Davies's resignation from the academy became effective.¹¹

Years later, Mary Lane, during one of her frequent bouts of maternal nostalgia, averred that "John was his country's pride and would have been his country's honor." Her observation, though understandably tinted by emotion, contained a substantial measure of truth. If John Lane was dead, the pontoon invention he perfected lived on, permanently lodged in the army's institutional memory. Falling short of formal adoption, it survived through the agency of several self-appointed stewards who recognized its potential for outmaneuvering future adversaries. Evolving bridging technologies represented one dimension of an ongoing competition between the United States and European powers to improve their military capabilities. The same 1836 issue of the *Army and Navy Chronicle* that reported Lane's skirmish with Seminole warriors at Tampa Bay also argued that his pontoon boat invention held far more promise for bridging water obstacles than a competing British prototype.¹²

A full three years after John's death, another edition of the same journal implicitly confirmed an almost universal familiarity with Lane's name, at least within military circles. In 1839, a mounted patrol departed remote Fort Leavenworth against the Otoe Indians. Proceeding westward, the dragoons presently reached the banks of the Platte River:

This river...was fordable by horses, but its bed abounding in quicksands rendered the crossing entirely impractical [for] loaded

wagons. An opportunity was thus offered of testing the utility of Capt. Lane's admirable application of India rubber to purposes of military economy. A small box of little weight, containing a boat capable of transporting about 1500 pounds weight across a rapid stream, having been brought with us, the cylinders were inflated and the boat launched. It is almost superfluous, after the many testimonials in its favor, to say that the boat answered all the purposes of its invention...[in a way that] must give it entire precedence over every other kind of ponton [sic] yet offered to the consideration of the military public.¹³

That same year another observer, concerned lest an Englishman might receive credit for an invention created by an American, made a comment that might easily have issued from the pen of John Lane's mother: "Justice to the memory of one of the brightest ornaments of his profession, requires that the matter should be put right, and the character of the invention is of sufficient importance to reflect honor upon the country of its projector."¹⁴

By the time this glowing testimonial to John Lane's work appeared in print, his surviving relatives were well on their way to restarting their lives. Don Carlos Buell was midway through his tour as a West Point cadet, and James Henry Lane had already occupied the position of postmaster at Lawrenceburg for over a year. That he basked in the glow of a *federal* appointment testified to the unwavering loyalty of both Jim Lane and his father to the course charted by the national Democratic party.¹⁵

The presidential election year of 1836 did not bode well for Jacksonian Democrats in Indiana who hoped for great things in the following year's congressional elections. U.S. Congressman Amos Lane was no exception. The outcome of Indiana's 1836 canvass prefigured what happened in the national contest four years later. William Henry Harrison, the Whig presidential candidate, and Francis Granger, Harrison's vice-presidential running mate, carried Indiana with nearly fifty-six percent of the popular vote, compared with forty-four percent garnered by Andrew Jackson's designated successor, Martin Van Buren, and his Democratic

party sidekick, Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky. As personal friends and political allies of Johnson, the Lanes would have preferred his selection as their party's standard bearer. Nonetheless, when the Democrats chose Martin Van Buren as their nominee, the Lanes campaigned hard to secure what turned out to be the New Yorker's successful bid for the White House.¹⁶

Yet success at the national level in 1836 failed to translate into a victory in Indiana, where Van Buren's popularity proved no match for Harrison's. Amos Lane's support of the new president probably contributed to the loss of his congressional seat a year later, when he was defeated by George H. Dunn, another Lane relative who one newspaper described as "a solid, undemonstrative attorney from the old Lawrenceburg bar." Thanks largely to the economic Panic of 1837, that year's congressional elections in Indiana centered on the state's financial condition, which Amos Lane viewed as "fearful and alarming."¹⁷

In the early stages of the economic downturn, Indiana's Whig governor as well as its Whig-dominated legislature avoided negative political consequences of the Internal Improvement System of 1836, a comprehensive and originally bipartisan economic agenda designed to improve the state's transportation infrastructure. Critics of the nine-point plan, including Amos Lane, focused less on its individual components than the legislature's failure to provide for completing projects incrementally, an option that would have prioritized them within an overarching framework to allow for fluctuations in Indiana's dwindling financial resources. According to one Indiana historian,

...the System of 1836 rested on a weak and fragile foundation from its adoption. The legislative session of 1836-1837 wisely declined to add works to the system, but it also declined to classify the system, so that a few of [the projects] could be completed...[before] all had been finished. Whether the System of 1836, or at least a substantial part of it, could have been completed

had prosperity continued for several more years is a moot question. But the impact of the Panic of 1837, commencing in May and followed by disruption in the financial markets, reduced the prospect for a successful return across the Rubicon.¹⁸

The wreck of the System of 1836 eventually provided Amos Lane a platform in the Indiana House of Representatives from which he could launch attacks against a Whig power structure hegemonic in state politics since the mid-1820s. For the time being, however, he was compelled to sit on the sidelines while erstwhile colleagues, both state and national, took center stage in debating the great issues of their day. Perhaps this was just as well. Still reeling from the loss of their eldest son and youngest daughter, the former congressman and his wife contended with a deluge of personal issues.¹⁹

One urgent preoccupation involved making suitable permanent living arrangements for their motherless grandchild, “Little Jane” Lane Huntington. Characteristically, the extended family stepped in to help. The St. Clairs, childless since their marriage in 1825, agreed to raise Little Jane as their own. Perhaps because of this pressing personal consideration, Arthur St. Clair, bringing the Lanes into his confidence, quietly prepared to conclude his hard-won tenure at the Indianapolis land office. In mid-January 1838, St. Clair submitted his resignation and returned to Lawrenceburg. No one at the time realized that while making these preparations, he neared the end not only of his professional career, but also his life.²⁰

Sadly, neither Arthur St. Clair nor his adoptive daughter had long to live. On January 14, 1840, four-year-old Jane Lane Huntington succumbed to scarlet fever almost two years to the day after Arthur resigned from his land office position. About a year after “Little Jane’s” death, her surrogate father fell prey to a chronic illness. St. Clair’s mother-in-law later recorded in her diary that on August 24, 1841, he “sweetly fell asleep in the arms of his redeemer.” Thus two more family members with close bonds of affection to James Henry Lane passed out of his life

forever. St. Clair, formerly a familiar face among Jackson supporters in Indianapolis as well as others outside the state, had long been a pillar of Lane political interests in southern Indiana. He was thirty-eight years old when he died.²¹

During the late 1830s, death also stalked one of Amos Lane's staunchest political allies. In 1838, John Tipton, elected to the U.S. Senate the year before Lane won his seat in Congress, declined running for reelection. As one historian has observed, "The Whigs were in complete control of the Indiana legislature in 1838 and neither a dyed-in-the-wool Jacksonian, nor a halfway Jacksonian, such as Tipton, had a chance of being elected to the Senate." As with Amos Lane, "Tipton's personal interests had suffered during his absence in Washington and now they called for his attention." The difference was that Lane's political career had been temporarily interrupted. Tipton did not live to see William Henry Harrison elected president. He died on April 5, 1839, after losing his wife the previous February.²²

Shortly after John Lane's death, as historian W. H. Stephenson observed, James H. Lane assumed the role of "able political lieutenant" to his father. Between 1836 and 1839 he sat on Lawrenceburg's town council and served as postmaster and town recorder. Meanwhile, Amos Lane "had no intention of retiring from politics." Despite the long-standing Whig ascendancy in Indiana and an overwhelming burden of personal loss, Amos in 1839 ran for and won a seat in the twenty-fourth session of the state General Assembly. Because these annual sessions typically met only during the mid-winter months, plenty of time remained for members to pursue their private occupations. For the Lane family patriarch, that meant practicing law. By 1840, his son, James Henry, could mind the office during periods that required Amos' presence at the state capitol. After working for awhile as his father's apprentice, Jim Lane, then twenty-six years of age, was admitted to the Indiana bar. Having abandoned the mercantile trade after John's death

four years earlier, Jim methodically began laying a foundation on which he could build a future in politics.²³

With considerably less fanfare than his father-in-law, in 1836—the same year that John Lane and Jane Lane Huntington died—George Pearson Buell inauspiciously launched a political career of his own in a forlorn bid to attend the twenty-first session of the Indiana House of Representatives. This study already noted a remark Buell made previously to John Lane, his now-deceased brother-in-law, vowing an intention “to remain through life endeavoring to make my wife happy, to educate my children [and] finally to leave them a comfortable home.” For a time at least, success crowned his efforts. A local history records that “he was not a partisan from love or desire for office... in later years Mr. Buell amassed a handsome competency.” Though interested in public affairs, Buell charted a course that presumed a local focus and maintaining local ties. Consequently he never exhibited the thirst for strident partisan politics that set his Lane kindred in Lawrenceburg apart from their contemporaries.²⁴

Between December 2, 1839, and the end of February, 1840, Amos Lane served his final term in the Indiana General Assembly. Although he and his wife were now both in their sixties, he kept any indications of impending retirement strictly out of public view. Indiana still suffered from the Panic of 1837 and, more parochially, from its own failed system of internal improvements. Although Amos earlier caught the internal improvements fever himself, the ascendant Whigs were now most vulnerable in the economic sphere, and it was against this exposed political flank that Lane predictably launched a series of attacks over the winter of 1839-40 that produced telling effects.²⁵

As chairman of the Committee on Canals and Improvements, he preached a gospel of fiscal retrenchment while relishing the opportunity “to expose...the perpetual fraud and villainy

of [Whig Governor Noah Noble and his successor, David Wallace] and their party men.” Lane’s vehicle for achieving this end was an eighteen-page report on internal improvements formally submitted to the Indiana House of Representatives. Before composing it, he vowed privately to “lay-in at the root and trim-out every branch and twig and gardener of the [moribund] System.” He was as good as his word.²⁶

Not until the closing weeks of 1841—after a period of prolonged mourning that followed the deaths of “Little Jane” Huntington and Arthur St. Clair—did Mary Foote Lane muster sufficient emotional strength to record thoughts in her diary. Still, her entries prove that this period in her life, and that of her husband, was not exclusively about personal loss and political retribution. Their two surviving sons, George and James Henry Lane, already embarked on new careers, respectively set about finding their future wives. Characteristically summarizing the most notable events of the past forty-two months, Mary Lane noted the March 1840 marriage of George to Sally Buell, the sister of Don Carlos, and granddaughter of Judge Salmon Buell, the patriarch who, like Amos Lane, abandoned his native New York in the early 1800s, to settle his family on the banks of the Ohio.²⁷

Mary Lane also recorded the November 1841 marriage of her youngest son, James Henry, to Mary Elizabeth Baldrige of Youngstown, Pennsylvania. During her courtship with her prospective husband, Mary Elizabeth suggested that Jim Lane’s religious scruples were rather more genuine and less politically motivated than some of his future detractors cared to acknowledge. She recollected occasions “when we used to go to the Methodist Church to sing psalms together.” In due course, after the wedding, Mary Elizabeth Baldrige Lane’s mother-in-law, a devout Methodist, declared herself “very happy” about her son’s choice of a life partner. In July 1843, Mary Foote Lane was even more pleased when her new daughter-in-law joined the

same church that Jim Lane had joined more than ten years earlier. “How happy it made me,” the elder Mrs. Lane averred. “None but a mother can appreciate the joy” that it occasioned. For her own part, Mary Foote Lane, since the death of her children, had “laid aside all reading but such as would tend to promote [her] growth in grace.”²⁸

The year of James Henry Lane’s marriage to Mary Baldrige also marked a personal milestone, if not also a professional one, in his father’s life. Until September 1841 Amos Lane always enjoyed robust health. However, at that point, according to his wife, he was “brought to the brink of the grave” by a sudden attack of “congestive fever.” Sufficiently grim was the prognosis that all concerned—family members, physicians, and perhaps most of all Amos himself—were surprised when at length he made a full recovery. The brush with death impelled him to embrace religion, albeit only for a short time, much to Mary Lane’s disappointment. Amos’ eventual return to his worldly ways caused no small amount of friction in his relationship with his wife. After patiently nursing him through the winter months of 1843, she despaired “of his ever bowing down to the obligation of a holy life,” going so far on one occasion as to express regret over feeling “too anxious” about her former prospects of impending widowhood.²⁹

In the summer of 1843, just shy of the two-year anniversary of his near-fatal bout with congestive fever, Amos Lane delivered what he insisted would be his last Fourth-of-July oration in Lawrenceburg. Yet his recent retirement from elective office hardly signified a decreased interest in politics, especially considering that family members around him remained actively engaged. A seemingly nondescript diary entry Mary Lane made that August warrants elaboration for its political implications. It chronicles two days spent with John Dunn and “General Drake and Lady.” The Drakes were members of the Lane family’s extended kinship

network through James P. Drake's marriage to Priscilla Holmes Buell, whose sister-in-law was Ann Lane Buell.³⁰

The leadership position that Drake held in Indiana's Democratic Party infrastructure exponentially increased his potential importance to the Lane family's immediate political future. This was the same James P. Drake who, thanks to the machinations of James B. Gardiner a few years earlier, lost his position as the receiver of public monies at the Indianapolis land office, where he formerly worked alongside Arthur St. Clair. By 1843, Drake had fought his way back to regain his former stature among the state's pro-Jackson politicians, and now occupied a seat on Indiana's Democratic State Central Committee. It also happened that in 1843 Indiana voters precipitated change on an historic scale, fundamentally altering long-standing power relationships that formerly determined the course of intra-state politics.³¹

Drake and his brother-in-law, George P. Buell, stood at the cusp of that change. Meanwhile, the time was at hand to pass the baton of mentorship within the extended Lane family. Although Amos surely basked in his reputation as the "wheel-horse of the Democratic party" in Indiana, by the early 1840s, his relevance was beginning to fade as a new generation of political movers and shakers came to the fore. Where family interests were concerned, James P. Drake, Amos Lane's junior by about twenty years, probably ranked highest among them. If indeed, as W. H. Stephenson averred, Jim Lane functioned as a political lieutenant to his sexagenarian father, by 1839 he may have been concurrently serving more than one master.³²

The younger Lane would have been a poor student of the Jacksonian era had he failed to appreciate the potential of patronage for smoothing his own path to public office. Should political variables align to permit such patronage to occur under a cloak of nepotism, so much the better. Of Senator John Tipton one scholar observed "that the standards of the day

sanctioned such practices and...Tipton, whose judgments were conventional, simply followed them.” The same could be said of James Henry Lane. Patronage represented a hedge against the change that had become the only constant he could count on, not only in the political venue, but in all other aspects of life. Thus did the youngest politician in the Lane family, while still little more than an apprentice to his older and more professionally seasoned in-laws, ultimately benefit from their new-found ascendancy and largesse. They were, in a word, his enablers within the local and state power structures.³³

In the context of the Lane family’s extended kinship network, both James P. Drake and George P. Buell stood out as symbols of the Democratic party tidal wave that in 1843 swept across Indiana. As state historian Donald F. Carmony explained,

At the voting on August 7, 1843, the Democrats won a sweeping victory. For the first time since [political] parties had developed [in Indiana] they won majorities in both houses of the General Assembly; and they elected James Whitcomb as their initial governor. In the [U.S.] congressional elections they won eight of the ten seats...The dominance which Hoosier Democrats gained over the congressional delegation in this election was retained throughout the forties. Moreover, the sweeping victories they gained in 1843 hastened the transition to a new generation of Democrats as issues regarding expansion and slavery came to the fore.³⁴

Mary Foote Lane closely monitored the 1843 elections, noting in her diary that their outcome yielded results “favorable to our family” when Buell was elected to the state senate.” For yet a while longer, the political interests of Buell as well as his brother-in-law, Jim Lane, retained a distinctly local flavor.³⁵

By the end of 1843, both men were intensely interested in an impending county division. Since Indiana statehood, the geographical space occupied by Dearborn County was large enough to encompass two separate local governments. For several years prior to the election that sent

George Buell to the state senate, the town of Wilmington, as opposed to Lawrenceburg, took its turn as seat of Dearborn County. George Buell and Jim Lane both belonged to a local Democratic party faction that advocated re-designating Lawrenceburg as the hub of local government.³⁶

Although the 1843 state senatorial campaign in Dearborn County revolved around this essentially local issue, it also involved a broad principle consistently extolled by Jim Lane, first in Indiana and later in territorial Kansas: the right of instruction. “The people have the right to instruct their representative,” Lane reminded his older brother-in-law.³⁷ The question that most concerned Lane in the short run was whether recent developments had obviated the need for Buell to make good on an earlier campaign pledge to settle the county seat location issue by a direct popular vote. Lane assured Buell that such was the case, and pleaded with him to support a bill that would again make Lawrenceburg the seat of county government, and forbear holding a direct election. Lane’s anxiety was for naught. As a local history records, “there was no real danger of [the bill’s] defeat, for it passed the House by a vote of sixty-two to twenty-three, and the Senate by a good majority, and became law at once.” In early 1844, the city of Lawrenceburg regained its former status, even as Dearborn simultaneously spawned a new county named after Indiana’s eastern neighbor, Ohio.³⁸

Just as George Pearson Buell prepared to settle into his remaining three years of elective office, fate once again upended his personal expectations, and those of everyone else in the extended Lane family. It is small wonder that in late October, 1844, Mary Foote Lane wearily asked, “where shall I begin to recount the occurrences of the past year?” In the ten months that had elapsed since the previous December when she made her last diary entry, she was “called to witness the last sickness and death of my beloved daughter,” Ann Lane Buell. Ann’s husband

was now a widower. His responsibilities, in addition to those that inhered with his new role as state senator, now included raising seven children in a household that no longer included the loving consort who had shared his life for the past twenty years. Ann Lane Buell would be sorely missed.³⁹

The unremitting series of tragedies that intruded upon Jim Lane's young adulthood beginning in 1836 bears recounting. Death first claimed an older brother and younger sister—John Lane and Jane Lane Huntington—just months apart. Jane's daughter, "Little Jane," was only four years old when, early in 1840, she followed her mother to the grave. About midway through 1841, brother-in-law Arthur St. Clair met his end through illness. Finally, Ann Lane Buell's death in March 1844 rounded out the extended family's losses, at least for the time being. Thus, in the formative years that spanned the gap between Jim Lane's twenty-first and twenty-ninth birthdays, he grieved over the loss of five close family members. "Little Jane" had been the youngest to die; St. Clair, the oldest, passed in his thirty-eighth year.⁴⁰

At the time of Ann's death, observed Mary Foote Lane, three of her seven children were probably too young to remember their mother in later years. To keep her memory alive in the minds of her children, their grandmother penned a eulogy so that they might have "something to remind them of the virtue of their dear departed mother except what shall remain on the vague pages of memory."⁴¹ Mary Lane's musings on her deceased daughter incidentally revealed a strong erudite tradition that abided within the Lane household, especially among its women. Ann, Mary recalled, "read her Bible well at five years of age." Moreover,

She was mostly taught at home with her brothers and sister—and no sooner was her own lesson learnt than she was voluntarily assisting the others. When attending school she was ever a favorite with her instructor; nor do I recollect that she ever received a reproof, much less a punishment. Her studies were always performed with ease to herself and pleasure to her preceptors...

When at school (after getting her own lessons, which she did with ease) her pleasure was to help others. How often have I seen her weep by a younger brother—because he could not learn [as easily] as herself. I have seen them weep together. She never would leave him until his lesson was committed.⁴²

Two preoccupations informed the entries Mary Lane made in her diary in late 1844, when once again she finally regained sufficient composure to express thoughts in writing. One was an obvious rekindled determination to reestablish and maintain ties to trans-Adirondack family members. The genesis of this resolve may well have been a recent four-day visit to Lawrenceburg by Mrs. Charles Davies of West Point, New York. Shortly after Mrs. Davies' departure Mary began making plans for a reciprocal visit that would also include the St. Lawrence valley and the scenes of her youth. It required four years to bring her plans to fruition, but she eventually succeeded.⁴³

The second salient feature of Mary Foote Lane's diary-keeping in late October 1844 reflected an avid family interest in, and active involvement with, the imminent U.S. presidential election that occurred the following month. Her husband traveled to Cincinnati in order to gather the earliest possible intelligence concerning Ohio election results. Meanwhile, a circus atmosphere prevailed in Lawrenceburg. When on the evening of the second of November both major parties organized torchlight parades through town, Mary was relieved to learn that "all went off peaceably." As if all this were not enough to rowel the mind, Mrs. James P. Drake, then incidentally en route to Helena, Arkansas, stopped for a visit and somehow became separated from her baggage, which eventually reached Helena several days in advance of its owner.⁴⁴

Mrs. Drake was still at the Lane residence the next day when Amos Lane returned home by steamboat bearing disheartening news from Ohio. The electors of Indiana's neighbor to the east would cast their votes for the Whig presidential and vice-presidential candidates,

respectively Henry Clay and Theodore Frelinghuysen. The evening of the fifth of November, following Mrs. Drake's mid-afternoon departure, Mary Lane and her husband were "insulted" by several Whigs who came to gloat at them. In the end, of course, James K. Polk, the Democrat, won by a large majority."⁴⁵

W. H. Stephenson noted that it was Amos Lane who, on November 6, 1844, personally notified Polk of the latter's election victory in Indiana. "We have had a hard fight," the aging Jacksonian advised the president-elect, "and enough is known to justify the firm belief [that Indiana] has gone for P. and Dallas." A little over three weeks after Lane conveyed this message, the mood among Lawrenceburg Democrats remained buoyant. Mary Lane recalled that on the twenty-third of November the whole town was "illuminated...in honor of our victory over the Whigs—all went off without damage or accident. Mr. Lane made a speech—was surrounded by vocal music at eleven o'clock." The following February, Amos Lane received the singular honor of accompanying Polk and his entourage between Louisville and Lawrenceburg as the president-elect made his way to Washington.⁴⁶

Changes that Polk's election portended for the Lane family proved to be even more significant than those heralded by the Democratic party's resurgence in Indiana state politics. Eight years earlier, and again in 1840, for the sake of party unity the Lanes had loyally supported "Old Kinderhook's" (Martin Van Buren's) bid for the presidency, perhaps at the cost of sacrificing Amos Lane's reelection to Congress. Now, in 1844, they risked alienating former Jacksonian allies in deference to the overriding need to support a candidate capable of defeating the Whig nominee in the general election. Amos Lane and a number of his colleagues had been in politics long enough to witness the discord that developed between Andrew Jackson and his first vice-president, John C. Calhoun. Over time, this pair's estrangement split the national

Democracy into two contending sectional factions. By 1844, the schism had lasted well over a decade, so long, in fact, that to some observers the original generation of protagonists now seemed superannuated. In 1844, noted one historian, “Van Burenites and Calhounites threatened to bolt [the party] if their opponents obtained the presidential nomination.”⁴⁷

The national Democracy that year consigned itself to one schism in order to avoid another. Polk’s dark-horse candidacy offered a realistic hope of restoring party unity by embracing an increasingly popular clamor for continental expansion. According to historian Yonaton Eyal, “Old Andrew Jackson wrote from the Hermitage that Polk’s nomination would ‘secure the harmony and concert of action, necessary to bring the whole party into the field.’”⁴⁸ The concert of action, however, entailed sacrificing the presidential aspirations of its former standard bearer, Martin Van Buren. Given his long-standing ties to New York, Amos Lane may have felt a pang of conscience the day he telegraphed the president-elect that Polk and Dallas had triumphed in Indiana.

A number of James H. Lane’s contemporaries dated the eventual pre-Civil War dissolution of the Democratic party to its 1844 abandonment of Van Buren. One such contemporary, Preston King, hailed from Ogdensburg, New York, where Amos Lane once resided with his young family before immigrating to the Ohio River country. Historian Eric Foner observed:

Preston King, a Van Burenite who [later] became a leading Republican, wrote that 1844 had marked the end of the traditional politics of the Jacksonian era, because “Slavery upon which by common consent no party issue had been made was then obtruded upon the field of party action.” Throughout the stormy years which followed the nomination and election of Polk...[Van Burenites] insisted that they did not wish to make any position on slavery a test of party loyalty. They were quite willing to tolerate disagreements within the national party over the peculiar

institution, but they resented what they considered southern efforts to force pro-slavery views upon the party as a whole.⁴⁹

The presidential election of 1844 also acquired an inter-generational dimension that affected the politics within the Lane family no less than it did the national Democracy at large. The mid-1840s marked the heyday of the Young America movement, which, as Yonatan Eyal observed, correspondingly spawned a “Young America phase of Democratic Party development.” Hallmarks of the movement, Eyal explained, included advocacy of “territorial expansion, an increase in the volume of trade and manufacturing, government involvement in social matters, and assertiveness in foreign policymaking.” Thus the movement to elect Polk “expressed many Democrats’ desire for a generational change of leadership, one that could draw the party together in a way the Old Fogies could not.” Bluntly stated, by 1844, Amos Lane, then approaching his seventh decade of life, numbered among the Old Fogies. Meanwhile a grim process of elimination had whittled down the Lane family to a point where only one person remained with ambitions expansive enough to spill across state boundaries. James Henry Lane could well identify with the new impulse for generational change that Eyal described.⁵⁰

If Jim Lane harbored misgivings or pangs of conscience over the decision to jettison Martin Van Buren as a presidential candidate, he found considerable consolation in the tenets of the Democratic party platform. Lane enthusiastically supported admitting Texas into the Union, even if it increased the likelihood of war with Mexico. To his mind, if that threat materialized, the potential good to be achieved by a victorious outcome outweighed the blood and treasure that would inhere with fighting the war. Military victory would bring within reach the expansionist goal of a North American republic whose boundaries stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific.⁵¹

What Eyal termed the “Young American logic of territorial expansion” afforded Jim Lane an effective line of argument that justified pursuing such ambitious national goals. The

implicit internationalist dimension of the Young America movement could be enlisted to make foreign adventurism seem like an effective vehicle for spreading democratic values throughout the world. Thus Jim Lane, like many of his colleagues in the mid-1840s, accepted the notion that conquering Mexico presented an opportunity to bestow the blessings of liberty on a benighted population suffering under the yoke of autocratic rulers. Perverse as this view of the right of self determination may seem by twenty-first century standards, in 1844 it provided grist for a highly effective presidential campaign. Jim Lane made good use of it on behalf of James K. Polk.⁵²

So dedicated was Jim Lane to the Democratic party platform of 1844 that he subsequently put his life on the line in support of its tenets. In this undertaking, he stood poised in the spring of 1845 to profit from both the living and the dead. Very much in the category of Jim Lane's living mentors were two centers of influence within Indiana political circles, his father Amos, and his cousin James P. Drake, each respectively representing the older and younger generations of the state's Democratic party leadership. If diplomatic relations with Mexico deteriorated to the point of war, a national Democratic administration would be sure to ask the help of its Indiana powerbase in redeeming jingoistic pledges made during the late presidential campaign.⁵³ Jim Lane eagerly awaited the call-to-arms.

So persistent was the memory of John Lane in military engineering circles that Jim, his surviving younger brother, probably benefited from his legacy. This was especially true at West Point, where, in 1842, the creation of a Department of Practical Military Engineering kept John's pontoon boat project alive during the run-up to the Mexican War. Instructors in the new department included John's former classmate and long-standing family friend, Alexander Swift. It would almost seem as if fate repaid the extended Lane family for a service John's maternal uncle, John Thomas Davies, rendered to General Joseph Gardner Swift and his son, Alexander,

many years earlier while John was still a cadet. Davies provided the elder Swift financial help that enabled him to meet expenses incidental to Alexander's academy appointment.⁵⁴

In the years that immediately preceded the Mexican War, Alexander, in his capacity as instructor in the Department of Practical Military Engineering, imparted what he knew of his deceased friend's pontoon boat invention to a new generation of cadets who, no doubt sooner than many of them expected, learned through personal experience to appreciate a technical innovation specifically designed to overcome water obstacles under combat conditions. If John Lane was no more, the invention he perfected had taken on a life of its own. James Henry Lane, meanwhile, verged on entering a new venue that justified a "crash course" on military art and science. Contemporaries would comment on the extraordinary aptitude and adaptability displayed by the novice. Novice though he was, Jim Lane nonetheless benefited from the notoriety of a military reputation that preceded his own Mexican War deployment, namely that of his deceased brother.⁵⁵

Two deceased members of Jim Lane's family, John Foote Lane and Arthur St. Clair, for as long as they lived, exhibited traits their surviving brother sought to emulate. To his mind, both men stood-out respectively as paragons of military competence, political attainment, and manly virtues that only Amos Lane, the family patriarch, could rival; and as noted earlier, by 1845 Amos was fast approaching his seventh decade. That two iconic figures within the family died so young and so close together in time intensified the grief of Amos' youngest son. Fate left Jim Lane no choice but to go forward, cherishing the memory of those lost, if not patterning his own life according to their standards. Perhaps the new wife at his side helped cushion the psychological blow and bolster his resolve to make a fresh start. After all, there was still much to live for, and the future literally promised new fields to conquer. Ambition yet remained, and

the country might put to good use those skills that Kansans later called the fine hand of James H. Lane.⁵⁶

CHAPTER TWELVE

“As if Fighting Had Been Their Trade From Childhood Up:” Jim Lane and the Mexican War, 1846 – 1847

The Mexican War made Jim Lane’s political future just as surely as it propelled Zachary Taylor to the U.S. presidency, and garnered credentials for Jefferson Davis that eventually made him the leader of the southern Confederacy. Wendell Holmes Stephenson rightly observed that “while campaigning in Mexico [Lane] was building a foundation for that more remarkable career which began in Kansas a decade later.”¹ No one, of course, knew what the future held as events during the mid-1840s unfolded in real time. As always, contingency worked its own peculiar magic, and the law of unintended consequences ruled the day. Despite the inherently military character of the Mexican War’s northern campaign, political considerations were frequently uppermost in the minds of its battle captains.

Although few were surprised that James K. Polk’s election as president led to a breach in relations with Mexico, the nation at large was woefully unprepared for waging war. Because the regular military establishment was at best little more than a nucleus for creating an expeditionary army, Polk’s administration turned to a quota system as the most feasible expedient for manning a force to be built essentially from scratch. He called on Indiana to raise three regiments—roughly 3,000 men—of volunteers. Yet Indiana was no more ready for war than its sister states. When Governor James Whitcomb received Polk’s requisition on May 21, 1846, he had, according to Stephenson, “not a single regiment that could be called out, for the plain reason that none existed.” Still, the zeal and adaptability of the state’s governor, adjutant general, and other officials helped compensate for whatever they lacked in experience, materiel, and administrative infrastructure.²

More than a few contemporaries assumed that only a military draft would suffice to meet the challenge of raising three regiments. The actions of Jim Lane serve as a case study that explains why a draft proved unnecessary after all. A history of Dearborn County records,

Immediately upon the proclamation of President Polk calling for three regiments from Indiana, James H. Lane, then a merchant of Lawrenceburg, organized a company...of volunteers for the Mexican War, and was the first to report to the Governor the organization of a company. Jeffersonville [on the falls of the Ohio] was made the place of rendezvous, where, on the organization of the Third Indiana Volunteer Regiment, James H. Lane was elected its Colonel, and George Dunn, of Lawrenceburg, succeeded Lane in the captaincy of the company.³

Funding surfaced as the most immediate challenge in raising, equipping, and transporting the Dearborn Volunteers to their place of rendezvous. Lane personally staked seven hundred and forty dollars of his own money to meet this need, although he was promptly reimbursed by the Lawrenceburg branch of the Indiana state bank. Other leaders in communities throughout the state replicated Lane's initiative, obviating the need to implement a military draft. "The excitement of the people had become so intense," wrote Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "that within seven days after Indiana's quota of thirty companies was raised twenty-two others tendered their services."⁴

In short order, an "Indiana Brigade" had been formed, warranting the creation of a command hierarchy headed by a brigadier general. Personal gamesmanship, in some cases perceived as outright political intrigue, suffused the entire process. One soldier noted that "in the election of field officers for my regiment there was but one ticket... I remember being puzzled by the absence of contest. My experience was then too limited to help me comprehend the bit of furniture called a slate...Certainly the able Democratic Governor knew how to provide for himself and his party." From a brigade-wide perspective, the electoral slate included James P.

Drake (a Lane in-law), William H. Bowles, and James H. Lane respectively for colonels of the first, second, and third regiments. All of the nominees for these prospective command billets were Democrats. Joseph Lane (no relation to Jim Lane's family), chosen for brigade commander, was a presidential appointee.⁵

Date-of-rank emerged as a potential problem since the organization of all three regiments occurred simultaneously. In part for that reason, both Governor Whitcomb and his Lieutenant Governor, Paris C. Dunning, were on hand to preside over a lottery drawing that would assign numerical designations to the newly formed regiments. "Some excitement prevailed," wrote Stephenson, "before and during these elections, and the Whigs charged the governor with knowing how to take care of his political favorites. On the evening of the election, the colonels-elect, holding commissions of even date, determined the numbers of their regiments and their own rank by lot, drawn in the presence of the governor and adjutant general."⁶

The allegations being bandied about relative to political favoritism begs a question that plausibly gave General Zachary Taylor pause for thought. How did he view the prospect of leading a coterie of subordinate officers whose selection to fill command billets depended entirely on criteria established by Indiana's governor and the latter's political cronies within the state's Democratic Party establishment? Ostensibly Taylor was a military professional so sensitive about appearing politically neutral that he eschewed voting in presidential elections held prior to the Mexican War. Earlier studies of Taylor have shown that his political biases crystallized at roughly the midpoint of President Andrew Jackson's administration. Cass' biographer confirmed Taylor's proclivity for retribution, in noting that "he would exact sweet revenge in the presidential election of 1848."⁷

If Zachary Taylor's memory was long enough to carry a grudge for something that happened in the Black Hawk War, he surely would have recalled the role played by the late Lieutenant John Foote Lane in convincing him that advocates of Jacksonian Democracy were contemptuous of constraints which the U.S. Constitution imposed on the country's chief executive. Now, a full ten years after findings of an army court of inquiry led to J.F. Lane's dismissal from the prestigious Delaware Breakwater project, his younger brother commanded a regiment that Taylor was expected to lead into battle against the Mexicans.⁸

The Lane family, moreover, had remained on good terms with Lewis Cass since the early 1830s when John Lane participated in Indian removal expeditions. This abiding relationship would only have exacerbated Zachary Taylor's displeasure at the thought of Jim Lane serving as a subordinate. Finally, that two of the three regimental commanders of the Indiana Brigade—James H. Lane and James P. Drake—were members of former Indiana Congressman Amos Lane's extended family must have rankled General Taylor. By the mid-1840s the graying former congressman's status as "Wheel-horse of the Democratic Party in Indiana" was beyond dispute.⁹

That the select group of commanders who led the Indiana Brigade reads like a who's who of that state's newly ascendant Democratic party establishment hardly suggests that they were a cohesive lot. Dissention and personality clashes marred their deployment from start to finish. It is an understatement to suggest that James Henry Lane did not get along well with his immediate superior, Joseph Lane. A Mexican War historian rightly observed, "the effectiveness of the two unrelated Lanes was partly cancelled out...by the fierce antipathies they bore each other." To complicate matters, Joseph Lane's elevation to brigade command actually occasioned two elections to fill the vacancy created by his promotion. The administratively flawed process that

ended with William H. Bowles replacing Jo Lane as commander of the Second Regiment inspired little more than dissension among soldiers in the ranks. Though few would have predicted it at the time, this was a fateful development that subsequently undermined brigade cohesiveness and unity of purpose at a critical point in a battle no one foresaw.¹⁰

After being mustered into federal service on June 19, 1846, the Indiana Brigade tarried about two weeks at its rendezvous location on the Ohio River. From there, steamboats transported the men to New Orleans, where they pitched camp at a point not far removed from the site of Andrew Jackson's celebrated War of 1812 victory over the British. In mid-July, all three of the brigade's regiments boarded transports bound for Mexico.¹¹ Although some companies reached their destination on its eastern Gulf coast in about three days, soldiers aboard the vessel carrying Major Willis A. Gorman and two companies of Jim Lane's regiment were less fortunate. An Indiana historian observed:

The sea was rough and, as this was the first sea experience of most of the Hoosiers, wholesale seasickness resulted. The rain contributed to the general gloom and low spirits of the men...two hundred men were stowed in a hold four and one-half feet deep. In addition to the volunteers, the crew had to sleep in that hold on the warm nights, with hatches down, a heavy sea running and no air holes. They had to live on coffee, slop-fed pork and dry crackers. "Half the men were seasick and spewing all about you; sometime you would find yourself eating and someone close by would let slip on your dinner and on your clothes."¹²

Finally, after completing its eleven-day voyage, the Third Regiment along with the rest of Indiana Brigade arrived at the island of Brazos de Santiago, which one observer described as "a waste of sand dunes, about three and one-half miles wide. A narrow inlet, not much larger than a canal, led into the bay behind, which was seven miles across." Brazos island was adjacent to Point Isabel, where according to an official army history, "in June [1846] the volunteers

authorized by Congress began pouring in...and were quartered in a string of camps along the Rio Grande as far as Matamoros.” Brazos de Santiago was one of those camps.¹³

With roughly five thousand soldiers crammed onto the island, an outbreak of measles and diarrhea soon made an appearance and, according to one source, “unfitted scores for service.” Jim Lane’s regiment remained at Brazos de Santiago for only a few days before receiving orders to move a few miles inland to Camp Belknap, nearer the mouth of the Rio Grande, where General Joseph Lane established his brigade headquarters. Indiana historian R.C. Buley observed that “clearing the chaparral round about was troublesome work, as not only all the bushes had thorns, but all the insects as well.” Still, some men found the surroundings more aesthetically pleasing than their former campsite on the island: “In front lay the Rio Grande and Barita, while in the rear the wide plain was besprinkled with salt lakes.”¹⁴

From a sanitation and preventive health standpoint, the new campsite was hardly an improvement on Brazos de Santiago. As W. H. Stephenson explained, “The selection of this site for a camp was unfortunate, for a few days after the volunteers arrived the river overflowed its banks, and no fresh water could be obtained except by wading a muddy pond half a mile wide. This caused considerable sickness among the soldiers, ‘and the dead march was heard nearly every day.’” By early November, the men in Jim Lane’s Third Indiana had heard it something over forty times. Deaths ranged in number from one to as many as eight throughout the regiment’s ten companies. Lane himself fell ill with a debilitating case of chronic dysentery that persisted episodically throughout the remainder of his life.¹⁵

Despite all this, morale within the Third Indiana remained high. By the nineteenth of November it had moved to Matamoros, another coastal town where one officer gamely reported, “We have but ten men in the hospital...and they are mostly recovering.” He also opined:

Our regiment is one of the best drilled and disciplined regiments in the service. Their health is [improving] and the vigorous nerves of our farmer boys are beginning to show their usual power and strength. They...do not puff and take on about a fight, but...depend upon it, they look wolfish at Mexicans and the gamblers, and I believe they would just as soon shoot one as the other, the latter having swindled so many poor soldiers and given our police so much trouble to suppress this all-prevailing vice in Matamoros.¹⁶

The officer's closing remarks suggested that his regimental commander also comprehended the effect of timely pay on unit *esprit*: "Our boys have all been paid off in gold for four months and they look and feel like new men."¹⁷

The arrival of General Winfield Scott in late December, 1846 heralded an increased tempo of operations that incidentally played havoc with the plans of his subordinate, General Taylor. Scott's agenda, developed in Washington without Taylor's counsel or consent, called for an amphibious attack on Vera Cruz in early March that would be the first phase of a southern thrust toward the capitol, Mexico City. The campaign envisioned by General Scott required that Taylor reduce his northern army by about 8,000 regulars and volunteers, leaving him with a force numbering less than 7,000 men. General Taylor was livid when Scott ordered him to abandon Saltillo and assume a defensive position at Monterrey. There, in late September, Taylor prematurely accepted an armistice, proposed by the Mexican commander which Scott subsequently rejected.¹⁸

The course Zachary Taylor then charted not only affected the outcome of the Mexican War, but also unintentionally established the conditions that allowed Jim Lane's regiment to win fame on the battlefield. A campaign history records:

Enraged, Taylor attributed Scott's motive to politics. Hurrying back to Monterrey...he moved 4,650 of his troops...[including two regiments of the Indiana Brigade] to a point about 18 miles south of Saltillo, near the hacienda Agua Nueva. This move

brought him almost 11 miles closer to San Luis Potosi, 200 miles to the south, where General Santa Ana was assembling an army of 20,000. Most of the 200 miles were desert, which Taylor considered impassable by any army; moreover, both he and Scott believed that Santa Anna would make his main effort against Scott's landing at Vera Cruz, the news of which had leaked to the newspapers. On February 8, 1847, Taylor wrote a friend, "I have no fears."¹⁹

A measure of caution might have served General Taylor better than audacity that first week of February. At about the time he penned his letter, Mexican soldiers rifled through the pockets of a dead American officer to find Scott's order halving the number of soldiers available to Taylor. The valuable intelligence soon found its way to General Santa Anna, who promptly ordered a forced march northward toward Saltillo. The campaign history notes, "Leading his army across barren country through heat, snow, and rain, by February 19 Santa Anna had 15,000 men at a hacienda at the edge of the desert, only 35 miles from Agua Nueva. The hardest battle of the Mexican War was about to begin."²⁰ Taylor had scouts of his own who soon enough brought word of Santa Anna's hastily contrived northward march. Yet the major general and his staff, underestimating their opponent, continued to doubt that the Mexican army possessed sufficient will or capacity to move effectively under such adverse conditions. What Zachary Taylor most dreaded was transforming into reality.²¹

Colonel Lane's Third Indiana regiment was present to share whatever fate befell General Taylor's army. For the moment, neither he nor anyone else around him recognized the approaching danger. On February 20, 1847, while Santa Anna's army raced pell-mell toward Saltillo, Jim Lane focused on the impending expiration of his soldiers' enlistments. With much fighting still to be done, forming a new regiment of veterans surfaced as a viable option. After completing regimental drill that Saturday, Lane formed his men into a hollow square. He and

other officers used the time to share thoughts with their men about leading and staffing the proposed unit, and how individual personalities could be best matched with available positions.²²

As a soldier in the ranks recalled the incident, “General [Joseph] Lane, who had been standing just outside the square, listening to the talk, stepped inside and proceeded to make a statement.” Colonel Jim Lane, taking exception to either the tone or substance of what his superior said, framed a strident response. Dialogue became confrontation. In short order, General Lane asked his subordinate if Colonel Lane doubted his word, to which the Third Indiana’s commander responded, “I do, by God, Sir.” As the pair came to blows, fellow officers separated them. The brigadier retired from the scene, but only momentarily. As he left, the general called out, “Colonel Lane, prepare yourself.”²³

Following the brigadier’s departure, Colonel Jim Lane turned once again to face his men. He assured them that they had just witnessed a purely personal difficulty between himself and the brigade commander which was neither their concern nor their fight. As Lane thus addressed his soldiers they saw, as he could not, the brigade commander returning to the parade field. When General Joseph Lane reached a point about thirty yards in front of the Third Indiana, he called out, “Are you ready, Colonel Lane?” As the eyewitness recalled, Jim Lane “looked around and seeing the General, ordered a man in the ranks to load [a] musket, and replied, ‘I [damn] soon can be.’”²⁴

At that instant, Jim Lane may or may not have realized that rather than one, scores of soldiers charged their muskets. The timely appearance and intervention of the provost guard prevented a dangerous situation from turning lethal. By leading the general away, averred the eyewitness, they saved “the lives of both officers, for had [the two Lanes] exchanged shots I have no doubt that the General would have killed the Colonel, and...that fifty musket [balls]

would have found lodgment in the General's body." This account testifies to the willingness of Third Indiana soldiers to underwrite the bond between themselves and their commander with more than words. Unfortunately the incident signified a profound waste of mental and emotional energy as the time fast approached when lives would depend on cohesion and unity of purpose within the brigade. A personal quarrel between two officers paled in comparison with the danger posed by a rapidly approaching Mexican army looking to crush the badly outnumbered Yankees.²⁵

As the altercation between the two Lanes unfolded, General Zachary Taylor's conviction that Santa Anna's army posed no danger began to weaken. He had more important clashes to think about than those involving personalities. Besides, the American commander was hardly known to be a strong disciplinarian. Accordingly, as David Lavender explained, "No disciplinary action followed. Taylor, however, did keep [the Second and Third] regiments apart thereafter." Because General Joseph Lane led the Second Indiana prior to assuming overall command of the brigade, his continued highly visible presence with that regiment diminished the confidence its soldiers had in their new commander, Colonel William A. Bowles. That meant the regiment would enter the battle with two commanders, a situation that proved a sure recipe for disaster.²⁶

During the Civil War, James H. Lane and Ben McCulloch each won fame, albeit in different ways, from roles they played in the Trans-Mississippi West. Interestingly enough, both were present a decade-and-a-half earlier on the field at Buena Vista. In the Mexican War, McCulloch served as a scout for General Taylor. Simultaneous with Jim Lane's dispute with the commander of the Indiana brigade, wrote David Lavender, Taylor wondered "belatedly whether he had underestimated Santa Anna...[and] ordered McCulloch and seven or eight men dressed

like *vaqueros* on a reconnaissance to gather more up-to-date information” on the disposition of enemy forces. By noon on Sunday, February 21, 1847, McCulloch and other detachments dispatched by General Taylor returned with discomfiting news. Lavender observed, “The Ranger captain [McCulloch] and one of his men had actually ridden through the heart of the enemy camp. Twenty thousand men were there, he guessed, at least five thousand of them cavalry.”²⁷

McCulloch’s intelligence, corroborated by other sources, snapped Zachary Taylor out of his inertia and into decisive action. The American commander finally recognized the urgent need to concentrate all his available forces for the coming fight. Whatever else ensued, Santa Anna had lost the advantage of surprise. As his columns approached the abandoned American camp at Agua Nueva, however, the smoldering remains of the compound created the illusion that the Mexicans had routed Taylor’s army. Observing the disarray, Santa Anna wrongly concluded that his forces pursued a panicked, demoralized enemy.²⁸ With not a minute to spare, the Americans used the little time they had remaining to good advantage.

The topography of the landscape in the vicinity of Buena Vista proved well-suited for a hastily organized defense. From west to east, the terrain roughly resembled the outspread fingers of a hand, with the extended “fingers” representing steep ridgelines and arroyos that pointed eastward toward the surrounding plateau. Northeast of the spread and extended fingers stood the small hacienda of Buena Vista, which General Taylor’s forces soon converted into a combination redoubt and wagon park. A short distance to the west, running north-south through the “wrist” portion of the “hand” formed by the series of parallel ridges, was the road which the Mexicans used on their trek northward from San Luis Potosi. To block that road meant forestalling the advance of Santa Anna’s artillery.²⁹

Decades of military experience enabled Zachary Taylor to grasp immediately the overriding importance of training his own cannon on the narrow thoroughfare. James H. Lane's Third Indiana, located near Captain John M. Washington's battery of artillery, helped Taylor achieve his purpose. Their presence in the fortified defensive position assisted in denying Santa Anna key terrain on the army's western flank, protected the guns of the artillery battery, and, most importantly, constituted a reserve force of regimental strength that Taylor and his subordinates could use to meet any contingency that might surface in the ensuing battle. "As Santa Anna galloped ahead [of his army] and swept the ground with his spyglass," opined David Lavender, "his heart must have sunk." Instead of fleeing in a "runaway stampede, the enemy had wheeled around in a position of great natural strength, ready to fight. And he had come upon them with an exhausted army."³⁰

Despite all this, the Mexicans still held two advantages: numerical superiority and a commander skilled enough to exploit it. Buying time to wrest some high ground on which to position his own formidable artillery, General Santa Anna dispatched a courier to parley with the Yankees. His message offered them surrender as a merciful alternative to swift annihilation. Characteristically, a nonplussed Taylor dryly responded, "I decline accepting your request." Shortly thereafter, Santa Anna sent his forces in a wide arch around the exposed left flank of Taylor's southward-facing army. The next morning they launched a series of violent attacks westward through the gaps formed by the parallel series of ridges and arroyos. In general terms, this was the catalyst that precipitated the Third Indiana's entry into the fray.³¹

As far as Indiana's citizens were concerned, by far the most significant feature of the Mexican War was the northern campaign that ended with the American victory at Buena Vista. Two of the Indiana Brigade's three regiments—the Second and the Third, respectively

commanded by William A. Bowles and James H. Lane—played a major role in determining the final outcome. The events of February 23, 1847, left Bowles a pariah in his home state, and Lane a hero. The Third Indiana acquitted itself in a way that guaranteed its commander a new political future. Jim Lane's Buena Vista experience established his reputation as an expert in defensive warfare. Almost a decade later, he drew from knowledge gained during the Mexican War to construct hasty fortifications that frustrated the intentions of proslavery forces bent on sacking the fledgling free-state community of Lawrence, Kansas.³²

While at Buena Vista, Jim Lane answered to three general officers. His immediate superior, as mentioned earlier, was an unrelated namesake, Brigadier General Joseph Lane. At the top of the command hierarchy was the senior officer present on the field, Major General Zachary Taylor. Of equal rank with Joseph Lane was Brigadier General John E. Wool, whose army had only recently linked up with Taylor's after completing what an army historian described as "a remarkable march from San Antonio." General Taylor delegated to General Wool the responsibility for selecting the ground on which the "*norteamericanos*" made their stand during the battle of Buena Vista.³³

The American line of battle, about a mile-and-a-half in length, generally arced outward to face south, along an east-west axis. The men expected a main enemy attack from the southwest, against the bottleneck established by Washington's artillery battery astride the aforementioned main wagon route that linked Saltillo with San Luis Potosi. Unfortunately, they were in the wrong place, taken in by a successful ruse crafted by the Mexican general. "From the beginning," observed David Lavender, General Wool "had assumed the guns in the Narrows would be the Mexicans' main target. The preconception remained unshakable even after the

heavy concentration of [enemy] strength on the [American] left became fully apparent—a line of thinking Santa Anna had hoped to foster with [a] formidable diversion.”³⁴

Though his army greatly outnumbered the Yankee invaders, Santa Anna had no intention of obliging American hopes that he would commit the mass of his army against the most heavily fortified part of their line. Instead, after acquiring suitable high ground on which to position his own artillery, he sought to flank Taylor’s army by swinging his own infantry and cavalry around to the east where they could attack between the extended “fingers” of rough terrain that pointed toward the more meagerly-defended American left. General Taylor, upon departing briefly to secure his logistic trains at the hacienda of Buena Vista, left General Wool in charge of the battlefield’s southern sector. This move temporarily placed the Indiana Brigade under General Wool’s command.³⁵

On the morning of February 23, 1847, the battle of Buena Vista began in earnest. Jim Lane’s Third Indiana Regiment, it will be remembered, occupied a knoll overlooking the main American artillery position, and stood by as the designated tactical reserve. Shortly after eight o’clock, a sizeable column of Mexican lancers supported by infantry charged westward into a sector of the plateau defended only by two infantry regiments and a detached 2-gun artillery section. One of the infantry regiments was Colonel William A. Bowles’ Second Indiana. It was at this juncture that the command redundancy within that regiment revealed itself as a battlefield weakness.³⁶

The redundancy predated Jim Lane’s run-in with his brigade commander. From the time when the Second Indiana first mustered into service midway through 1846, Joseph Lane presided as its de facto commander. As noted earlier, this remained unchanged, even after Bowles’ contested election to fill the regimental command vacancy occasioned by Lane’s promotion to

brigadier general. Understandably, throughout the miserably cold night before the battle commenced, everyone was on edge, and the men slept on their arms. Responding to what mercifully turned out to be a false warning of an imminent enemy contact, Bowles thoroughly botched a routine maneuver that ended with his soldiers facing away from the expected direction of the Mexican advance. No real harm resulted, though lives could have been lost had the alarm signaled an actual hostile encounter. The offshoot of this fiasco was a spontaneously formed ad hoc committee of soldiers, who implored General Lane to accompany their regiment into battle the next morning. He assented to their request.³⁷

The brigade commander joined the Second Indiana about daybreak on the eastern and most vulnerable portion of the field, on the extreme left of the American line. Any insights regarding his plans or intentions for that day he apparently failed to share with the regimental commander, Bowles. Not long afterwards, General Wool, observing the field from high ground located near Washington's artillery and Jim Lane's Third Indiana Regiment, spied enemy formations obviously massing for their attack on the American left. Lavender described the impression created by the Mexican columns. They "were ragged and hungry, but they moved with snap and precision. Their flags and battle standards and the red pennants on the lance tips fluttered brightly. Bands played cockily, and the waiting Yanks felt their nerves tingle with admiration and more than a little awe."³⁸

Immediately upon observing this ominous display of military pageantry, General Wool dispatched a messenger to warn General Jo Lane of what was about to befall the Indiana Brigade. When the Mexican attack came, both General Lane and Colonel Bowles were in close proximity to each other on the field, but too far apart to insure effective communication or concerted action. Consequently, what is often called "the fog of war" intervened in a way that

proved thoroughly humiliating to Second Indiana soldiers who had begun the day hoping to reflect credit on their state.³⁹ General Lane later published a report of what happened next:

I soon perceived that I was too far from the enemy for my muskets to take that deadly effect which I desired and immediately sent my aide de camp to the [artillery battery commander,] directing him to place his [cannon] in a more advanced position...By this movement I should not only be near to the enemy, but should also bring the [infantry] company on my extreme left more completely into action, as the brow of a hill impeded their fire. By this time the enemy's fire of musketry and the raking fire...posted on my left had become terrible.⁴⁰

In the moment of crisis, then, the brigade commander sought to increase pressure on the enemy and more effectively protect his soldiers by ordering a modest advance of about sixty yards. Unfortunately Colonel Bowles had no idea of what General Lane intended. The latter shouted, "Forward, guide center!" to the Second Indiana soldiers, then galloped to another part of the line. Bowles, meanwhile, ignorant of Lane's plans, decided the time had come to order a retreat. Witnesses later said that Bowles shouted "Cease firing and retreat!" no less than three times before Second Indiana troops paid him any heed. At length, however, a few individuals hesitatingly responded, before they began, according to David Lavender, "falling in little groups to the rear. As soon as their backs were turned to the enemy fire, confusion swelled to panic and a rout developed...Peeling away company by company, [others] joined the panting flight across the plateau into the lower part of the lower ravine."⁴¹

Fortunately for the entire army, the crews of the four artillery pieces involved in the engagement, left unprotected by the flight of their comrades, somehow managed to fall back up the plateau some distance to the northwest, where as David Lavender explained, "Thomas Sherman and John Reynolds had brought up two more guns from reserve," bringing to six the total number of cannon in service on that part of the field. "The six swiftly firing guns,"

continued Lavender, “made a formidable barricade across the newly occupied corner of the plateau,” forestalling for the time being any further Mexican advance.⁴²

The demoralized remnants of the 360-man Second Indiana, along with stragglers from other units, went streaming across gullies and ridgelines in a generally northwesterly direction before encountering the First Mississippi regiment, commanded by Jefferson Davis, the former son-in-law of Zachary Taylor. At Buena Vista the future president of the Confederate States of America directly affected the fortunes of the Indiana Brigade, especially the regiment led by Jim Lane. Davis’ entreaties to General Wool, Taylor’s second in command, drew Lane’s Third Indiana into the battle. Only moments before, General Taylor sent Davis’ First Mississippi to the plateau south of the northern ravine to intercept a column of Mexican cavalry then preparing for another attack. En route to his new position, Colonel Davis happened across General Wool, sent by Taylor to that part of the field to round up stragglers. Perceiving that his force of four-hundred men seemed likely to be attacked by “lancers, backed by what seemed a full division of infantry,” as Lavender phrased it, Davis “asked Wool for support. The only uncommitted regiment was Colonel James H. Lane’s Third Indiana, on the knoll behind Washington at the mouth of the north ravine.” Wool agreed to commit Lane’s regiment.⁴³

The present writer found no evidence indicating that James H. Lane and Jefferson Davis made each other’s acquaintance prior to the battle of Buena Vista. Whether they met previously or not, each probably knew the other by reputation. It is virtually certain, however, that Jefferson Davis was formerly acquainted with Jim Lane’s deceased elder brother, John F. Lane. They had known each other at West Point and, in the summer of 1828, graduated as members of the same class. In the run-up to Buena Vista, Davis, as Taylor’s former son-in-law, was considered to be the general’s “pet,” a dubious distinction that frequently resulted in the First Mississippi pulling

escort duty for the army commander. In any event, despite the fact that Jim Lane and Jeff Davis almost literally served shoulder to shoulder on the field at Buena Vista, little evidence survives to indicate the experience inspired anything like a spirit of collegiality between the two officers.⁴⁴ Whether Davis played any role prior to Buena Vista in stoking Zachary Taylor's former antipathy toward John Lane or the Lane family is a matter of speculation.

The Third Indiana, held in reserve, awaited its moment to relieve pressure on an endangered part of the field. Colonel James H. Lane recalled that his soldiers remained near Washington's battery, shielded from Mexican artillery fire, "until [after] the Second Indiana, Kentucky, Illinois, and Mississippi troops had been successively driven back by the overpowering force of the enemy." It was then that Davis asked General Wool for help, to keep his Mississippians from being overrun. On several occasions at Buena Vista, the weights in the scale of battle seemed to hang almost evenly, as if they could dip in favor of either the Mexican or the American army.⁴⁵

This was one of those times. "The enemy having been twice repulsed from our front," continued Colonel Lane, "and having completely turned our left flank and taken position next to the mountain, [the Third Indiana was] ordered there and formed a junction with Colonel Davis's regiment and the Second Indiana which had been rallied." Accounts vary concerning the degree of success achieved in attempts to re-form the Second regiment. Zachary Taylor's biographer, K. Jack Bauer, noted that "the largest group [of Second Indiana stragglers] was intercepted by the Third Indiana and formed into a provisional unit." Meanwhile, General Taylor had left the defensive position at the hacienda of Buena Vista in order to make his presence felt in Wool's threatened sector near the First Mississippi and Third Indiana.⁴⁶

In so many words, Colonel Lane described the junction formed between his Hoosier regiment and Davis' First Mississippi as if it presented a wedge, or V pointed outward to the enemy. Once formed, the Yankee line moved forward. As Jim Lane subsequently explained in an account published in the *New Orleans Delta*,

This force advanced upon the [Mexican] infantry and lancers and kept up a brisk fire until ordered to cease by General Taylor. It was now that the lancers made [their] charge...in column upon the extreme right of my regiment, the Second Indiana and Mississippians being on our left. They were permitted to approach within twenty-five steps of the line before I gave the command to fire. They were repulsed and fled under cover of their battery and their infantry dispersed among the mountains.⁴⁷

This was not the only action the Third Indiana saw that day.

The Mexicans were not yet finished, and for a second time employed a flag of truce as a ruse to buy time. "And then," observed David Lavender, "either improvising on the spot or executing a plan formed at the time of the white flag, Santa Anna decided on a last assault...One last hard drive, [he] reasoned, would carry the field." Santa Anna's final gamble to win the battle played out at the base of the southernmost ravine. Although Jim Lane and Jeff Davis realized that the foe was rallying there and moved their respective regiments as rapidly as possible toward the sound of the firing, they traversed difficult terrain, and were a considerable distance from the threatened part of the American line where, noted Lavender, Mexican "horsemen and foot soldiers rose like evil genii out of the bordering ravine to the south."⁴⁸

Once again, the melee brought General Taylor to the critical scene of action. W.H.L. Wallace, who was present on the field, later recalled, "The most tremendous firing ensued that mortal man ever conceived!...The whistling of the Mexican bullets was almost sufficient to drown the report of their guns, though they were only fifty yards from us."⁴⁹ Three American officers died at this juncture in a forlorn attempt to rally their fleeing soldiers: Colonel William

McKee and Lieutenant Colonel Henry Clay, Jr., both leaders of the First Kentucky Infantry, and Colonel John J. Hardin of the First Illinois.⁵⁰

According to David Lavender, a terrible artillery duel ensued wherein American cannon fire “chewed great holes in the tight mass of Mexicans; surveying the field the next day, correspondent Josiah Gregg came across seven men annihilated by a single round shot.”⁵¹ It was then that Davis and Lane’s troops reached the field for what General Wool called “the hottest and most critical part of the action.”⁵² The issue remained undecided well into the afternoon.

The Third Indiana, James H. Lane later reported,

Moved to the vicinity of [John Paul Jones] O’Brien’s battery, and when we arrived there the Kentucky and Illinois troops, overpowered by numbers, were retreating and the enemy pressing upon them and the battery, which was in imminent danger of being captured. We opened fire upon [the Mexicans] and they retired in the greatest disorder. This last blow terminated the battle, and...the Third Indiana bivouacked [that night] in the most advanced position held by our troops.⁵³

Another cold, miserable night lay in store for the Hoosiers, who made do without benefit of either blankets or cooking fires. However, they were much relieved, and perhaps more than a little surprised when dawn revealed that Santa Anna’s army had abandoned the field.⁵⁴

Without question, the *Climax at Buena Vista*, as David Lavender aptly titled his work was also categorically the climax of Indiana’s involvement in the Mexican War. The hardest fought victory of Zachary Taylor’s northern campaign eliminated any further Mexican threat to the Rio Grande valley. Afterward, by far fewer resources remained at Santa Anna’s disposal to dispute Winfield Scott’s southern drive to Mexico City. At Buena Vista, a time came in the heat of battle when General Taylor, standing near Braxton Bragg’s guns, purportedly said, “A little more grape, if you please, Captain Bragg!” Whether apocryphal or not, the words made outstanding

grist for newspapers clamoring to transform Taylor into a military hero if not a presidential candidate.⁵⁵

In comparison to the humiliation suffered by the Second Regiment, members of Jim Lane's Third Indiana Volunteer Infantry were particularly gratified at their recently gained reputation as stalwart defenders. They were veterans now, not raw recruits. No objections surfaced when people back home began calling the Ohio River soldiers by their new sobriquet, the "Steadfast Third." The very misfortune that befell the Second Indiana helped fuel the public's tendency to praise the Third, which received much of the credit for salvaging the collective honor of the entire brigade. It was only to be expected that Jim Lane would bask in the glow of his regiment's newfound notoriety. The following April a soldier in the ranks noted that the Third Indiana "received the warmest thanks from General Taylor yesterday," and that in the heat of battle their "Colonel and Lieutenant Colonel acted as if fighting had been their trade from childhood up."⁵⁶

Buena Vista held a dual significance for most Hoosiers. On the one hand, it was a battle won on or about Washington's Birthday, thanks in no small measure to the contributions of a brigade furnished by their home state; on the other, it connoted a controversy that manifested the political dimension of an ostensibly military campaign. War correspondents kept Indiana residents abreast of the embarrassment suffered by the Second Regiment. So dismal was the performance turned-in by its commander, William A. Bowles, that his superior, General Joseph Lane, feared that the affair could, by extension, taint both his personal reputation, and that of the entire Indiana Brigade. If any good came of the scandal, it was simply that the feud between Jim Lane and his brigade commander that had played out during the run-up to the battle faded into

the background as the debacle involving the Second Regiment took center stage in the public forum.⁵⁷

In March, Brigadier General Joseph Lane drafted a series of charges and specifications against Colonel Bowles that he subsequently forwarded through channels to the army commander.⁵⁸ Perhaps to Lane's surprise, General Taylor refused to convene a court-martial, preferring instead to let the matter drop. In the same breath that he expressed the hope that those beneath him in Colonel Bowles' chain of command would take no further action, Taylor did offer the alternative of a court of inquiry, which could be convened under General Wool's authority. This presumed that a personal desire on Bowles' part to clear his own name would be the catalyst for such an inquiry.⁵⁹

General Taylor based his rationale on reports submitted by General Wool and the latter's subordinate, Jefferson Davis, shortly after the battle. On March 27, 1847, through his assistant adjutant general, Taylor reminded Wool that "by reference to the official reports of the engagement at Buena Vista it is seen that the personal conduct of Colonel Bowles is extolled by yourself and Colonel Davis, with whose regiment he was associated after the flight of his own." Taylor felt that if his subordinates wanted to make an issue of Bowles' conduct during the battle, they should have mentioned it in their initial reports.⁶⁰

All of this only made Jim Lane's regiment look better by comparison. Had relations between him and the commander of the Indiana Brigade been more cordial, General Lane might have drawn from information provided by Jim Lane's after-battle report to justify a court martial of William Bowles. However, apparently because of the lingering ill-feeling between the two Lanes, the senior officer deviated from the normal practice of requesting this report from his subordinate. As a result, General Lane wrote his impressions of what transpired at Buena Vista

without benefit of Jim Lane's impressions or insights. By forestalling the insights that Colonel Lane could have provided, the Indiana Brigade commander had inadvertently limited his own options.⁶¹

William Bowles, for his part, would have been more than happy to abide by Taylor's recommendation that the whole matter be dropped. In the context of public reputation, Bowles had little to gain and much to lose by further in-depth examination of his behavior at the battle of Buena Vista. Yet his reputation was not the only one at stake. Perhaps for that reason, it came as little surprise to colleagues when General Lane demanded a court of inquiry to clear his own name, lest the stigma that attached to Colonel Bowles' reputation should tarnish that of the entire Indiana Brigade.⁶²

Thus it was that in late April 1847 two army courts of inquiry convened in Mexico, one to render an opinion regarding General Lane's conduct during the battle of Buena Vista, the other to pass judgment on Colonel Bowles' behavior during that engagement. Of the two, Lane fared far better. In his case, the court found that he had "conducted himself as a brave and gallant officer and that no censure attaches to him for the retreat of the Second Regiment Indiana Volunteers." The court that heard Bowles' case held that although he was "ignorant of the duties of colonel," he "evinced no want of personal courage or bravery." The essential problem was his "want of capacity and judgment as [a] commander."⁶³

Although Mary Foote Lane undoubtedly learned eventually about the exploits of the Steadfast Third and the controversy surrounding the plight of its sister regiment, not a word of it leached into her diary. Jim Lane's mother was simply relieved that her youngest surviving son still numbered among the living. It had taken about six weeks for word of Buena Vista to reach Lawrenceburg. On a Wednesday evening, she noted in her diary that April 7, 1847, had been:

a day of great anxiety and care; [so great] that I cannot compose my mind to make suitable preparation for sacrament. We cannot hear whether [James Henry] has fallen... whether wounded or whether he is safe. On the 22d or 23d of February our army had a very severe battle with the Mexicans, Santa Anna at their lead... 700 of our men among the killed and wounded, and 2,500 Mexicans.⁶⁴

By April 25, Mary Lane had been apprised that her son survived the battle. She prayed for his safe return and hoped “that the remainder of his life be devoted to the cause of his redeemer.” Mary Lane’s information relative to battle casualties was not far off the mark. A soldier’s account published in a neighboring county’s newspaper placed the number of Third Indiana casualties at nine killed and fifty-six wounded.⁶⁵

Even before Mary Lane learned that her son survived the battle, Jim Lane was taking the editor of the *New Orleans Delta* to task for inaccurate reporting. In doing so, Lane ironically found himself defending the actions of his immediate superior. Both Lanes, it seemed, had a stake in sustaining the reputation of the Indiana Brigade. “It is an error,” Colonel James H. Lane advised the editor, “that the Indiana Brigade, as a brigade, was in default.” When the Second Indiana caved, explained Lane, “the First Regiment was on the Rio Grande... and the Third on the extreme right” of the south-facing American line, a substantial distance away from the hapless Second. “I suppose your informant was led into error because Brigadier-General Lane was with the Second Regiment.” Colonel Lane gave the New Orleans editor to understand that the Third never “hesitated for a single instant, and it has the signal [distinction] of being one, if not the only one... [of the regiments] that did not retreat.”⁶⁶

Thus as early as April 1847, when Jim Lane disabused prospective readers of erroneous notions regarding the Third Indiana’s deployment on the field, the fire known to history as “The Buena Vista Controversy” was already kindled.⁶⁷ It would continue to burn throughout the 1848

presidential election. It started with Zachary Taylor's official report of the battle. By Taylor's account,

The Second Indiana, which had fallen back...could not be rallied, and took no further part in the action, except [for] a handful of men, who under its gallant Colonel Bowles, joined the Mississippi regiment, and did good service.⁶⁸

That portion of General Taylor's report said not a word about the service rendered by the Third Indiana. Elsewhere, however, after lauding the heroic efforts of his former son-in-law's First Mississippi Regiment, he added, "The Third Indiana Regiment, under Colonel Lane, and a fragment of the Second, under Colonel Bowles, were associated with the Mississippi Regiment, during the greater part of the day, and acquitted themselves creditably in repulsing the attempts of the enemy to break that portion of our line."⁶⁹

More than a few Indiana veterans thought Taylor's remarks intentionally downplayed the Third Indiana's contribution to carrying the field at Buena Vista. Indiana historian R.C. Buley noted that "members of the Third became very indignant at thus being 'also mentioned' along with the reorganized Second. The [Third] regiment played a role second to none in the battle." The aforementioned soldier who provided casualty figures to the *Madison Courier* substantially agreed with Buley's later assessment. The soldier minced no words in writing, "the Third Indiana Volunteers, you may rely on it, saved the pass. Had we given way before the charge of the [Mexican] lancers and infantry all was lost." Jim Lane and his men would be setting the record straight well into the future.⁷⁰

History does not record whether Zachary Taylor eventually came to regret his persistent refusal to make adjustments to his initial impressions of the battle. Doing so might have shifted a greater share of responsibility for the Second Indiana's embarrassment more squarely onto the shoulders of its commander rather than consigning that burden to his soldiers. Taylor also

possessed the power, by amending his report, to remove all doubt regarding the Third Indiana's contribution to carrying the field at Buena Vista.⁷¹

There was no shortage of officers who counseled such changes, including Taylor's subordinate commanders. On August 23, 1848, the *Indiana Sentinel* reminded its readers of "an article [published] over the signature of Buena Vista [making] the rounds of the papers shortly after that battle, disparaging the Indiana troops...General Taylor's false report is the only one that now goes uncorrected." With that as an introduction, the *Sentinel* proceeded to publish an exchange of letters between James H. Lane and C.P. Kingsbury, who used "Buena Vista" as his *nom de plume* in a piece written shortly after the battle. Kingsbury cheerfully retracted aspersions he formerly cast on the Third Indiana, and closed by thanking Jim Lane for the opportunity to make a public correction.⁷²

Mid-June 1847 found the Third Indiana and its sister regiments of the Indiana Brigade making preparations to board ships that would carry them back to their native soil. Thanks in part to the diligent efforts of his father, Lane verged on realizing his goal of raising a new regiment comprised of veterans and returning with it to Mexico for the duration of the war. All that, however, would take place in the waning months of the year. Meanwhile, members of the Steadfast Third looked forward to receiving a hero's welcome upon their return home. Their colonel had every reason to be pleased with his own bright prospects for the future. Although he had contingency to thank for the combination of circumstances that garnered Jim Lane a new statewide if not national notoriety, the outcome could not have been better had he written the script himself.⁷³

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Beyond Buena Vista: Western Phoenix Rising, 1847-1854

The Mexican War sewed considerable discord in Indiana. Historian Donald Carmony aptly observed that “Hoosiers strongly supported the men who were fighting in Mexico, but they differed much about the causes of the war and terms for its conclusion.” As the previous chapter explained, the Lanes consistently gave their unqualified support to the conflict as waged under the aegis of President James K. Polk’s administration, and were hardly disposed to split hairs over technical legalities of a policy that promised to extend American boundaries westward as far as the Pacific Ocean. Those who did not take this view they regarded with suspicion if not outright contempt. The Lanes and their friends scorned members of Congress who criticized what was commonly called “Mr. Polk’s War.” A Whig editor in Richmond, Indiana scoffed that Polk was prepared to settle the Oregon question on peaceable terms with England but was “determined to whip the poor, puny, and half-starved Mexicans.” The president and his cabinet, alleged the Richmond *Palladium*, “do not pretend to have any claim to California, yet intend to have it. Who can be enthusiastic about such a war, ‘conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity?’”¹

Such talk made Amos Lane’s blood boil. Already smarting from Zachary Taylor’s failure to give Jim Lane’s Third Indiana Regiment the credit he knew it deserved for winning the battle of Buena Vista, the elder Lane declared that Whigs “would sell destroy and damn their country if its disgrace would elect that old fire eating [Taylor] President.” He called leading Whigs “the blackest Traitors,” and insisted that they “be hung.”² Regardless of the accuracy of his perception, by the time the “Steadfast Third” won a name for itself at Buena Vista, the army

had only recently received the funds required for prosecuting the war. The political firestorm that ensued after Pennsylvania Congressman David Wilmot introduced his famous “Proviso” to make appropriations conditional upon banning slavery from any territory that the United States might accrue from the war complicated matters considerably. Although the Indiana public had generously sustained the president’s policies, continued support over a prolonged period could prove problematic.³

Such considerations boded well for the success of Jim Lane’s scheme to raise a new regiment comprised primarily of veterans. The latter represented a more dependable pool of prospective recruits than raw civilian volunteers vulnerable to an ambivalent if not hostile Whig press. As if to illustrate the point, a Whig newspaper in Richmond, Indiana—a mere sixty miles north of Lane’s hometown of Lawrenceburg—spurned Governor James Whitcomb’s spring 1847 call for more troops:

Volunteers *may* be found; but we had hoped the people of Indiana being convinced that the war with Mexico is designed alone to secure the annexation of territory upon which to establish the institution of slavery, would refuse to aid the President in his unholy scheme.” Several weeks later this paper observed: “Our Recruiting officer left this place, as he came, ‘solitary and alone;’ not one convert to follow in his train. If Polk wants men to fight his wars he must look for them elsewhere.”⁴

Jim Lane viewed his own plan for organizing the new regiment partly as a strategy that would inoculate prospective veteran volunteers against the esprit-destroying doubts such articles could potentially sew among green recruits.

The extended Lane family, like a number of others across the state but especially from the Ohio River counties, proved to be generally immune to the entreaties of war critics. The Third Indiana’s commander incidentally was not the only Lane willing to put himself in harm’s way in support of the president’s policies. Jim’s older brother, George Wright Lane, apparently

numbered among those members the Second Regiment who either stood their ground at Buena Vista or re-formed ranks in time to repel the repeated Mexican attacks described in the previous chapter. Shortly after returning home, George won a seat in the Indiana General Assembly. A brother-in-law, William Baldrige, commanded a company in the Fourth Indiana, a regiment mustered in response to the governor's second call for volunteers while Jim Lane's regiment remained in Mexico. It too was led by a Lawrenceburg native, Ebenezer Dumont, a local lawyer and county official who would cross paths with Lane in the following decade.⁵

While the younger generation of Lanes joined volunteer regiments from their home state, their father, nearing his seventieth birthday, volunteered in a different capacity. Historian W. H. Stephenson commented on the paucity of evidence documenting Amos Lane's whereabouts for nearly three years following the late summer elections of 1844. Stephenson did observe, however, that during this period the elder Lane made several trips to Washington that included appointments with the president and secretary of war. A close reading of the record explains why such trips were necessary, and suggests that they began earlier than 1847.⁶

As the midterm congressional elections approached, the Hoosier Democracy stood on shaky ground. Notwithstanding George Lane's personal success in his bid for election to the Indiana legislature, Whigs picked up two additional seats in the U.S. House of Representatives in August 1847. It no doubt represented increasing war weariness throughout the electorate. Shortly thereafter, noted Indiana historian Donald Carmony, "by the razor thin margin of 82 to 81, the House declared that the war had been '*unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States.*' Three Indiana Whigs voted for this declaration, five Democrats opposed it, and one from each party was a nonvoter."⁷ Although the election outcome certified waning public sentiment in favor of seeing the war through to a successful conclusion, it

benefited the Lanes by increasing the pressure on the Polk administration to consider favorably the Third Indiana commander's request to organize a new veteran regiment.

Amos Lane's most significant contribution to the Mexican War (and by extension, to Polk's presidency) took the form of persistent Washington lobbying on behalf of his son's designs. Telltale words and phrases embedded in formal correspondence Jim Lane received from the secretary of war that autumn of 1847 revealed both the measure of his father's political influence and the administration's urgent need to make good on mounting manpower shortages. "The Honorable Amos Lane has submitted to this department your application for permission to raise a regiment of volunteers," wrote John Y. Mason, "to be composed principally of officers and men of the Indiana regiments who have recently served in Mexico."⁸ In brief, the acting war secretary conveyed the president's approval to raise Lane's proposed regiment. Mason closed by enjoining Colonel Lane "to be as prompt as possible in preparing the regiment for service." Amos Lane's many trips to Washington had paid off.⁹

With the weight of a gubernatorial proclamation thrown into the balance, Jim Lane lost little time asking "the Returned Volunteers and Citizens of Indiana" to form a regiment that would be "creditable to the State and service." Appealing to the returned volunteers, he declared, "I fondly hope that the officers and men of the old [Indiana] brigade will at once be found rallying to the standard of their country."¹⁰ Lane's hope that one more campaign would "secure an honorable peace, and place Indiana first among the first," amounted to a veiled criticism of General Zachary Taylor. As noted in the previous chapter, Hoosier veterans resented his failure to recognize what they perceived as the disproportionate magnitude of Indiana's contribution to the success of American arms in Mexico.¹¹

By October 1847, Indiana's adjutant general reported that "the organization of the Fifth Regiment is going rapidly and pleasantly forward."¹² So frenetically did Jim Lane set about the task of manning his new regiment that on occasion he apparently forgot about the chronic diarrhea he contracted during his late tour of duty in Mexico. At one gathering in Greenfield, Indiana, besides defending "the justice of the war" and urging "its prosecution [to a] speedy and successful completion," Lane suggested,

That one year of camp life was worth five of inactive civil life. He set forth more inducements independent of the promptings of patriotism why men should volunteer in the present war and counteracted lucidly the unfounded statement that the climate of Mexico was prejudicial to health. He said he believed it was the most pleasant and congenial climate in the world and that all reports to the contrary were and are made and circulated by persons opposed to the war and its prosecution.¹³

Lane castigated critics of the war as unpatriotic. He concluded, said the local newspaper, by condemning "in the strongest terms the actions of such men; he knew not or cared not what their motives were, he believed they were enemies of their country and should on all such occasions, times, and places [be looked upon] as such."¹⁴ The views expounded by the scion of "the wheel-horse of the Democratic party in Indiana" on this occasion and others like it predictably mirrored those of his father.

The Whig argument that the Mexican War essentially amounted to a mere pretext for advancing southern proslavery interests hardly resonated with the Lanes, who regarded such arguments as, at best, distractions from the overriding need to win a decisive victory. Most of Indiana's prominent Democrats shared this view. Donald Carmony observed that the state's "two Democratic senators and most of its Democratic congressmen...[preferred] to delay resolution of the slavery issue until after the war was over and additional territory was secured" to the United States.¹⁵

During the Mexican War Robert Dale Owen, the Welsh-born entrepreneur, philanthropist, and social reformer best known for his New Harmony experimental community, served as a U.S. congressman from Indiana. Then and in the years that preceded the Mexican War Owen made quite a lasting impression on the Lane family. Like Jim Lane, he too cast critics as unpatriotic. As Carmony observed,

Owen reminded colleagues that when the war was called “unholy, unrighteous, damnable; the President’s war,” that these words were heard in Mexico. He asked: “what chance [have we] of terminating the war, while the enemy is daily fed with hopes, that, divided in feeling and distracted in counsel, we cannot, for any length of time, conduct military operations with vigor or prosecute them with success?”¹⁶

Senator Edward A. Hannegan, another Lane ally, held similar views. In 1835 while still serving in the House of Representatives, Hannegan chaired the select committee that investigated the alleged assault on Congressman John Ewing by Jim Lane’s older brother, then an army lieutenant. Carmony noted that Hannegan “considered agitation on the slavery question concerning additional territory [from Mexico] both premature and detrimental to the war effort. Why, he asked, ‘kindle a flame on either side of the matter now,’ as there will be time” later to address peripheral issues. In sum, it was not as if the Lanes and their Democratic colleagues in Indiana and elsewhere were oblivious to slavery. Rather they argued, as Carmony phrased it, “that it was premature to establish policy about slavery in territory yet to be obtained from Mexico.”¹⁷ Like Hannegan, the Lanes saw little sense in kindling a flame on either side of the matter. For as long as victory hung in the balance, the slavery issue could wait. Meanwhile, raising a regiment of veterans was a way to lead by example in both a military and political context.

The summer of 1847 held more in store for the Lane family than barbeques, speeches, and the prospect of mustering a new regiment. The interregnum between deployments also afforded an opportunity for Jim and Mary Elizabeth to become reacquainted. By the time Mary's husband rendezvoused with his regiment at Madison on the 25th day of September, the couple already knew they were expecting their second child. Despite the happy news, military matters predominated. After roughly a month of intensive drill, training, and attendance to interminable administrative details inherent in creating the Fifth Indiana, its members chose their field officers. "Of course," observed the *New Albany Democrat*, "James H. Lane...was elected colonel."¹⁸

The first day of November saw the Fifth Indiana bound for New Orleans aboard the steamboats Wave, Ne Plus Ultra, and Phoenix. They reached Vera Cruz, their designated port of debarkation, about three weeks later. One of Lane's company commanders opined that the regiment was encamped "on a beautiful grassy plain about a mile above the city," then averred "we have come at an unprecedented time." He observed also, "The health of the troops is good." That the last significant Mexican effort to thwart the American invasion collapsed at Puebla, even as the Fifth Indiana elected its officers, no doubt convinced Captain James McDougal that the regiment had arrived at a propitious moment. As the Fifth reached Vera Cruz, Santa Anna resigned his position as Mexican president, and shortly thereafter fled the country. Peace was in the wind.¹⁹

In contrast to the battles fought by Jim Lane's redoubtable "Steadfast Third," occupation duty awaited the Fifth Indiana. Thus, Lane's subsequent appointment as provost marshal of Mexico City virtually made him governor of the vicinity that included the capitol. His soldiers behaved well toward the local populace. Contemporaries extolled their regiment, noted W. H.

Stephenson, “for its perfection in drill, its strict discipline, and uniform good conduct,” a fact that relieved its commander from the burden of undue disciplinary problems. “Not a single individual,” continued Stephenson, had to be hauled before a court-martial, “for all ‘seemed to be moved by a desire to sustain the honor of the state.’”²⁰

During his second and more tranquil command tenure in Mexico, Jim Lane grew anxious about an economic slow-down back home. “I hear terrible stories of our town depreciation of property,” he confided to Mary Elizabeth, “and of course it affects my spirits.” Still, he expressed a determination to persevere. “Wife we are young,” he added, “with good constitutions and...we can soon recuperate.” Lane also averred that concerns over family well-being and public reputation informed his decision to return to the seat of war. “Wife I suppose you sometimes think I have acted...toward you...slightingly, he explained.” “I hope if I get home to convince you that my course is free from censure toward you or my family; indeed that I was influenced in my course by that very family.” To have remained at home before the war’s end, he insisted, “would have ruined” him and been a burden to the family. That, he “could not bear.”²¹

By June 1848, Colonel James Henry Lane looked forward to rejoining his family in Indiana. He was also clearly proud of his earlier role in General Taylor’s northern campaign. “This glorious war,” he wrote, is closed by a glorious and profitable peace—and wife your husband was engaged in it at the commencement and during its continuance and...is the only [colonel in the army] who mustered two regiments into the service.” In stressing this last accomplishment, Lane did not fail to mention that the Fifth Regiment had raised \$800.00 to present him with “an elegant sword,” in recognition of his leadership. Thinking of his imminent

return home, Lane enjoined his wife to reciprocate his affection. If she did, “this world will be almost a heaven.”²²

Regardless of whether Jim Lane’s personal life was heaven in the latter part of 1848, returning to Indiana entailed reentering the contentious world of party politics. A presidential election loomed in November. His father, Amos, proved himself a strategic thinker early in the campaign season by predicting that the Whigs would select Zachary Taylor to head their ticket. Amos further predicted that, should the Democrats nominate Lewis Cass, they would most certainly be beaten. “For if [the Whigs] have a war candidate,” he explained, “we must also.” Nonetheless, the Democrats had no one to match General Taylor’s war record. Thus, they did indeed nominate Lewis Cass for president, and, consistent with Amos Lane’s prediction, went down to defeat in the general election.²³

Things worked a little differently in Indiana. If the national Democratic ticket lacked a war hero, Hoosiers at least boasted a native son who, besides meeting that standard, ranked with his father among the most spellbinding speakers of his day.²⁴ “During the summer and fall of 1848,” observed W. H. Stephenson, “Lane kept his name before the public by attendance at barbeques and political meetings.” Although he thought the idea premature, some colleagues went so far as to toss about his name in connection with an upcoming vacancy to the U.S. Senate. Of course, he owed this surge of personal popularity to what Stephenson characterized as “brilliant military achievements” garnered at Buena Vista during the Mexican War.

Meanwhile Zachary Taylor’s continued recalcitrance in setting the record straight relative to the “Steadfast Third” and the Indiana Brigade’s overall contribution to achieving victory in Mexico increasingly undermined his credibility among Hoosier voters. Presently their collective mood shifted away from surprise and consternation, and toward retribution. The same dynamic

incidentally transformed Amos Lane's second campaign prediction into reality: Although Lewis Cass lost the national election, he carried Indiana by a five thousand vote margin over General Taylor.²⁵

From a country-wide perspective, the Whig strategy of 1848 proved effective. Adopting a platform that amounted to little more than listing Taylor's accomplishments in the late war avoided the necessity for a fractious debate over whether Congress possessed the authority to limit slavery in the territories. The strategy backfired, however, in Indiana. Hoosiers were having none of it. The case of Lew Wallace helps explain why the war so dominated the state's campaign season, as well as Jim Lane's almost exclusive public focus on the Mexican War. "In this campaign," observed W. H. Stephenson, "Wallace, heretofore a Whig, refused to support Taylor because of his attitude toward the Indiana volunteers, and [instead] helped edit a free-soil paper." Embracing the free soil movement provided Wallace a way to reconcile his opposition to slavery with his resentment of Zachary Taylor's insensitivity toward Indiana's war contribution. Conversely, the Whig focus on Taylor's Mexican War exploits conveniently allowed Jim Lane to oppose Taylor's election without dredging up a divisive issue that Lane and a phalanx of like-minded Democrats regarded as both distasteful and destructive of party unity.²⁶

That is not to say that a vote for the Indiana Democracy in 1848 was a vote in favor of slavery. Despite their resentment of abolitionists whom, they believed, undermined the war effort, a number of leading Hoosier Democrats opposed extending the geographical reach of the South's peculiar institution. As the end of the year approached, the time drew nigh for the state legislature to elect a replacement for U.S. Senator Edward Hannegan, whose term of office was about to expire. On December 14, it chose outgoing Governor James Whitcomb to fill the

vacancy. Referring to the acquisition of territory from Mexico, Whitcomb had declared, ‘This territory has come to us free (of slavery) and in my opinion should remain free, and that every constitutional and legal means should be adopted to keep it free.’”²⁷

A separate study would be required to determine how much or how little time and energy Jim Lane expended on the slavery issue during the 1848 presidential campaign. It is virtually certain, however, that the amount would prove negligible compared with Lane’s herculean effort to redeem the reputation of the Indiana Brigade and extol the accomplishments the Steadfast Third. At any rate, once the campaign season ended, one more symbolic act remained that would bring personal closure to his own war experience: formally receiving the sword he had written his wife about. Perhaps the most singular aspect of this ceremony was the date chosen for the presentation, January 8, 1849, the thirty-fourth anniversary of Andrew Jackson’s celebrated victory over the British at New Orleans.²⁸

In 1849 the Indiana Democratic party continued its longstanding tradition of holding its state convention on “Jackson Day,” so-called, explained Donald Carmony, “to capitalize on national pride and the General’s military fame.” The January 15, 1849 issue of the *Indiana State Sentinel* reported the grand public ceremony which took place in the chamber of the state legislature. “The sword is a very splendid one,” said the paper, “the gift of the officers and men lately under the command of Colonel Lane in the Mexican War.” The historical moment was the capstone of Jim Lane’s political career to that point in his life. His reputation as a state military hero paid high political dividends. When the state Democratic convention in Indianapolis began, he was an esteemed former commander of a volunteer regiment; before it ended, he held that party’s nomination for lieutenant governor.²⁹

As previously mentioned, traditional party politics of the antebellum era essentially ended four years earlier during the 1844 presidential campaign. This occurred because, according to New York Democratic Congressman Preston King, “slavery...upon which by common consent no party issue had [formerly] been made, obtruded upon the field of party action.” So alienated were loyal Van Burenites by their party’s nomination of James K. Polk for the presidency in 1844 that four years later they bolted to form a new party of their own. Its platform affirmed the tenets of the Wilmot Proviso and advocated securing homestead rights for western settlers, specifically including newly arrived foreigners fleeing European famines and autocratic monarchs. Thus the new Free Soil party adopted the rallying cry of “free soil, free speech, free labor, and free men.” Though still proportionally small in 1848 compared with the Whig and Democratic parties, it attracted a sufficient number of their defectors in New York to deprive Lewis Cass and his running mate, William O. Butler, of the state’s thirty-six electoral votes needed to win the national election. From that point until the Civil War, slavery remained the preeminent and most divisive national political issue.³⁰

This inconvenient reality placed the Lane family in an uncomfortable predicament relative to some longstanding personal loyalties and party allegiances. Despite their strong ties to New York and their former support of Martin Van Buren in the 1836 and 1840 elections, when confronted with the ominous choice between schism and unity, the Lanes invariably opted for the latter. To them, party fracture was anathema. Strong Unionists above all else, they accordingly persisted in their fealty to the national Democracy. Years later as a newly-elected U.S. congressman from Indiana, Jim Lane received an invitation from the Tammany Society of New York to attend its thirty-ninth annual Jackson Day festivities. Pleading the pressing nature of new responsibilities to excuse his absence, Lane rejoiced, “To know that there are some yet

remaining in the Empire State who are anxious to allay the disaffections which have proved so disastrous to the success of the Democratic party in your State.”³¹

Formerly, as historian Yonatan Eyal argues, the Young America wing of the Democratic Party “acted as a glue touching Barnburners and Hunkers, Van Burenites and Calhounites, northerners and southerners.” The Lanes did everything in their power to ensure that the glue holding the Hoosier Democracy together bonded indefinitely. Some synthesis of Lewis Cass’ doctrine of popular sovereignty and homestead rights for prospective western settlers represented, to their minds, the best hope for preventing the disastrous disaffections that had plagued New York from destroying their party’s hard-won hegemony within Indiana. For that reason Jim Lane in the late 1840s and early 1850s focused his considerable talents on achieving unity and preventing defections. It was only logical, then, that he steered clear of strident political factions that ever more shrilly pled the cause of “Southern rights” on the one hand and abolitionism on the other. Thus, in 1854 following his election to Congress, Lane reminded his colleagues that he hailed from a state that occupied the “summit of the conservative position.” In practical political terms, that meant decrying both proslavery and antislavery extremism in whatever guise they appeared. Few if any of his 1840s contemporaries called him a chameleon for taking this stand.³²

In August, 1849, Indiana voters validated Jim Lane’s nomination for lieutenant governor. Both Lane and the Democracy’s gubernatorial nominee, Joseph A. Wright, won handily. Each garnered close to seventy-seven thousand votes apiece, and incidentally scored ten-thousand-vote margins over their respective Whig rivals.³³

Although the Free Soil turn-out in Indiana was meager in proportion to the support received from the two major parties, voters who rallied to its standard found considerable solace

in the election outcome. While the final tally was still pending, editors of the pro-Free Soil *National Era* declared themselves “highly gratified” that Lane and Wright were “advocates of Free Soil and the non-extension of slavery.” The editors also expressed confidence in the determination of persons elected to the state’s highest offices to uphold the Wilmot Proviso. The Mexican War, they averred, “was waged by a slaveholding administration for the extension of slavery, and the aggrandizement of the South at the expense of the North.”³⁴

The days that fate gave Amos Lane to relish his son’s 1849 election victory could be counted on the fingers of two hands. When, in January 1848, the elder Lane correctly predicted that Lewis Cass would win Indiana’s electoral votes in the U.S. presidential campaign, the “wheel-horse of the Democratic party” in that state had roughly a year-and-a-half to live. Although he enjoyed robust health until almost the very end, the same cholera epidemic that carried away Harriett Beecher-Stowe’s infant daughter in Cincinnati also felled the Lane family patriarch who resided only twenty-six miles downriver in Lawrenceburg. Amos Lane died on September 2, 1849, as official results of the recent state elections were still being counted.³⁵

Though still inconclusive, circumstantial evidence indicates that Amos Lane celebrated his seventy-first (and last) birthday in New York state renewing both professional and family ties. That much is at least suggested by diary entries his wife made in the aftermath of the 1848 election campaign. Certain it is that Mary Lane spent the winter of 1848-1849 in upstate New York. With regard to the social conventions prevalent in her day, it would have been highly unusual if not unseemly for any woman, let alone a matriarch two months older than her septuagenarian husband, to make such a lengthy and multi-legged journey without a male escort. The trip unavoidably entailed travel by stage, rail, and water.³⁶

Points visited included Buffalo, Geneva, Syracuse, and finally, recorded a relieved and travel-weary Mary Lane, “the curve of the St. Lawrence.” This last portion of the journey occasioned a stopover at Kingsport before proceeding to the final destination, Ogdensburg, where she and Amos first met and courted. There for one last time Mary strolled the banks of the Oswegatchie River with three other sisters. The interregnum since their last reunion spanned roughly forty years. That Mary neglected to mention Amos by-name may signify nothing more than a husband whose presence was eclipsed by the emotion of the moment. Revisiting the scenes of her youth, while simultaneously meeting three grandchildren for the first time, plausibly induced a euphoria that contributed to the oversight. Characteristically, Mary Lane marked the occasion with poetry.³⁷

Singularly important though the trip was in a personal sense, its route paralleled the geographical trace of events that hold historic significance. Places visited by the couple bring to mind Captain McDougal’s earlier remarks describing the arrival of their son’s regiment in Mexico. Their New York visit, too, occurred at an “unprecedented time.” As they passed through Buffalo, for example, Amos Lane probably reflected on friends who attended the Free Soil convention hosted by that city the previous August, when New York’s disaffected political factions chose Martin Van Buren to lead their new party. Given her family’s connections to Robert Dale Owen, and her own passion for reading and keeping informed on current affairs, it is almost inconceivable that Mary Lane was incognizant of the famous women’s rights convention recently held at Seneca Falls. Nor would it have escaped her attention that the Seneca Falls convention met in the town’s Wesleyan Methodist Church.³⁸

Amos Lane, as noted earlier, did not live to see his son sworn-in as Indiana’s lieutenant governor. That ceremony occurred at yet another historic moment, as Hoosiers anticipated an

impending revision of their state constitution. The charter had not been amended since 1816 when Indiana first entered the Union. Indeed, a constitutional convention was already in the works on Jackson Day of 1849 when Jim Lane received the sword commemorating his service in the Mexican War. Despite W. H. Stephenson's contention that "the office of lieutenant governor...then, as now, [was] a relatively unimportant position," issues that Indiana's state government grappled with during Lane's tenure played no small part in shaping his attitudes and reactions to political events after he immigrated to Kansas.³⁹ He occupied an excellent vantage-point for observing these earlier proceedings.

Lane assumed the duties of his new office in December 1849, the same month, according to Donald Carmony, that outgoing Governor Paris C. Dunning "advised legislators that it had become their 'plain duty' to provide for the election of delegates to a constitutional convention." The same election that had given Jim Lane the lieutenant governorship also polled voters to gauge popular support in favor of crafting a new state charter. The response was overwhelmingly affirmative. Convention delegates incidentally chose as their chairman Alexander F. Morrison, a Lane family political ally since Andrew Jackson's first term as president.⁴⁰

When pondering arguments advanced by Jim Lane after he arrived in Kansas, it is important to consider that during Indiana's 1850 constitutional convention, he hardly stood out as an iconoclast. All six sections of the charter it produced concerning the legal status of Indiana's black population, for example, initially fell within the purview of a Committee on the Rights and Privileges of Inhabitants Within the State. Robert Dale Owen chaired this committee. As its name implies, matters brought before it covered a broad spectrum of topics in addition to those that touched on race relations. Committee deliberations regarding the rights and privileges

to which the women of Indiana would be entitled commanded the particular interest of the extended Lane family.⁴¹

A bond of mutual support that prevailed between their kinship network and Robert Dale Owen has gone largely unnoticed by historians. Owen's committee work on behalf of women's rights in Indiana strengthened a sympathetic association with Lane kin that, for reasons explained earlier in this chapter, was originally forged some years before the Mexican War.⁴² The name of Priscilla Buell Drake, whose brother, George P. Buell, was Jim Lane's brother-in-law, appears often in Lane family correspondence. While residing in Indianapolis, she maintained an open channel of communication with her Lane kinfolk in Lawrenceburg. Priscilla's husband was, as previously noted, a mover and shaker in the Indiana Democracy. During the 1840s, he mentored Jim Lane, and in the Mexican War, commanded the First Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry as part of the Indiana Brigade."⁴³

Writing early in the twentieth century, Indiana adjutant general Oran Perry observed that Priscilla Drake "partook" of her husband's "liberal views in politics, religion, and social questions. They worked together with Robert Dale Owen during the Constitutional Convention to remove the legal disabilities that surrounded the women of [Indiana]." The Drakes were not the only ones who shared Owens' views. The prerogative of Indiana women to own property also interested Mary Foote Lane. As Perry phrased it early in the twentieth century, the political agitation over women's property rights reflected a "latent restive feeling of the noble mothers of Indiana."⁴⁴ When Jim Lane's mother felt restive about something, she often responded proactively.

Despite the recent death of her husband, Mary Lane retained enough interest in contemporary political issues to lend her support to Owens' efforts. If all this was consistent

with what a Civil War era Kansas journalist later described as “a superior woman,” possessed of “fine intellectual qualities,” by twenty-first century standards hers was a very conservative cause indeed. In many respects, Mary Foote Lane embodied the totality of mid-nineteenth-century traits historian Barbara Welter classified as ‘the cult of true womanhood.’⁴⁵ Still, her actions represented an instance of maternal example that plausibly affected her son in later years.

Hugh Fisher, the Methodist cleric who delivered James H. Lane’s funeral oration in Lawrence, Kansas in July, 1866, claimed to “know him intimately and long and well.” Fisher also opined that he “never knew a man who...was so powerfully under the influence of [his] mother’s teachings.”⁴⁶ However negligible or important Jim Lane’s role in framing the Indiana constitution of 1851, surviving records suggest that Mary Foote Lane and other members of her family’s extended kinship network made their presence felt by pooling their efforts in support of policies advocated by Owen.

Following the death of Jane Lane Huntington in 1836, Jane’s husband Elisha had moved on with his life. In 1848, shortly before Jim Lane became lieutenant governor, Huntington, who had since remarried, left Terre Haute and resettled his new family in Cannelton, Indiana. While the constitutional convention met in Indianapolis, the “new” Mrs. Huntington, according to state historian Thomas De La Hunt, “initiated the movement” in support of Robert Dale Owen that her husband’s former mother-in-law soon joined in Lawrenceburg.⁴⁷

Just before Christmas 1850, the *Cannelton Economist* published an appeal in behalf of women’s rights in Indiana. By twenty-first century standards it was modest indeed, couched in conservative wording that fell entirely within the proscribed bounds of social convention that Welter addressed in her study. The open letter solicited contributions towards purchasing a “token of our lasting gratitude” in recognition of “the high-minded gentlemen, delegates to the

Constitutional Convention, who favored the adoption of the section securing to the married women of Indiana, independent rights of property.” Determined to avoid any taint of Whigish elitism, the ladies made a point of limiting contributions to no more than a dollar from each prospective donor, “that the women of Indiana, generally,” might “contribute to this most laudable object.” Mary Lane’s late husband would have approved.⁴⁸

A considerable proportion of the fourteen feminine signatories of the open letter published in the December 22, 1850, issue of the *Cannelton Economist* were all current or former spouses of contemporary movers and shakers within the Indiana Democracy. Besides Susan M. Huntington of Cannelton, three other signers included Mary Foote Lane and Mary St. Clair Buell, both of Lawrenceburg, and Priscilla Holmes Buell, of Indianapolis. The offshoot of their successful fund drive was “a magnificent silver pitcher” bearing the inscription, “Presented to Robert Dale Owen by the Women of Indiana, in acknowledgement of his true and noble advocacy of their independent rights to property, in the Constitutional Convention of 1850.”⁴⁹

Could an 1850 Indiana fund-drive, in tandem with values inculcated earlier by his mother if not perhaps both parents, have predisposed Jim Lane to champion women’s rights five years later in territorial Kansas? Although such intangibles defy measurement, anecdotal evidence at least suggests this possibility. Writing roughly a century later, James Malin noticed an episode long ignored by Kansas historians. It occurred during the Topeka constitutional convention of October 1855, when Lane, in his capacity as the convention’s president, cast a tie-breaking vote that secured Mrs. Clarinda Chapman’s admission to record its proceedings. “To Clarinda Chapman,” observed Professor Malin, “must go the distinction, probably, of being the first woman newspaper correspondent accredited in Kansas to report a public meeting.” Who is to say that the example of a mother, deceased for less than a year in October 1855, did not reach out

from the grave to influence her son's decision to help an aspiring journalist go beyond the staid bounds of feminine propriety and enter a sphere formerly considered the exclusive domain of male journalists?⁵⁰

Perhaps with justification, some of Jim Lane's antislavery contemporaries criticized his supposed callous attitude toward persons of color. Two Lane biographers, William Elsey Connelley and Connelley's protégé, Wendell Holmes Stephenson, both wrote of a rumor that once made the rounds of Westport, Missouri. It alleged that Lane said "he would as soon buy a Negro as a mule, and that the question of the success of slavery in Kansas [should depend] upon the suitability of the country to produce hemp." Scholars should take Lane's pre-Kansas background into account when pondering the historical significance of these criticisms.⁵¹

Any indifference or callousness on Lane's part to the fate of Indiana's black population in the mid-1850s mirrored an attitude common among the state's registered voters. For reasons made clear in foregoing paragraphs, Lane's mind was geared to regard the whole race issue primarily as a potential threat to party unity. It was at least in part a mentality forged in the crucible of war while facing Mexican lancers. Accordingly, Lane tended to avoid the subject in his public statements and appearances. W. H. Stephenson's study of the 1849 campaign for lieutenant governor found that Lane "had nothing whatsoever to say on one of the most important issues of that campaign—the slavery question." Lane's silence, though, was a statement in itself, amounting to acquiescence in the collective stand taken by the Indiana Democracy.⁵² Indifference is an opinion.

The Democratic party's position during the 1849 campaign, averred Stephenson, suggested "a strong support for free-soilism." Moreover, "during the interval between the election of Taylor and the crisis of 1850 there was a decided antislavery tendency in the

Democracy of the Northwest.” Yet, antislavery sentiment in the Old Northwest was hardly synonymous with abolitionism. It assumed other guises in that region that included opposition to extending slavery to the territories and establishing a program for establishing colonies in Africa to accommodate both slaves and freedmen.⁵³

Roughly a month after James Henry Lane assumed his duties as lieutenant governor, the Indiana General Assembly passed a resolution related directly to race relations in Indiana. With one stroke, it publicly remonstrated in favor of African colonization while simultaneously suggesting that the federal government assume full responsibility for the initiative:

Whereas the settlement of the African coast with colonies of civilized colored men is the cheapest and best plan of suppressing the [African slave] trade...Be it resolved...that our Senators and Representatives in Congress be...requested in the name of the State of Indiana, to call for a change of national policy on the subject of the “African Slave Trade,” and that they require a settlement on the coast of Africa with colored men from the United States, and procure such changes in our relations with England as will permit us to transport colored men from the united States to Africa, with whom to effect said settlement.⁵⁴

Those who seek to know the genesis of how Jim Lane’s notions about antislavery affected his actions after he arrived in Kansas need look no farther than this legislation, which apparently reflected a near consensus among enfranchised Hoosiers of that period. Upon its approval the bill bore the signatures of Indiana’s governor, the speaker of the state house of representatives, and Jim Lane. Article thirteen of Indiana’s 1851 constitution subsequently codified the state’s black exclusion policy in greater detail.⁵⁵

An idiosyncrasy of the 1850 convention in Indianapolis may have influenced Lane’s actions five years later, after he immigrated to Kansas. It concerned a requirement, as Donald Carmony explained, “that the article [in the new constitution] about black exclusion and colonization be voted on as a ‘distinct proposition’ with no other part so submitted.” Because

Hoosier voters subsequently endorsed the article's six sections by a significant margin, Carmony pronounced the canvass a measure of "the approximate peak of antiblack sentiment, prejudice, and discrimination in Indiana."⁵⁶

In October 1855, Jim Lane, Charles Robinson, and other leaders in Kansa labored to unite the myriad factions within the territory's fractious antislavery community under a single free-state banner. Delineating the rights and privileges accorded prospective black settlers emerged as a sticking-point during the Topeka convention. To break the impasse, Lane proposed a compromise solution: a referendum on what settlers called the "black law." His idea required no long search to find a precedent. The Topeka constitution, ratified by free-state voters the following December, contained provisions strikingly similar to those found in the 1851 constitution adopted in Indiana. As in Indiana, they specifically approved its black exclusion clause by a separate vote.⁵⁷

To James Henry Lane and a majority of Democrats in Indiana, then, the antislavery cause had little to do with notions of racial equality. Neither did it suggest a willingness to live in close proximity to black people. Whatever he said or did not say publicly on the subject, Lane's family had maintained a sympathetic rapport with purveyors of African colonization since the mid-1830s when his deceased older brother served as Amos Lane's congressional assistant during Andrew Jackson's second term as U.S. president. Historian Eugene Berwanger quoted the editor of the *Indiana State Sentinel*, "[Colonization] we can enter into with heart and soul, and one upon which we love to dwell [because] they must go."⁵⁸

This mid-1850s line of reasoning prefigured that used by Jim Lane during the Civil War, when, as Ian Spurgeon observed, "colonization remained his favorite option... In February 1864 Lane eloquently argued that a section of Texas be set aside for the black population." If, by then,

colonizing Africa seemed unfeasible, planting Negro enclaves of free labor in former Confederate states offered a means of, in Lane's words, extending "to [blacks] that substantial freedom to which they are so justly entitled." Thus, colonization surfaced as a war measure for achieving a dual purpose: keeping the races separated, and punishing treason in the South. None of this entailed any fundamental change of attitude on Lane's part.⁵⁹

Another facet of James Henry Lane's career that warrants additional scrutiny by historians concerns the relationship he cultivated with the European immigrant community both before and after his arrival in Kansas territory. Entries made by Mary Foote Lane in her diary as early as 1842 mark the advent of "German revivals" in Lawrenceburg. Historian Kenneth Stampf observed, "Most Hoosiers welcomed the flood of German and Irish immigrants which poured into Indiana during the forties and fifties." The Lane's were no exceptions. "These newcomers," continued Stampf, "made a rich cultural contribution to the state and played a substantial part in its economic progress."⁶⁰

The torrent of German and Irish immigrants Stampf referred to peaked at about the time Jim Lane assumed his duties as Indiana's lieutenant governor. Predictably, he and the movers and shakers within the Indiana Democracy welcomed the new immigrants as potential voters. It was equally predictable that as Kenneth Stampf explained, the state constitution of 1851 provided for extending "the voting privilege to foreign immigrants after they had declared their intention to become [U.S.] citizens and resided in the United States for one year and in the state for six months."⁶¹

Thus did the Indiana constitution that became effective in November 1851, incidentally convert every recent European arrival residing in the state's fourth congressional district into a prospective constituent of Jim Lane. It is in this context that historians should view Lane's role

as Indiana's official host to Louis Kossuth during the latter's 1851 visit to the United States.

Kossuth, of course, embodied the forlorn hopes of Europe's ill-fated 1848 revolutions. As W. H.

Stephenson observed:

In December, 1851, a large and enthusiastic meeting was held in Indianapolis, and a committee was appointed to invite the distinguished Hungarian to visit and partake of the hospitality of the state. The lieutenant governor was selected as chairman of a committee to meet the guest in Cincinnati, deliver the invitation, and accompany him to Indianapolis. While at the capital Kossuth was the special guest of the senate, and Lane introduced him to members of that body.⁶²

These festivities incidentally provided Lane a golden opportunity to cultivate his public image as an advocate for the rights of immigrants.

Kossuth's Indiana visit also became one of a chain of occasions wherein Young Democrats like Jim Lane took positions that brought them into close alignment with those taken by their traditional political foes. A year earlier, secretary of state Daniel Webster responded to an Austrian official who criticized President Taylor's effort "to ascertain the progress and probable result of the revolutionary movements in Hungary." Webster gave the Austrian government to understand that, although the United States had no intention of meddling in European affairs, it wished "success to countries contending for popular constitutions and national independence...because they regard[ed] such constitutions and such national independence...as real blessings."⁶³ In his public appearances with Kossuth, Jim Lane played upon the same theme.

Reflecting on this period of American history, Yonatan Eyal observed that "congressional Democrats with Young America leanings delivered speeches and made rhetorical gestures of support for the rebels," usually stopping just short of advocating military intervention on behalf of Young Europe. All told, it was a situation ideally suited for the exercise of Jim Lane's

elocutionary talents, and he made the most of it. Although he was not yet a U.S. congressman at the time of Kossuth's visit, Lane's aspirations and position in Indiana's Democratic infrastructure definitely suggested it as a reachable political goal. Meanwhile, in January 1853, his term as lieutenant governor was set to expire.⁶⁴

In August of the previous year, Lane's party nominated him to represent Indiana's fourth congressional district in the U.S. House of Representatives. Moreover in October 1852, explained W. H. Stephenson, "the Democrats were successful and returned ten out of the eleven congressmen from Indiana" to the national legislature. Lane simultaneously battled for his own seat in Congress and waged a successful campaign in support of the national Democratic ticket headed by Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire and Senator William R. King of Alabama. Because his party had also made him a presidential elector for the state at large, he was among the thirteen Indiana Democratic electors that gathered at Indianapolis in December 1852 to vote for Pierce and King.⁶⁵

The other Indiana electors who voted for the national Democratic ticket that year included Ebenezer Dumont, an old acquaintance of Jim Lane. Because the pair came dangerously close to fighting a duel in 1851, Stephenson opined that "a review of Lane's career as lieutenant governor would not be complete without mention of...a difficulty that arose between him and Ebenezer Dumont." Be that as it may, no compelling need exists to rehearse the details of an episode already addressed by Stephenson and chronicled in documents in the safe keeping of the University of Kansas' Spencer Research Library.⁶⁶

The most important fact pertaining to the near clash is that it never happened. Onetime Lane ally J.H. Shimmons suggested that Lane should be judged by his success rather than by his words. That Lane substituted words for bullets in his difficulty with Dumont hints at a valuable

skill learned from his late father, namely, how to walk the fine line between incendiary speech and violent action. By knowing where to stop in the game of verbal brinksmanship, Jim Lane avoided the kind of tragedy that nearly ended his deceased brother's military career fifteen years earlier. Lane successfully applied this skill in 1851 in his encounter with Dumont, as well as on subsequent occasions in Kansas.⁶⁷

The episode with Dumont underscores yet another strand of continuity in Lane's life. If nothing else it confirms that the precepts of the gentleman's code to which he was first exposed as a boy still remained deeply lodged in Lane's psyche four years before he left Indiana. He never renounced them. That they continued to influence his behavior after he arrived in Kansas territory suggests that his feelings on this subject, if not entirely rational, were nonetheless genuine and persisted over a period of decades. His behavior relative to dueling, though exasperating to contemporaries who did not share his views, hardly indicates a chameleon-like character. More likely is the probability that it mirrored values first imbibed as a pre-teen at his father's knee. He was, in other words, essentially a product of his times and the prevailing antebellum culture that predominated along the Indiana-Kentucky border.⁶⁸

Christmas 1853 saw James Henry Lane already sworn-in as a representative of Indiana's fourth congressional district, and the Thirty-third Congress well underway. As he passed that important milestone, his mother contemplated the coming June, when her youngest son would celebrate his fortieth birthday. Between Jim Lane's arrival in Washington and December 5, when Congress convened, Mary Foote Lane served up some cautionary advice. "What a man is at forty," she warned, "he will continue to be through the remainder of his life—you have from now until June to go upon." Predictably, she urged him to hold fast to religion, and rehearsed some of the angst she had suffered on her son's behalf, especially while he served in Mexico.

During those two years, she reminded him, “hardly an hour passed” when she “did not send a petition to heaven” for him.⁶⁹

Something about Washington made Mary Lane uneasy. The self-aggrandizing and materialistic ambience that prevailed in the nation’s capitol, after all, hardly meshed well with her personal world-view. Perhaps some combination of advanced age and insight gleaned from experiences shared with her late husband focused Mary’s thoughts on character. “There has been no time in your life,” she confessed to her son, “when I have felt a deeper concern, or a more prayerful anxiety than I do at present.” If nothing else, the apprehensions Mary Lane expressed at least inspired a response that she apparently found reassuring. The night before Congress convened, she offered a final word on character: “If your heart is right, your actions will of course be so... Tomorrow opens to you a new scene—a new course of life to which you are an entire stranger—what responsibility rests upon you, learning it.”⁷⁰

Jim Lane indeed had much to learn in what must have seemed an incredibly short space of time. During his first quarter-year in office, Lane behaved in a manner typical of any junior legislator who sought a reputation for hard work and intra-party cooperation. He seized every opportunity to praise Franklin Pierce, and deprecated anything that remotely hinted at party disunity. He averred that “every assault upon [Pierce’s] administration must be viewed as an attempt at disorganization”, and would be met “with strong rebuke.” There is little doubt that in early 1854 Jim Lane dismissed any suggestion of an estrangement from the president and leaders of his party as inconceivable.⁷¹

Meanwhile Stephen A. Douglas, a distinguished Democratic senator from a neighboring western state, readied legislation to organize a broad expanse of the old Louisiana Purchase only sparsely populated by white settlers. Debate on his bill conceivably could offer an ambitious

novice congressman an opportunity to join in the public discourse. Though long a proponent of making government land available to prospective settlers (as opposed to speculators) at affordable prices, James H. Lane had misgivings about the measure Douglas proposed.⁷²

As was true of his Mexican War experience and his parents' 1848 visit to the scenes of their youth, Jim Lane's tenure with the Thirty-third Congress occurred at an "unprecedented time" in the nation's history. Fate had spared neither "the wheel-horse of the Democratic Party in Indiana" nor an iconic older brother, who might have relished the moment with him. Still, he remained as their sole surviving representative, ready, willing, and able to serve as surrogate. Almost twenty years, earlier Elisha Mills Huntington had voiced a desire to "see success perched upon [Amos Lane's] banner." By 1854, the patriarch was no more. Yet, fortune once again seemed to smile on the family he left behind. From that collective vantage point, the success perched upon Jim Lane's banner that year assumed the appearance of a phoenix. A broad, indeterminate future beckoned with all its inherent opportunities and dangers. As his fortieth birthday neared, Lane perhaps recalled the words he penned to Mary Elizabeth from Mexico: "Wife we are young and with good constitutions and...we can soon recuperate." He was ready for the fray.⁷³

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

“Ho, For Kansas!:" Jim Lane’s Move to the Territory, 1854-1855

The 1853 holiday season marked the end of a year-long interregnum between Jim Lane’s term as Indiana’s lieutenant governor and the beginning of his short lived career as a U.S. congressman. Chance denied Lane a large measure of whatever good cheer he might have expected that Christmas, for it was then he learned that courting the immigrant vote could have its downside. A previous chapter mentioned that Lane’s duties occasionally brought him in contact with celebrities whose reputations derived from the 1848 revolutions in Europe, and that among this select group, Hungarian Louis Kossuth stands out as the most notable. At mid-century these famous revolutionaries symbolized a new tide of democracy that seemed to be rolling inexorably across the Old World. Jim Lane’s watch as lieutenant governor ended as the Hoosier Democracy continued its tradition of cultivating ever closer ties to refugees from the recent European upheavals for the potentially rich harvest of votes they represented.¹

Indiana’s demographic changes portended rough sailing for Lane’s successor in the lieutenant governor’s chair. The large influx of immigrants generated more anxiety than goodwill in locales where citizens harbored an endemic fear of foreigners, especially those who subscribed to the Roman Catholic religion. “The immigrants,” observed one historian, “remained a class apart, forming their own settlements and retaining their own habits and customs, many of which were repugnant to the Americans.” Moreover, natives feared communities where tolerance of lower wages created additional pressure in a job market already under stress.²

By the early 1850s, immigrants were a political force to be reckoned with, potentially representing enough votes to influence the outcome of state if not national elections. Even the

venerated Kossuth raised more than a few eyebrows when he suggested to one German-American audience, “You are strong enough to effect the election of that candidate for the presidency who gives the most attention to the European cause.” A backlash was brewing. Jim Lane’s successor would have his hands full.³

Just under a year after Lane vacated the lieutenant governor’s chair, Indiana received a visit from two Italian celebrities unnoticed by Wendell Holmes Stephenson and other Lane biographers. Father Alessandro Gavazzi was a one-time Catholic priest who renounced his former religion to become a popular spokesman for Young Europe’s revolutionary cause. In late 1853, the Hoosier Democracy proffered courtesies upon him that matched those previously accorded Kossuth. On October 29-30, explained historian Carl Brand, Gavazzi addressed crowds in Indianapolis “on the evils of the Church of Rome, against Catholic schools, and of the horrors of the Inquisition.” In all probability Jim Lane knew about, if he was not actively engaged in, the welcome given Gavazzi by state officials. Indiana Democrats prepared once again to capitalize on a visit by another celebrity highly esteemed by foreign-born voters.⁴

Yet there was more to Alessandro Gavazzi’s tour than met the eye. Besides coming to America for the general purpose of deriding the Catholic Church, in 1853 Gavazzi intentionally crafted his schedule to match the itinerary followed by Archbishop Gaetano Bedini, who visited America during the same period as an official emissary of Pope Pius IX. According to historian David J. Andres, Gavazzi intended to shadow “Bedini throughout his trip, rousing indignation [against] the Catholic Church and alerting the public to the barbarism” allegedly inflicted by the nuncio on the hapless European revolutionaries.⁵ It was Jim Lane’s misfortune that the trace of Bedini’s route brought him to Cincinnati in the wake of Gavazzi’s visit to Indianapolis.

As Bedini and Gavazzi made their rounds, the Reverend Lyman Beecher's *Plea for the West* resonated with Ohio River evangelical congregations whose anti-Catholic sentiments were well-entrenched by mid-century. In this publication, observed Catholic Church historian James F. Connelly, Beecher "brought out the dire plight of Americanism and Protestantism in the West. A direct appeal was made [to Beecher's Protestant readership] to resist the encroachment of this foreign Catholic Religion, especially in the region of Cincinnati." Moreover, explained Connelly, "from the earliest display of Catholic missionary activity, a bitter anti-Catholic spirit prevailed among the sectarian groups of the city." The nativist sentiment aroused by Beecher and other Protestant divines in 1853 hardly boded well for Bedini's impending visit. The nuncio represented a Pope widely hated for spurning Young Europe and embracing a notoriously autocratic Austrian monarchy headed by a Roman Catholic emperor.⁶

Archbishop Bedini embarked on his ill-starred tour of the United States and Canada just as Jim Lane prepared to take his seat in the Thirty-third U.S. Congress. Predictably, Lane depended on the continued support of recently naturalized foreigners within his Fourth District constituency. Ironically, it was the German "Forty-eighters" of neighboring Cincinnati who negated any gains Indiana Democrats hoped to achieve from cultivating the goodwill of immigrant voters. Archbishop Bedini arrived in that city shortly after visiting Pittsburg, where a "minor disturbance" occurred, and Louisville. Meanwhile, Gavazzi had seen to it that the archbishop's "reputation" preceded him. A Cincinnati paper, alluding to atrocities allegedly committed or condoned by Bedini against the revolutionaries of 1848, asked its readers, "Dost thou know who Bedini is? There is blood on his hands—human blood! [He is] a murderer, a butcher of men."⁷

The advance work done by Gavazzi, the Protestant clergy, and a host of hostile journalists predictably electrified the political atmosphere that awaited the Papal nuncio's arrival in Cincinnati. A local history recorded the reaction of the city's ethnic Germans:

With them the belief was popular that they had been betrayed, and among their betrayers they thought they recognized Father Bedini, who had in some way got mixed up with their affairs in Europe. When, therefore, in 1853, as the Pope's Nuncio, he reached Cincinnati...they called an indignation meeting, the result of which was the framing of a request for the Nuncio to leave the city. Upon the adjournment of this meeting, a crowd [of two hundred or more Forty-eighters] started for the Archbishop's residence...In the meantime, [the Mayor] had heard of the threatened disturbance, and had issued an order to [the]...police to take steps to prevent it.⁸

From that point, the situation quickly degenerated. Measures police hoped would guarantee public safety went tragically awry. They attacked, "using their clubs right and left in such a vigorous manner that a panic seized the rioters," who beat a hasty retreat. Besides the fourteen injuries sustained by the German protesters, Henry Carroll, a local night-watchman, was mortally wounded, and died of his injuries the next day.⁹

The ramifications of this Cincinnati Riot of 1853 posed an imminent threat to Jim Lane's political future, which now depended on the lame hope of minimizing the public outcry that followed immediately. That the contemporary press parlayed the tragedy into a national issue was no more than predictable; but events took an unexpected turn when former Democratic presidential candidate Lewis Cass gave the fiasco new life by discussing it on the floor of the U.S. Senate. As Andres explained,

On January 23, 1854, Senator Lewis Cass, father of the United States minister to Rome [Lewis Cass, Junior], introduced a resolution to ascertain the nature of Bedini's mission. Cass went on to condemn the outrages against Bedini and to defend the nuncio's past, particularly the charge that he had murdered Ugo Bassi [a priest sympathetic to the Italian revolutionaries.]¹⁰

His remarks inspired a rejoinder by Senator Stephen Adams of Mississippi, who suggested that Cass' meddling could endanger the rights of American citizens. "I find no authority in the Constitution," said Adams, "for us to...regulate public opinion."¹¹

The early weeks of 1854 found a junior congressman from Indiana contending with a sudden firestorm of anti-foreign sentiment within his district. The Bedini Riot, the way Jim Lane viewed his obligations to immigrant voters, and his public stance on the Kansas-Nebraska bill share a connectivity of seismic importance to the way his future unfolded from that point forward. That Lane's hometown of Lawrenceburg lay less than thirty miles downriver from Cincinnati, did not help matters.

Cass's resolution concerning the Bedini visit and the introduction of Douglas' Nebraska bill coincidentally occurred on the same day. Consequently, the national slavery controversy that would be reignited in response to the Kansas-Nebraska Act came in the midst of another discourse concerning the status of immigrants and Roman Catholics in American society. Meanwhile, the Cincinnati riot, besides providing fodder for the national debate over nativism, simultaneously sparked a corresponding parochial movement inside Indiana strong enough to destroy the Democratic party's former hegemony in state politics.¹² The phenomenon, though short-lived, dealt a knockout blow to Jim Lane's short-term political aspirations.

That three of Lane's siblings—two sisters and a brother—had married into the Roman Catholic Buell family hardly endeared him to the Know-Nothing element of Indiana's Fourth Congressional District. Know-Nothingism, observed Indiana historian Carl Brand, "professed to oppose and annul the influence of the Roman Catholic church over the institutions and affairs of our country and to break up the [perceived] subserviency of American politics and politicians to foreign influence." Though more formally known as the "Order of the Star Spangled Banner,"

or “Order of the Sons of the Sires of ’76,” critics dubbed it “the Know-Nothing Order” for its notoriously self-imposed secrecy. Brand averred that “no man of prominence” played a role in spreading the clandestine organization throughout Indiana. Instead, “the work was accomplished by obscure men.” Nonetheless, its Indiana membership grew by leaps and bounds in the immediate aftermath of the Bedini affair.¹³

Sadly for Lane’s interests, the earliest and most exponential growth of this secret order occurred in the immediate vicinity of his hometown. Less than a hundred days after first making their appearance in May 1854, Indiana Know-Nothing leaders boasted of an aggregate state-wide membership in excess of thirty thousand. So unprecedented was the order’s growth rate that politicians almost immediately recognized its potential for influencing elections. Ohio River communities witnessed the most rapid growth of all. “In Dearborn County,” observed Brand, Know-Nothings “claimed a majority.”¹⁴

Jim Lane’s public record as an advocate of immigrant rights combined with his aforementioned long-standing connections to the Buell family to make him an obvious target for nativist detractors. Meanwhile, as debate in Congress raged over Douglas’ Kansas-Nebraska Act, the rise of Know-Nothingism continued apace within Lane’s local Indiana constituency. Only in this context can his exceptional sensitivity to an amendment introduced by Senator John M. Clayton of Delaware be fully appreciated. The revised version of the Nebraska bill that Douglas’ Committee on Territories placed before the Senate on January 23, 1854, guaranteed immigrants voting rights and the prerogative of holding public office, if they declared their intention to become U.S. citizens. Clayton specifically crafted his amendment to abrogate such rights.¹⁵

As a junior congressman, Jim Lane kept his public remarks on the House floor to a bare minimum. Like most of his Indiana colleagues, he harbored misgivings about northern reaction to the Nebraska bill, but preferred to voice objections to such potentially fractious issues only in caucuses held behind closed doors. Predictably he remained discreetly silent in January, when five disenchanted party members in both houses of Congress denounced the provision in the Kansas-Nebraska bill that eliminated the 36° 30' northern boundary of slavery mandated by the 1820 Missouri Compromise. As previous chapters have shown, years of experience and grooming dating to the early 1830s conditioned Lane to view his party's internal channels as the single most effective means of pursuing legislative goals that required political cohesion and unity of action. He preferred to act in concert with his party or not at all.¹⁶

James H. Lane knew very well that, as historian Willard Klunder phrased it, Lewis Cass "had no quarrel with [the] popular sovereignty core" of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Lane's personal support of Cass pre-dated the presidential election campaign of 1848, and his family had been on good terms with Michigan's former territorial governor since the days of Andrew Jackson's presidency. Lane in early February would have thought it only appropriate that Cass and Senator John Petit of Indiana stood out among northern Democrats who championed the Nebraska bill in Congress. Then came the first week in March, when Senator Clayton introduced his amendment. As noted earlier, its intent was to strike from the Nebraska bill the provision that permitted immigrants to vote and hold office in the new territories.¹⁷

Up to that point Lane, along with the rest of his colleagues in the House, closely monitored the progress of the Nebraska bill through the Senate. "After a stormy all-night session," observed Nicole Etcheson, "the Senate passed the bill [with the Clayton amendment intact] in the early morning hours of March 4." Robert Russel explained that a separate vote on

the amendment broke out along sectional lines. “Every Southern member present,” noted Russel, voted “aye and every free state [Senator] but one nay.” The Clayton amendment was of such visceral interest to Jim Lane’s southeastern Indiana constituents that he took the exceptional step of voicing his concerns in an open letter. He raised the possibility that he might be forced to vote against the Nebraska bill to protect the interests of citizens in his district if it retained the form given it by the Senate. Still, any expectation of taking a stand against leaders of his own party went against the grain and weighed heavily on his mind.¹⁸

President Franklin Pierce and Senator Stephen Douglas were in no mood to brook opposition of the sort presented by the Independent Democrats. As the embodiment of the Young America movement in Congress, Douglas was not entirely insensitive to the objections generated by the Clayton amendment. Still, pressure applied by the Pierce administration, observed Eric Foner, entailed “ruthless manipulation of the patronage to ensure the bill’s passage.” In Illinois, “Douglas insisted that ‘the principle of this bill will form the test of Parties,’ and threatened to ‘shoot the deserters.’” The game played out in much the same fashion across the North. “In state after northern state,” concluded Foner, “the party hierarchy demanded obedience to the Douglas measure. In Indiana, Senator Jesse Bright, the [Democratic] party dictator, had opponents of the bill expelled from the state convention and from local conclaves.”¹⁹

Lane was no party deserter; neither was it in his blood to pursue any policy that would alienate him from the inner councils of the Indiana Democracy. Once the threat posed by the Clayton amendment receded, it logically followed that he would vote in favor of the Nebraska bill. This was true despite the fact that a viral species of radical nativism so roiled the public mind in his home constituency that it supplanted slavery as the most volatile public issue of its

time. Both Lane's vehement opposition to the Clayton amendment and his subsequent vote in favor of Douglas' Nebraska bill were entirely predictable, given his background as an Indiana Democrat, his recent experiences as lieutenant governor, and the pro-immigrant policies codified in Indiana's recently adopted state constitution. Equally predictable was his fealty to party allegiances that dated to his father's tenure in Congress. Jim Lane's demonstrated adherence to principle during this episode suggests resolve rather than a proclivity for political vacillation.²⁰

James Henry Lane in the House and John Clayton in the Senate both stand as notable exceptions to the norm posited in the early 1960s by historian Robert R. Russel. "On final passage of the bill," averred Russel, "probably not as many as five votes in both houses together turned principally or even largely on the bearing the bill might be expected to have on any issue other than slavery." Lane's public objections to Clayton's amendment led to a lively exchange on the House floor with Augustus Sollers of Maryland. In a heated moment Lane purportedly quipped, "The gentleman may mould the sentiments of his curly heads, but thank God I represent a constituency that does not require five men to count as three." Theodore Hunt of Louisiana was among the slave state congressmen who predictably took offense at Lane's remark.²¹

When Hunt pursued the matter a few days later, Lane seized the opportunity to explain his position on the slavery issue. "I shall go as far as any of you," said Lane, "in trampling out agitation in the North, and as far as any of you in trampling out agitation in the South, which is calculated to disturb the harmony of the Union." It is understandable that post-Civil War biographers, writing with the advantage of historical hindsight, focused on this episode without realizing the cause that fueled Lane's hypersensitivity to the Clayton amendment: a festering nativism inside Indiana's Fourth Congressional District that could potentially jeopardize his chances for reelection.²²

John Clayton's status as a southern Whig shielded him from the sort of pressure Stephen Douglas applied to Democratic party colleagues to ensure passage of the Nebraska Act. According to Russel, when the House sent its version of the bill back to the Senate for the last time, Clayton withheld his support, "ostensibly, because he could not swallow squatter sovereignty." John Clayton had less to lose than Jim Lane did in assigning party harmony a low priority. In any case, by the spring of 1854 there was little left of the Whig party to harmonize. In some parts of the country—including Lane's Fourth Congressional District in Indiana—its tenets had become superannuated by an ascendant Know-Nothing agenda.²³

During the run-up to Indiana's 1854 election, an eclectic mix of disaffected anti-Nebraska elements throughout the state, especially including the Know-Nothings, coalesced to form a "Fusion," or "People's Movement." "Although the Know Nothings had nowhere openly run tickets of their own," noted Carl Brand, "the thorough manner in which they controlled, almost monopolized the People's movement [in Indiana] was now so well known that its victories were reported indiscriminately as Fusion, or Know Nothing successes." By the time election day arrived, on the tenth of October, explained Brand, "the way to political preferment was through a Know Nothing 'wigwam,' and to oppose nativism was to commit political suicide."²⁴

In apparent defiance of an increasingly obvious political reality, the Indiana Democracy refused to go down without a fight. Four days before President Franklin Pierce signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill into law on May 30, 1854, the Democratic party of Indiana assembled in convention at Indianapolis. It unanimously adopted a resolution critical of what many members now called "the dark lantern party." The resolution disparaged the endemic secrecy of the Know-Nothing movement:

That the Democracy of Indiana, still adhering to the constitution of the Confederacy, openly and avowedly condemn any organization, secret or otherwise, that would aim to [deprive] any citizen, native or adopted, of his political, civil, or religious liberty²⁵

Although facing an uphill battle, noted Brand, “the [Indiana] Democrats made the campaign of 1854 chiefly against Know Nothingism.”²⁶

It was during this period—the late spring and early summer of 1854—that Jim Lane decided to forego a bid for reelection to Congress, although he deferred advising his constituents until the month after the Indianapolis convention adjourned. “In a letter addressed to the voters of the Fourth Congressional District,” wrote Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “Lane declared that feeble health prevented him from being a candidate.”²⁷

Scholars have long presumed that Jim Lane’s support of the Nebraska bill worked his ruin in Indiana, eventually forcing him to leave his home state in search of more lucrative political opportunities in Kansas. That was the view adopted by W. H. Stephenson, who believed that if Lane had run for reelection after voting in favor of the act, “he might have suffered the fate of four of his Democratic colleagues who voted for the Kansas-Nebraska bill.” Thus, concluded Stephenson, “he did not even seek the nomination.” While some northern Democrats faced the dire choice of either alienating their constituents by voting in favor of the Nebraska bill, or ruining their futures within the party establishment by voting against it, this was not universally the case. In the 1970s, Michael F. Holt noted a tendency among some historians to underrate the significance of other factors that affected the behavior of mid-nineteenth-century politicians. These included, averred Holt, such forces as “the rise of the Know Nothing party—forces that had little to do with the slavery crisis.”²⁸

Surveying the past from his late nineteenth-century vantage-point, Professor Leverett Spring demonstrated a proclivity for reading history backwards. “How did it happen,” asked

Spring, “that Lane should betake himself to Kansas in the spring of 1855?” In the 1880s Spring ventured a statement to the effect that “for some cause Lane’s political fortunes did not thrive in Indiana,” and consequently “took himself to the fresh fields of Kansas.” By the late 1890s, Spring seemed surer about why Lane emigrated “to the debatable ground.” It was because he had “ruined his political fortunes in [Indiana]...by his vote for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, while a member of the House of Representatives.” By the late 1950s other historians embraced Spring’s explanation of Lane’s decision to emigrate. Albert Castel, for example, flatly stated that Lane’s “vote in favor of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill wrecked his political career in Indiana, and he came to Kansas early in 1855 to repair it.”²⁹

A friend and contemporary of Lane’s—Robert Gaston Elliott—later provided significant insight into part of the reasoning that informed Lane’s decision to leave Indiana. Though offered by Elliott more than forty years after his friend’s death, it nonetheless carries the weight of a first-hand account. Elliott, like Lane, hailed originally from Indiana. At mid century both men—independently and for different reasons—traded comfortable livelihoods in their native state to seek an unknown future in the newly organized territory of Kansas. Recalling a convention that both he and Lane attended, Elliott mentioned the various strategies considered by free-state men in advance of an 1857 election. According to Elliott, “Some of the [convention] members who had witnessed the sudden and unlooked for overturning of the Democratic party in 1854 by the Know-nothings proposed the adoption of their methods, but Lane, himself a victim of that policy, would have none of it.” If this contemporary view of Elliott’s is credible, Jim Lane’s motivation for leaving Indiana had little to do with either alienation from the Democratic party or retribution exacted by an aroused antislavery constituency.³⁰

Analyzing Lane's reasons for immigrating to Kansas requires dividing the puzzle into two core issues: the public cause that impelled him to leave Indiana, and peripheral factors including personal considerations, that affected both the decision to move as well as the timing of his departure. Besides positing a questionable assumption that Lane's vote on the Douglas bill constituted the root cause for his departure, Stephenson, perhaps because of a lack of relevant evidence, eschewed examining the private sphere of Lane's life at mid-century. Perhaps giving Jim Lane credit for being more of a long-range planner than he was in reality, Stephenson also ventured a second dubious conclusion: that "in all probability [Lane] determined to emigrate to Kansas before he rejected the nomination."³¹

For an office-holder to lay low for a season to weather a local political storm that temporarily roils his constituency is one thing. It is another matter altogether to abandon hearth, home, and a fairly lucrative legal career to move an entire family to an austere frontier community notorious for strident political factionalism. No written record survives to confirm precisely when James H. Lane decided to forsake Indiana for a new life in "the fresh fields of Kansas," as Professor Spring expressed it. Yet surely timing had to be an important consideration.³²

Politician that he was, Jim Lane occasionally used double entendre as a means to avoid telling quite the whole truth about a given situation. Stephenson was probably right to infer that seizing upon personal health issues spared Lane the humiliation of a difficult and unpleasant reelection campaign that offered little hope of success. That, as Stephenson noted, "during his term of service in the house, Lane was frequently absent on account of ill health," was a matter of record. Stephenson further observed that "after Lane returned from Mexico...in 1848, he stated before a notary public that he had contracted [chronic] diarrhea" during his tour of duty,

and was subsequently “prostrated by the disease” for the remainder of his service.³³ Lane’s episodic bouts with his debilitating illness created a face-saving alibi that allowed him to bow out of the 1854 congressional elections. This public explanation proved as effectively amorphous as it was plausible.

Stephenson probably had no way of knowing that in 1854 Jim Lane fretted over health concerns not exclusively his own. His mother, by then a widow for roughly five years, neared death that October when nativists ended the Democracy’s decade-long ascendancy in Indiana state politics. Mary Lane lingered for two months after the election before peacefully passing the following December. Where Lane’s subsequent immigration to Kansas is concerned, a fundamental question for historians is whether Jim Lane possessed any foreknowledge of his mother’s impending demise. Mary Lane had been unwell for years. It is quite possible that her son intended to stay in Indiana for as long as she remained alive.³⁴

Exactly when Jim Lane first began thinking seriously about moving to Kansas remains a mystery. During this period family matters probably weighed as heavily on his mind as declining political fortunes. Stephenson’s suggestion that Lane’s decision to immigrate dated to the previous June overlooks the possibility that contingency influenced Lane’s Kansas musings more than any other factor between mid-1854 and the following March, when his term in Congress ended. It may also be significant that as late as February 1855—two months after his mother’s death and two months prior to his arrival in Kansas territory—James H. Lane was still running ads in local newspapers to garner prospective clients for his Lawrenceburg law firm.³⁵

As the first session of the Thirty-third Congress drew to a close in early August 1854, it was still too early to predict whether the Democracy or the so-called Fusionists would win the impending election in October. Besides, to Lane’s mind, important work remained that summer,

for it was only a few days before the first session of the Thirty-third Congress adjourned that a graduation bill passed both houses.³⁶

Getting some variety of homestead legislation through Congress before the first session ended topped Lane's priorities. He hoped to see it pass in conjunction with the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Desiring approval of the latter in its original form, Lane wanted the Senate to "pass the Homestead bill sent to them some weeks since by our House, giving to every white person, male or female, over 21 years of age 160 acres of land." Lane believed linking the two bills together would effectively bar slavery from the newly organized territories. Instead of regarding this perspective as symptomatic of a "wavering and irrational attitude," or chameleon-like behavior, historians could view it alternatively as an indicator of intergenerational fealty to the homestead ideal. The Lanes' vision of westward expansion foreshadowed the concept of Manifest Destiny in vogue at mid-century and dated to the heyday of Senator Thomas Hart Benton.³⁷

Opening western lands to bonafide settlers (as opposed to speculators) was a family political project that dated to the early 1830s when Jim Lane's father served in the Twenty-third Congress. "Who raised the value of [western] lands," Amos Lane once asked, "those who remained at home in ease, comfort, and luxury; or those hardy pioneers who went into the wilderness, subdued the savage, and made it smile and blossom like the rose?" Amos' son voiced much the same sentiments twenty years later. Although Jim Lane advocated passage of a homestead bill that would give "every family head...land out of the public domain, upon condition of occupancy and cultivation," he decried legislation to reserve "a tract of land to a corporation for the purpose of building a railroad [that would benefit] only a few." The distinction involved a fundamental principle traditionally important to the Lanes, namely, the

right of instruction. “Now my first lesson in Democracy,” said Jim Lane, “was that we should legislate for the whole people, and not exclusively for the rich and well-born.”³⁸

On March 2, 1855, the second session of the Thirty-third Congress adjourned *sine die*. In all probability this session seemed rather anticlimactic to Lane, since the legislation in which he was mainly interested passed during the first session, and also because concerns related to his impending emigration surely dominated his thoughts. The end of April would find him, along with his wife and their four children, in Kansas territory. A confluence of circumstances created the conditions that impelled them to venture westward. The move replicated a family precedent established a generation earlier, when Lane’s father and mother abandoned New York and struck out for a new life on the Ohio.³⁹

That Jim Lane’s wife and children shared his Washington lodgings throughout his term in Congress loosened the ties that formerly bound them to Lawrenceburg. By 1855, both his parents were deceased. When his term of office expired in early March, both the graduation act and the Kansas-Nebraska bill had become the law of the land. Lane could do little more than look on helplessly as the Know-Nothing fever ran its course, operating through the fusion movement to drive the Democracy from power in Indiana.⁴⁰

Meanwhile, midway through 1854, the newly created Republican party emerged as a national organization. Neither Lane nor his Democratic party colleagues realized at the time that the fusion movement in his home state represented in embryonic form the future Republican party of Indiana. As historian Eric Foner explained, “as late as 1858, the name ‘Republican’ was not used in states like Indiana...in order not to antagonize conservatives who associated Republicanism with radical policies. One radical pundit likened this reticence to a baby going

three years without a name.” Although Lane numbered among the conservatives, he could embrace no species of conservatism that condoned a nativist world-view.⁴¹

When Jim Lane and his family left Washington in late winter 1855, “the baby” had yet to be named in Indiana. Foner also noted that fusionist movements in different locales exhibited a range of traits that reflected the various former party allegiances of their supporters. Indiana represented something of an anomaly, since, according to Foner, “in the [other] western states conservatives were more likely to join new fusion parties than the Know-Nothings.” In Indiana, Know-Nothing lodges collectively became the driving force in the state’s fusion movement. It must have galled Lane and other Young Americans within the Hoosier Democracy to be disparaged as “Old Liners” by adversaries who only recently abandoned Whiggery for fusionism.⁴²

The family traveled together as a unit on its trek to Kansas. In former days, Jim Lane’s solid reputation as a national Democrat would have vouchsafed his family’s safe passage as it made its way by steamboat across Missouri in the spring of 1855. What compelled him, then, to travel incognito? Neither his admirers nor detractors denied that he wore a disguise. Leverett Spring noted that upon arriving in Lawrence, Lane explained, “My route through the territory lay through Missouri. I should have fared badly if I had been recognized. So I adopted this disguise of overalls and a round-about.”⁴³

Despite Lane’s Democratic party credentials, pro-slavery Missourians considered him anything but sound on the “goose question.”⁴⁴ Many of them associated his staunch defense of immigrant rights with Thomas Hart Benton, whose last term in Congress reflected support garnered mainly from St. Louis’ ethnic Germans. By 1855, Missouri’s Know-Nothing element had seriously damaged the reputations of both Lane and Benton. For reasons of intra-party

infighting that fall outside the scope of this study, Benton had run afoul of the proslavery constituency in Missouri that was led by Senator David Rice Atchison. Largely because of Atchison, Benton was already far down the road of political decline when Jim Lane first arrived in Washington.⁴⁵

For his part, Lane had alienated Missouri's pro-slavery faction by publicly speaking out against Clayton's amendment to Douglas' Nebraska bill. What Robert Russel observed about southern sensibilities in Congress incidentally explains the antipathy of Senator Atchison's backers toward Jim Lane. "The main consideration," argued Russel, "was not the proper treatment of immigrants but how the suffrage requirements would affect the slavery question in the...territorial legislatures: Immigrants were predominantly strongly antislavery, and giving them the suffrage would strengthen the free state cause." Pro-slavery Missourians, meanwhile, rejected any interpretation of popular sovereignty that risked giving immigrants sympathetic to free labor a foothold in Kansas territory; hence the need for Jim Lane to wear a disguise as he traveled through the state.⁴⁶

There were occasions when Lane's adherence to the principle of popular sovereignty situated him at a place on the political spectrum pleasing to no one. Pro-slavery advocates resented the potential limitations voters might impose on taking human "property" into newly organized territories. Conversely, because abolitionists feared that popular sovereignty might become an administrative vehicle for opening Kansas to slavery, Lane's vote in favor of the Nebraska bill rendered him *persona non grata* to many northerners. This group included Dr. Charles Robinson, hired by the New England Emigrant Aid Company (NEEAC) to establish an anti-slavery community in Kansas. Contingency made the two men arch rivals.⁴⁷

More than one historian has accepted at face value Robinson's inference that Lane left his family to fend for themselves in Indiana while he embarked on his Kansas adventure. By Robinson's account, "rumors said [Lane] came to Kansas in favor of slavery; tried to purchase a female slave on credit in Missouri, but could not get trusted; had quarreled with and separated from his wife...besides voting in Congress to open Kansas to slavery." Robinson's comment about Lane's divorce and an attempted purchase of a female slave suggests that he left his family in Indiana and sought to procure human chattel en route to Kansas in order to satisfy a primitive need for female companionship. A century later, Nicole Etcheson apparently based her views of Lane's character on Robinson's earlier assessment. Etcheson, too, mentioned "rumors that Lane, estranged from his wife and three children he had abandoned in Indiana, had tried to purchase a female slave in Missouri."⁴⁸

An 1858 "Autobiography" by Jim Lane published in the *New York Times* contradicts Robinson's version of what happened. Writing in the third person, Lane recalled that his wife "accompanied him from Washington City [to Kansas] with their children." Presuming Lane's memory to be accurate on this point, the family would have included four children ranging in age from one to eleven. The same Robert Gaston Elliott mentioned previously in connection with Lane's political downfall at the hands of the Know-Nothings subsequently became editor of the Lawrence *Kansas Free State*. An article Elliott ran in the April 30, 1855, issue of the *Free State* confirms that Mary Baldrige Lane traveled at her husband's side: "Col. James H. Lane, late member of Congress from Indiana, arrived in our place on the 22d inst., with his family all in good health and spirits....He...will in all probability remain permanently with us. His design is to live in the territory." If Lane had attempted to procure a female slave en route to Kansas, it may be that his wife needed a servant to perform domestic chores and look after three-year-old

Annie Lane and her little sister, Eugenie (aged eighteen months when the family began its journey).⁴⁹

Exactly what James H. Lane intended to do once he reached Kansas remains a matter of conjecture. In the mid-1880s, a surviving brother opined that Lane “had no expectation of leaving the Democratic party: he desired by a conservative course to make Kansas a free state and a Democratic State.” Whatever his desires, fate brought his political activities to an abrupt halt, at least briefly. While free-state advocates bemoaned the result of a fraudulent March election that brought a so-called “bogus” territorial legislature into existence, the Lane family suffered a profound personal tragedy. On June 18, 1855, little Annie Lane succumbed to an illness. Her parents buried her on their new homestead. This little-noticed episode likely played a catalytic role in the couple’s divorce, which occurred the following year.⁵⁰

In Jim Lane’s aforementioned 1858 newspaper “autobiography,” published before the pair reconciled, he gave a politician’s gloss to the dismal story of his wife’s initial heartbreak and complete disillusionment with Kansas. “Accustomed to the conveniences and refinements of a city life,” said the former husband, “Mrs. Lane found it difficult to endure the hardships, annoyances, and inconveniences of a pioneer’s lot. She desired to return, and went to her home in Indiana.” That was putting it mildly. The grief occasioned by Annie’s loss was more than a distraught wife could bear. The Lanes separated, putting off a final disposition on their marriage until some future date.⁵¹

Mary Baldrige Lane first petitioned the circuit court of Dearborn County, Indiana, for a divorce in November 1855. She indicated that, following Annie’s death, she and the rest of the children (except for her son, James H. Lane, Jr.) returned to Lawrenceburg. Thus, sometime after June 18, 1855, Jim Lane accompanied Mary and their surviving daughters to the confluence

of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers, booked passage on a steamer bound for Indiana, and gave his wife to understand that in three weeks he would return and take them back to Kansas. Three weeks eventually turned into ten months. The couple next met the following April, during Lane's visit back East, two weeks after the U.S. Senate rejected the Topeka Movement's petition for statehood, and just prior to Lane's indictment for treason by a Kansas territorial court. Shortly thereafter, on May 17, 1856, their divorce became final.⁵²

All this goes to demonstrate that contingency is no respecter of political timetables. Notwithstanding this season of personal trauma in Jim Lane's life, a ceaseless parade of historic political events unfolded in Kansas during the same period. If Lane was opportunist enough to manipulate crises in a way that advanced his own interests, he would hardly have difficulty finding one that summer in Lawrence. Viewing Kansas' early settlement from a nostalgic post-Civil War perspective, Charles Robinson remembered a time of cohesion and consensus. "The Free-state party acted as a unit," he recalled, "and none could well be spared from the ranks. All had not the same gifts, but everyone found full play for his faculties, and none are to be disparaged."⁵³

Former *Free State* editor Robert Gaston Elliott remembered things somewhat differently. The view he presented cast the period between the Lane family's arrival in Lawrence and little Annie's death in mid-June as one that involved nothing less than a rebellion within a rebellion. Citizens were almost literally up in arms over a recent election farce, perpetrated on March 30, 1855, relative to choosing a legislative body to represent the territory. The success of popular sovereignty presumed the integrity of the ballot box. When large numbers of "border ruffians" crossed Missouri's western border on election day only long enough to cast their votes, destroy ballot boxes in anti-slavery precincts, and preclude free-state residents from voting, and finally

return to Missouri whence they came, their behavior predictably outraged Kansas settlers. As Nicole Etcheson observed, “The Missourians had simply gone too far.”⁵⁴

Merely limiting the South’s peculiar institution to regions where it already existed proved a far too tepid variety of anti-slavery for Lawrence abolitionists led by Charles Robinson. Robinson’s biographer, Leverett Spring, wrote of “a Hunkerish strain of conservatism...among the colonists” in Kansas. Quoting William Lloyd Garrison, Spring doubted the fortitude of the new settlers. If the emigrants “had no pluck [in New England],” asked Garrison, “what could rationally be expected of them in the immediate presence of the demonical spirit of slavery?” Robinson himself decried the weakness of settlers who “had not gone to Kansas to be martyrs in the cause of the enslaved Negro, nor to sacrifice their chances for a good homestead upon the altar of principle, but to find a comfortable home for themselves.” Jim Lane embodied the “Hunkerish strain of conservatism” to which Spring referred, and soon came to represent the very Kansans who in Robinson’s view “partook of the general hostility or indifference to the labors of radical abolitionism.”⁵⁵

In April, 1855—the month following the bogus election—Charles Robinson needed a hedge against future incursions by Missouri border ruffians. He dispatched George W. Deitzler to Massachusetts with a letter requesting a hundred Sharps rifles. Meanwhile, associations formed in and around Lawrence to prevent claim-jumping and settle land disputes among settlers. Forming themselves into military companies, they served as hometown militia to deter any potential threat to free-state communities.⁵⁶

Both James H. Lane and R. G. Elliott belonged to a sizeable group of non-New England settlers who believed that Robinson’s Sharps rifles initiative would accomplish little more than provide territorial authorities a pretext for preemptively attacking Lawrence and neutralizing a

perceived threat by the town's radical abolitionist element. Elliott also believed that pro-slavery influence had peaked in Kansas, and now stood at the threshold of decline. "It was certain," averred Elliott, "that there would be no further invasion, last of all [of] Lawrence, unless provoked." Lane agreed that importing firearms would provoke an overreaction by proslavery interests, and advocated returning the weapons to New England. In part because he aspired to practice law in Kansas, Lane also favored recognizing the territorial government's authority until popular sovereignty resolved remaining issues via the ballot box.⁵⁷

Grief over the loss of his four-year-old daughter and the trauma that attended the return to Indiana of his immediate family left Jim Lane temporarily unbalanced. He initially remained aloof of the political controversies that swirled throughout Lawrence, but it proved difficult to keep a low profile. He was, after all, a former congressman, and for good or ill, R. G. Elliott's newspaper had already ensured that people noticed his presence. Little time passed until a politician's craving for notoriety impelled him to set personal issues aside and immerse himself in the territory's practical experiment in popular sovereignty.⁵⁸

Jim Lane later told more than one audience that he emigrated to Kansas in order to establish the National Democracy in the territory. His claim that Stephen Douglas played some role in hatching this idea remains unproven to this day. If W. H. Stephenson's account is correct, Lane attempted to establish the Democratic party in Lawrence on June 27, 1855, only nine days following Annie's death, and almost immediately after most of his family departed for Indiana. He addressed a small gathering in a lawyer's office. "The place of the meeting," noted Stephenson, "indicates that the number present could not have been large....It was resolved that... 'the best interests of Kansas require an early organization of the Democratic party.'" For its charter, the group chose the 1852 platform, which stamped the party's imprimatur on popular

sovereignty. Perhaps it was more than coincidence that ten days later Mark W. Delahay published the first issue of the *Territorial Register*, Leavenworth's short-lived popular sovereignty mouthpiece.⁵⁹

Meanwhile, Charles Robinson prepared to deliver a Fourth-of-July address to the citizens of Lawrence. That the New Englander's remarks were hardly conciliatory toward the territorial regime was made clear by historian Nicole Etcheson, who noted Robinson's outrage at the territorial government. "We must not only see black slavery...planted in our midst, and against our wishes," declared the NEEAC agent, "but we must become slaves ourselves." If Robinson's remarks inspired some members of his audience to resist the abuses of the bogus legislature, they alienated others who resented the presumptiveness of Lawrence's New England leaders almost as much as they did cross-border incursions by Missourians.⁶⁰

Throughout the summer and fall of 1855, a series of Kansas conventions met against a backdrop of endemic fractiousness grounded in geographic bias. Settlers arriving from different parts of the country carried a spectrum of visceral preferences and prejudices that mirrored their regional backgrounds.⁶¹ In this regard, Jim Lane differed little from the rest. While New Englanders extolled the virtues of abolition, western attitudes ranged from complete indifference on racial issues to overt hostility toward any suggestion that a black presence should be accepted in Kansas. R. G. Elliott, discerning arrogance in the way New England leaders managed local affairs, observed,

The numerous assemblages that met in Lawrence with almost weekly regularity, were composed of delegates representing the promoted immigration, and were dominated by the ardent and volatile elements that were seeking opportunity rather than counsel, and expending themselves in resolutions of denunciation and defiance rather than deliberation. The assumption of leadership which these numerous meetings forced upon Lawrence

awakened a spirit of hostile jealousy and alienation among the more sluggish settlements.⁶²

So offended were some non-Lawrence settlers by the inflammatory tone of Robinson's Fourth-of-July speech that they decided to take matters into their own hands. In the absence of any political infrastructure inclusive enough to pacify the disgruntled factions within the free-state camp, dissention spread among the fence-sitters. Some of them, averred Elliott, "would have landed...in a hostile [pro-slavery] organization, which was seeking to organize as the ally of the administration, under the leadership of some of the brightest and ablest minds in the territory." Preventing further defections would require an extraordinary initiative.⁶³

On July 17, 1855, R. G. Elliott called a meeting at his *Free State* office. When the number of attendees exceeded the capacity of the building, the gathering relocated to the more comfortable surroundings of a nearby riverbank. During the brief trek to this *ad hoc* "Sandbank Convention," recalled Elliott, "all who were met on the way were invited to join the conference," until the number of attendees swelled to about twenty. "Colonel Lane, fresh from attendance upon the bogus legislature," accepted the invitation with the caveat that his attendance "should not be published; so," concluded Elliott, "no mention of him appears in the record."⁶⁴

According to Elliott, the sense of the meeting was "that the situation could be saved only by a convention in which every locality should be fairly represented, and free from domination by local influences." The site chosen for the prospective convention was Big Springs, an attractive location on the California Road. This was neutral ground, yet not far removed from Lawrence. The Sandbank gathering scheduled its next meeting for the fifth of September.⁶⁵

The Sandbank Convention was a low-key if not impromptu affair. Jim Lane's real public debut in Lawrence occurred roughly a month later—in mid-August—three weeks prior to the encampment at Big Springs. What became known as the Lawrence Convention began on the

fourteenth of August as a proslavery initiative to frame a state government, and ended the next day as a “non-partisan people’s convention,” as R. G. Elliott termed it, that incidentally included a number of anti-slavery and neutral elements. All concerned agreed to put their respective agendas on hold until the gathering at Big Springs provided additional insight into what follow-on action might be required. In modern parlance, various free-state factions in Lawrence “crashed” the pro-slavery meeting and modified its purpose to attract a broader spectrum of popular support.⁶⁶

The mid-August Lawrence convention marked the first time Jim Lane unleashed his formidable elocutionary skills on a crowd of Kansas citizens. His future reputation as a “Grim Chieftain” had yet to be earned. On this earlier occasion, few in his audience were surprised when he advocated charting a conservative course:

If I believed a prayer... would do any good, it would be that you might be imbued with the wisdom of Solomon, the caution of Washington, and the justice of Franklin... I say as a citizen of Kansas, I wish we had wisdom today. There is the existence of a nation hanging upon the action of the citizens of Kansas. Moderation, moderation, moderation, gentlemen! I am as anxious as any of you to secure a free constitution to Kansas... I would vote for the Kansas-Nebraska bill again. I desire Kansas to be a free state. I desire to act with my brethren, but not in a manner to arouse the passions of the people of other states. I would not repudiate the acts of the [territorial] legislature, but [only] the acts that contravene... popular sovereignty.⁶⁷

As Jim Lane explored the feasibility of establishing a Democratic party in Kansas, he first visited the territorial capitol in Pawnee, and later the Shawnee mission, near the Missouri River. If Lane closely monitored the workings of the migratory territorial legislature, he was no less concerned with the myriad free-state initiatives undertaken in communities throughout Kansas, especially Leavenworth, a major population center and transportation hub located less than forty miles east of Lawrence. Contrary to the impression conveyed by some writers that

Lane's effort to establish the Democracy floundered in Lawrence from want of local interest, a cosmopolitan attempt to establish a political framework supportive of popular sovereignty flourished in Kansas until the end of August.⁶⁸

Only three days after Charles Robinson delivered his famous Fourth-of-July oration that sparked an intra free-state rebellion in Lawrence, Mark W. Delahay published the first issue of his *Territorial Register* in Leavenworth. It stretches the limits of credulity to presume Jim Lane's incognizance of a new newspaper totally committed to the cause of popular sovereignty. The *Register* more nearly reflected Lane's positions on current issues than did Elliott's *Kansas Free State*, since Delahay, a self-professed Young America Democrat, aligned his paper with the Democracy's 1852 platform.⁶⁹

The two weeklies differed with respect to their positions on nativism. In 1855, anti-foreign and anti-Catholic sentiment still represented a potent if relatively latent force in Kansas politics. Delahay consistently and categorically used his publication as a forum for repudiating both the Know-Nothing influence and mentality. Conversely, according to historian Bill Cecil-Fronsman, the *Free State* editors, like the New Englanders, "promised to struggle against the 'twin evils of slavery and Romanism.'" Thus, explained Cecil-Fronsman, the journal mirrored the nativist influence prevalent at the time. Catholic countries, suggested the *Free State* editors, "blind to the perception of truth...have hugged their effete, senseless, and rotten institutions until they have become the most contemptible among nations."⁷⁰

Both Delahay, himself a Roman Catholic, and Jim Lane, whose relatives subscribed to the same religion, abhorred such sentiments, not only for personal reasons, but also because they contradicted the pro-immigrant tradition extolled in a train of earlier Democratic party platforms. Both men were also mindful that growing numbers of Germans and Irishmen were beginning to

make their presence felt in various Kansas communities, especially those that, like Leavenworth, lay along the major migration routes into the territory.⁷¹

Because Delahay resided in Leavenworth and Lane in Lawrence, nothing in the historical record confirms that they made each other's acquaintance prior to the Big Springs convention. In any case, both verged on being overtaken by events. Five days before the Big Springs encampment, and on the same day that popular sovereignty supporters met in convention at Tecumseh, to explore the feasibility of establishing a political infrastructure in support of the popular sovereignty principle, the pro-slavery territorial legislature formally made it illegal to organize the national Democracy in Kansas. This abrupt turn of events later enabled Lane to say truthfully that he remained loyal to the Democratic party in Kansas even as it deserted *him*.⁷²

If the prospect of a convention at Big Springs vexed what Jim Lane disparagingly dubbed "the pro-slavery fragment" of the Democratic party, the varied positions taken by the disparate free-state elements gathered there lent the affair an aura of legitimacy. At the appointed time and date, R. G. Elliott recalled in flowery prose, "The nascent town of Big Springs bloomed with a display unknown to that isolated watering place on the California road since the days when the Oregon pilgrims and caravans of the Argonauts made its inviting ranges their camping-ground."⁷³ In other words, the event drew an impressive crowd.

Attendees promptly organized themselves for the business at hand. Charles Robinson's biographer, Leverett Spring, later suggested that Jim Lane "intrigued himself into the chairmanship of a committee of thirteen to which the construction of a platform was entrusted." Elliott, who performed a dual role as secretary and chairman of the committee on state organization, perceived rather less intrigue on Lane's part. "It is only necessary to [say]," Elliott recalled, "that where Lane sat was the head of the table."⁷⁴

The committee reports that issued from Big Springs clearly reflected fissures within the free-state movement. Leverett Spring called the aggregate of conservative views expressed in Lane's platform committee report a "curious pronunciamento." In Spring's view, it "ought to have satisfied the most ultra 'Hunker' in the territory or out of it....[It] applauded...the Fugitive Slave law, advocated the exclusion of negroes from Kansas, and repudiated...all sympathy with 'abolitionism.'"⁷⁵

Lane's committee report indeed denied any connection between the free-state movement and abolitionism, and endorsed a variety of black exclusion similar to that codified in Indiana's 1850 constitution. Yet, Elliott denied that all this suggested anything sinister or even exceptional about Lane's personality or outlook. Alternatively, Elliott argued that "the convention was not a synod called for...reforming a political creed, but a council charged with the harmonizing of the most diverse elements drawn together by the pressure of an overshadowing issue, and banding them together for the coming struggle to the finish." Moreover, Elliott insisted that "the convention was not 'persuaded [by Lane] to adopt negro exclusion.'" Political reality left leaders little choice but to acquiesce in a conservative policy designed to preclude disaffected westerners from abandoning the free-state standard. Elliott recalled "a...phrase [then] of wide currency: 'If we are to have negroes...we want their masters with them.' This was the creed of a class of no inconsiderable numbers, that [threatened desertion] to the enemy."⁷⁶

It was the report of J.S. Emery's committee—not Lane's—that drew a response from pro-slavery ideologues so virulent as to pose an imminent threat to Kansas' entire free-state community. The committee on resolutions, ostensibly chaired by Emery, issued a report actually authored by Andrew H. Reeder, whom President Franklin Pierce had only recently turned out of office as territorial governor. One resolution provided,

That we will endure and submit to these [proslavery] laws no longer than the best interests of the territory require, as the least of two evils, and will resist them to a bloody issue as soon as we ascertain that peaceable remedies shall fail and a forcible resistance shall furnish any reasonable prospect of success; and that in the meantime, we recommend...the organization and discipline of volunteer companies and the procurement...of arms.⁷⁷

James H. Lane, Marcus J. Parrott of Leavenworth, and others who preferred pursuing a conservative course, worked frenetically to dissuade the convention from passing resolutions that territorial officials were sure to consider insurrectionary. Yet, as Elliott observed, “the utterly atrocious features of the slave code, just recently made public, had worked the popular mind up to such a pitch” that all efforts to mitigate the defiance embedded in Reeder’s resolutions proved futile. Thereafter supporters of the proslavery regime equated any mention of Big Springs with the “Bloody Issue resolutions,” and implicitly, with treason to properly constituted territorial authority.⁷⁸

James H. Lane and Mark W. Delahay probably first met face-to-face shortly after the Big Springs convention. Yet another convention was in the offing, which Delahay would attend as a Leavenworth delegate. Also pending was another canvass, prescribed in the organic act, to elect a Kansas representative to Congress. After the territorial legislature formally designated the first of October as the official election date, the throng gathered at Big Springs chose to ignore this mandate in favor of holding their own separate election. Thus in October 1855, the free-state and pro-slavery communities in Kansas respectively organized separate and redundant canvasses. Shortly thereafter, two individuals representing two mutually hostile governments headed for Washington, each claiming the same seat in the Thirty-fourth Congress.⁷⁹

The last quarter of 1855 witnessed a sea change in the power dynamics operative within the free-state community. Foregoing paragraphs have shown that Jim Lane, whether by design

or coincidence, arrived in Kansas at a unique time, when a number of settlers unaffiliated with the organized immigration sponsored by the NEEAC, felt marginalized by leaders who they believed represented exclusively New England interests. Lane, meanwhile, embodied a combination of charismatic qualities that, with sufficient popular backing, could potentially reduce if not supplant the doctrinaire New England influence throughout Kansas.⁸⁰

Lane's rapid rise to the top echelons of free-state leadership within three months of entering the territory's political arena is a measure of how well his personal aptitudes and western biases resonated with disaffected elements in Lawrence and elsewhere. Changes that transpired between the first week in September, when the Big Springs convention assembled, and the second week of November, when the Topeka Constitutional Convention adjourned, suggest that just such a dynamic was in play. Big Springs brought into existence the rudimentary initial phase of an inchoate free-state-government, which chose Charles Robinson to head a Territorial Executive Committee. This was the entity that organized, watched over, and accepted the returns from the aforementioned free-state congressional election held on the eighth of October.⁸¹

By the time the Topeka Constitutional Convention met on October 23, 1855, Lane's political fortunes had risen dramatically. At Big Springs he played an important but proscribed part as a committee chairman. Roughly six weeks later, the Topeka delegates elected him to preside over their convention. In a general way, it was as if Charles Robinson and James H. Lane had swapped their relative positions within the free-state power hierarchy. Viewed one way, this was a personal power struggle between two leaders. In another context, it reflected the burgeoning power of a conservative western influence in Kansas that was willing to sanction a free-labor system even as it condemned abolitionism as an extremist ideology.⁸²

Nothing in the resolutions adopted at Big Springs required free-staters to renounce their former party affiliations. For that reason, Jim Lane presided over the Topeka Constitutional Convention as an unapologetic national Democrat. Before adjourning on the eleventh of November, delegates established a Free State Executive Committee to be headed by Lane. Villard observed that Lane “emerged from the Topeka Convention with additional prestige and thoroughly committed to the Free State policies.” As 1855 drew to a close, Robinson no longer chaired an Executive Steering Committee that provided stewardship to the free-state community; neither was he the foremost spokesman for its cause. Radical abolitionists avoided losing power altogether but were henceforth consigned to share it with their rough-hewn western neighbors.⁸³

By late November, a petty quarrel over a land claim completely skewed the dynamics of free-state/pro-slavery rivalry. The murder of free-state settler Charles Dow by Frank M. Coleman precipitated a military style confrontation that historians commonly call the Wakarusa War. As conflicts go, the Wakarusa War was a relatively bloodless endeavor, primarily because it ended in a negotiated settlement. Escalating tensions in the aftermath of the Coleman-Dow incident soon led to the encirclement of Lawrence by an invading pro-slavery force of roughly twelve hundred men that predictably included a large number of Missourians.⁸⁴

Political rivalry is one thing. Waging a defensive war is quite another. Thwarting the Missouri invaders inspired a united response among free-staters. Recognizing the range of skills embodied in Charles Robinson and Jim Lane, the citizens of Lawrence placed the former in overall command, and charged the latter—based on his Mexican War experience—with primary responsibility for designing and constructing the town’s defenses. For purposes of the present study, the episode demonstrates the willingness of both men to set aside temporarily their personal quarrels in order to meet an external threat. There is scant evidence to suggest that the

Wakarusa War wrought any fundamental change in Lane's political outlook. It did, however, reveal a violent streak that subsequently informed his leadership of armed bands in the murky venue of irregular warfare. Soon enough, and not without reason, Jim Lane would become infamous as the "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas. Yet, at the close of 1855, with high hopes for a political settlement still intact, popular sovereignty remained his watchword.⁸⁵

All things considered, the "war" ended well for the free-staters, with a negotiated truce. Mid-December found them ratifying the Topeka Constitution via the ballot box. By a separate vote, they also approved a specific provision in the same charter that mandated black exclusion. Meanwhile, harsh weather struck with a sudden ferocity that seemed almost purposely tailored to dampen the ardor of erstwhile combatants on both sides of the Kansas-Missouri border. Politics, however, continued apace. In January, George W. Brown, abolitionist editor of Lawrence's *Herald of Freedom*, thought he was witnessing the historic birth of the Republican party in Kansas. Ian Spurgeon noted that, at a convention held that month, "Lane and a number of National Democrats endorsed a resolution recognizing the right of Congress to interfere with slavery in the territories." Yet the resolution fell short of renouncing popular sovereignty. Thus was Brown mistaken. Three years would pass before Republicans in territorial Kansas finally established a party infrastructure.⁸⁶

Though disillusioned with the perversion of popular sovereignty by the territorial legislature, and angered by continuing pro-slavery provocations in Leavenworth that before Christmas saw Mark Delahay's presses thrown into the frozen Missouri River, Jim Lane continued to pin his hopes on the national Democracy. In March 1856, the free-state legislature convened long enough to elect him as a U.S. senator and send him to Washington on a mission to win Kansas' admission to the Union under the Topeka Constitution. Lane yet believed that

proscribed though the National Democracy was in Kansas, it still flourished throughout the North. He looked forward to making his case for popular sovereignty and statehood among former friends and colleagues in the familiar surroundings of the nation's capitol.⁸⁷

CONCLUSION

Radicalism, the End of Days, and the Silver Cord

Did the train of events that transpired between April and December, 1855 radicalize James Henry Lane? The answer depends on the context of the word *radical*. Certainly he remained a national Democrat who regarded any form of political abolitionism reprehensible if not subversive. After the Wakarusa War ended, Lane was no closer to being an abolitionist than on the day he purportedly averred that he would as soon purchase a Negro as a mule. Still, his evolving political attitudes made him excellent raw material as a prospective convert to Republicanism. “The key to its widespread acceptance,” noted Eric Foner, “was its multifaceted nature. A profoundly successful fusion of value and interest, the ideology could appeal in different ways to various groups within the party, and it gave northerners of divergent social and political backgrounds a basis for collective action.”¹

Few would deny that New Englander Charles Robinson and James H. Lane represented divergent political backgrounds. Yet in the winter of 1855-1856, Lane was not yet ready to join the growing ranks of the recently-founded Republican party. He still clung to what contemporary Dwight Thatcher characterized as “the delusive hope that there still lingered in the bosom of the Northern Democracy sense enough to...welcome any measure that promised an honorable...exit from the political quagmire into which they had been plunged by the fateful and ill-starred repeal of the Missouri Compromise.”²

Hyperbolic prose employed by some late nineteenth-century admirers of Jim Lane at times confused the issue of his purported radicalization. The previous chapter of this study noted that Lane counseled moderation on the occasion of his Kansas public debut during the Lawrence

Convention. Milton W. Reynolds chronicled the event thirty years later in a way that portrayed Lane as bigger than life, and perhaps ever afterward stigmatized him with the radical label.

Describing Lane's deportment at the mid-August Lawrence meeting, Reynolds observed:

Lane was in his best mood. He was prepared for a vituperative, sarcastic, ironical and intensely personal speech. Such the crowd usually likes, or used to in the early days, when men were walking arsenals and crept over volcanoes....His late Democratic associates were denounced, burlesqued, ridiculed, and pilloried in a hysteria of laughter by an excited, cyclonic crowd. No one ever afterward doubted where he stood. He crossed with a leap the Rubicon of radical politics and burned all his bridges behind him. He was not baptized,--he was immersed in the foaming floods of radicalism.³

In the 1930s W. H. Stephenson generously observed that "Reynolds told the story as it had taken shape in his mind through the years, but his memory was very faulty." In August, 1855, as was still the case in early December, Jim Lane had no compelling reason for burning his political bridges to the Democracy.⁴

Kansas historian James Malin discerned "three degrees of radicalism...among supporters of the Topeka statehood movement: 1) those who would stop with the framing of a constitution, until Congress had acted; 2) those who would elect the necessary officers, but hold in abeyance activation of a government until Congress had spoken; [and] 3) the radicals who would organize the state government and set it in motion in disregard of the territorial government and Congress." By Malin's criteria, Jim Lane clearly falls within the second category of statehood advocates. On the one hand, he favored the immediate organization of a "shadow" government capable of functioning independently of the territorial legislature; on the other, he wanted to defer setting the new government's machinery in motion pending congressional sanction of the Topeka movement. In this way Lane hoped to avoid any violent clash between the prospective state government and agents of formerly established territorial or federal authority.⁵

Jim Lane viewed statehood as an end in itself. It is quite probable that he accorded this goal a higher priority than determining the status of slavery in Kansas. In this regard he fundamentally agreed with positions taken by two of Leavenworth's delegates to the Topeka Convention, Marcus J. Parrott and Mark W. Delahay. Preferring that Kansas enter the Union as a free state, all three men would accept any arrangement that allowed the fractious slavery issue to be solved by a majority vote of bona-fide Kansas settlers.⁶

Thus it was, as Malin explained, that during the first week of Topeka Convention deliberations, "Mark Delahay, of Leavenworth...threw a bomb...which exploded all over the place." It came in the guise of a resolution that proposed binding the convention to the tenets of popular sovereignty: "*Resolved*, that this convention approve the principles of the Squatter Sovereignty and nonintervention by the people of the States, as well as by Congress in the local affairs of Territories and States." This approach, if successful, offered a potential for deterring future interventions by Missourians into Kansas affairs, while holding final resolution of the slavery issue in abeyance until after the all-important goal of statehood had been achieved.⁷

Although the convention adopted Delahay's resolution on November 8, 1855, Charles Robinson orchestrated its reconsideration and defeat the following day. Robinson favored positive action by the federal government to prevent the extension of slavery into the territories, and opposed any measure that might breathe new life into the peculiar institution through some exercise of local autonomy. In any event, nothing in the proceedings during the Topeka Convention, or in the state constitution it produced, radicalized James Henry Lane's views on race or his political beliefs.⁸

In time, the alliance of convenience initially formed in Leavenworth between James H. Lane and Mark Delahay evolved into a friendship that persisted for the remainder of Lane's life.

Besides a common political background that helped the two see eye-to-eye on such bedrock issues as popular sovereignty and Kansas statehood, Delahay later became the agent that entwined the destinies of Jim Lane and Abraham Lincoln. Meanwhile, in the wake of the Wakarusa War, both Lane and Delahay found themselves in Washington pleading the cause of the Topeka movement to members of Congress. Circumstances beyond the power of either man to control compelled Delahay's departure well in advance of Lane's.⁹

Historian Ian Spurgeon dates Jim Lane's transition to Republicanism to the time when Stephen Douglas and other northern Democrats in Congress withheld their support of the Kansas Memorial. "It was then," averred Spurgeon, "in Washington, D.C., in April 1856, that the real switch in [Lane's] party allegiance took place....Lane did not abandon the Democratic Party. In his eyes, Democrats had abandoned Kansas, the principles they had championed, and, perhaps most painful of all, him." Although this perceived betrayal by the Democracy embittered Lane to the point of challenging Senator Stephen Douglas to a duel, some influential members in both houses of Congress still championed the cause of admitting Kansas to statehood under the Topeka constitution. The effort remained alive until shortly after the Fourth-of-July.¹⁰

In an address commemorating the quarter-centennial of Kansas statehood, T. Dwight Thatcher recalled that in the Last week of June, Galusha C. Grow of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, introduced a bill that would have admitted Kansas to the Union under the Topeka Constitution. It passed the House by a vote of 99 to 97 on July 3, 1856. Yet, in order to succeed, the memorial required approval by both houses of Congress. Instead of accepting the House version, Douglas crafted a substitute bill calling for Kansans to create another constitution. Senate passage of Douglas' measure signified Congress' final rejection of the Topeka Constitution.¹¹ Meanwhile, on the Fourth of July, the U.S. Army, acting under

federal authority, forcibly shut down the free-state legislature at Topeka. On June 17, 1856, just before the Topeka Constitution went down to defeat for the last time in Congress, the first national Republican convention met in Philadelphia. To the extent that the supposed radicalization of James H. Lane equates to switching party allegiances, his personal realignment probably occurred shortly after the Fourth of July week-end.¹²

For well over a hundred years, scholars have speculated about the political radicalization of James H. Lane. If indeed he experienced some form of radicalization, it probably occurred beyond the confines of legislative chambers and meeting halls. Once the Wakarusa War made mobs and armed bands the vehicles of political change, a new set of dynamics rose to the fore. “Excesses,” observed James Malin, “were being committed by both sides. Many things were involved and under the circumstances all were highly explosive.”¹³

One such emotionally charged event was a convention held in Lawrence on Saturday, December 22, 1855, to nominate a slate of free-state candidates for state and federal elective offices. The convention selected Lane’s friend, Delahay, to run for the Topeka government’s representative in Congress. That same night, a proslavery mob in Leavenworth chopped a hole in the ice covering the Missouri River and slid Delahay’s printing presses into the opening. Because he had a price on his head, returning home entailed considerable personal risk.¹⁴

The wintery blast that heralded the end of the Wakarusa War was no mere squall. The winter of 1855-1856 sent temperatures plummeting to well below zero for weeks on end, and covered the landscape with snow. In January, the combination of ice and snow made roads treacherous enough to bring mail delivery to a standstill. Ice thick enough to impede steamer traffic on the Missouri River might also hold the weight of armed bands of Missourians intent on plundering free-state settlers along its banks, including those who resided in Leavenworth. So it

was, according to one Kansas historian, that on New Year's Eve, Delahay and a few trusted colleagues, "all armed to the teeth," departed Leavenworth under cover of darkness. Sheltering in Indian lodges during the day and traveling at night, they eventually reached Jefferson City, where they booked passage on more pleasant conveyances for the rest of their journey to Washington. In that way, Delahay preceded Jim Lane to the nation's capitol, where he circulated among legislators, and began sending dispatches to Kansas that kept free-state leaders apprised of issues relevant to the Topeka movement.¹⁵

Earlier, Jim Lane, in his capacity as chairman of the Executive Committee of Kansas Territory, had proclaimed December 25, 1855, as a day of thanksgiving for the free-state community. The fate of Delahay's *Territorial Register* three days before Christmas no doubt dampened the celebratory mood in Lawrence. Moreover, the canvass that ratified the Topeka Constitution, although accomplished without a major invasion from Missouri, saw abuses that forestalled gathering returns from Leavenworth. There, according to William E. Connelley, "the election was disturbed by a Pro-slavery mob, and the polling lists destroyed." The shaky truce that ended the Wakarusa War was not holding very well in the eastern reaches of Kansas. Yet another important election was scheduled for mid-January, when free-state Kansans would cast their votes for the slate of candidates nominated by the previous month's convention in Lawrence.¹⁶

Some historians have drawn a straight line from the Wakarusa War of early December 1855 to the defeat of the Kansas Memorial in Congress four months later. Most recently, Ian Spurgeon opined that "following the Wakarusa War Treaty, the Topeka movement continued smoothly. Voters adopted the Topeka Constitution days afterward, and at the end of December Lane participated in a meeting to schedule a January election of state officials." In reality, events

in Leavenworth served as a barometer in confirming that political pressures remained at dangerously high levels.¹⁷ The collective free-state mood seemed to lighten in proportion to the distance one traveled from Leavenworth. For a time, even John Brown thought that the recently-negotiated truce would combine with the harsh weather to usher in both peace and a free-state victory. “And now,” observed Stephen Oates, “with the free-state constitution ratified [in December] and elections scheduled in January for a free-state governor and legislature, Brown was hopeful indeed. ‘What now remains for the Free State men of Kansas,’ he rejoiced, ‘is to hold the ground they now possess, *and Kansas is free.*’”¹⁸

Exceptions to this general rule, including the fate of Delahay’s newspaper and the violent disruption of Leavenworth’s elections on December 15, though largely unnoticed by Jim Lane’s biographers, endangered the peace of the territory while he yet remained in Lawrence. Leavenworth’s mayor also sought to prevent the scheduled January 15, 1856, free-state election, but only succeeded in driving it underground to Easton, a short distance away. There, as John Brown’s biographer, Oswald Garrison Villard, explained, “it was held on the 17th, despite the disarming and driving away of Free State voters.”¹⁹

“That night,” continued Villard, “there was severe fighting between the two sides [in Leavenworth], in which the proslavery men lost one killed and two wounded, while two of the Free Soilers were injured.” This was enough to generate a trickle of refugees away from the river city and toward Lawrence. The sight of their bedraggled countenances could hardly have been reassuring to James Henry Lane, whose departure for Washington was still roughly six weeks away. Equally demoralizing was the news that Reese P. Brown (unrelated to the John Brown of Harper’s Ferry fame), a local free-state leader, had been murdered. According to Stephen Oates, after taking Brown captive on election night, proslavery forces “hacked on [him]

with knives and a hatchet, tossing him mortally wounded at his cabin door. ‘Here’s Brown,’ they told his wife, who became hysterical when she saw his mangled body.”²⁰

The aggregate effect of these troubling events in Leavenworth throughout December 1855 and January 1856—the destruction of the town’s popular sovereignty press, the violent disruption of two free-state elections, and the murder of R.P. Brown—held a high potential for destroying the uneasy peace that prevailed along the Kansas-Missouri border since the end of the Wakarusa War, and Jim Lane was still on hand to witness it. It stretches the bounds of credulity to believe that someone like Lane, committed as he was to the free-state cause, could observe such events first-hand without experiencing some form of radicalization. “The Leavenworth troubles,” recorded Oswald Garrison Villard, “were so serious as to be taken on both sides as ending the truce” previously negotiated among Lane, Robinson, and Territorial Governor Wilson R. Shannon.²¹

A special message issued by President Franklin Pierce on January 24, 1856, almost seemed tailored to exacerbate earlier pro-slavery provocations. Pierce, as Stephen Oates phrased it, “blamed all of Kansas’ troubles on the various emigrant aid societies in the East, upheld the bogus legislature, branded the Topeka Constitution as ‘revolutionary,’ and warned that organized resistance on the part of free-state Kansans would be regarded as treasonable insurrection.” At this juncture, Jim Lane may well have concluded, as John Brown did, “that Franklin Pierce means to crush the men of Kansas.” With Lane’s trip to Washington still weeks away, the nation’s chief executive had removed yet another lynchpin of Lane’s faith in the Democracy. Everything now depended on the friends of popular sovereignty in Congress.²²

Doggedly clinging to the hope that stewards of the Kansas Memorial could somehow guide it through the gauntlet that awaited them in Washington, Lane inched ever closer to the

Republican position. In the coming months, a combination of factors, including the rejection of the memorial by Congress, finally forced Lane to abandon the party of his forbearers.²³ He thus represented in microcosm a schism in the Democratic party that witnessed the departure of many of its formerly stalwart supporters. Eric Foner placed the phenomenon in a national context:

Their defection from the Democracy lent credence to the charge that the regular Democratic party was no longer the champion of popular rights that it had been in Jackson's day, for these men could testify from personal experience that the Slave Power had taken control of the party and was pressing forward with plans for the expansion of slavery....And above all, the inflexible Jacksonian Unionism of the ex-Democrats made certain that when the secession crisis arrived, there would be a large body of Republicans who viewed secession as treason, and who were unalterably opposed to any concessions to the South.²⁴

Once Jim Lane departed for Washington in early March 1856, he would not return *in peace* to Kansas before another year had run its course. Historian Ian Spurgeon has aptly chronicled the balance of Lane's life from that point forward. It only remains to add that James Henry Lane arrived in Kansas in April, 1855 bearing a profound weight of psychological baggage, enough certainly to belie Noble Prentiss' late nineteenth-century appraisal of Lane as "one of our own things" in the pantheon of historical figures regarded as uniquely Kansan. He was, rather, what his past and his environment had made him. Mary Lane's cautionary warning to her son that "what a man is at forty, he will continue to be for the remainder of his life," perhaps applied more to Jim Lane than many of his Kansas contemporaries. His immigration to the territory occurred only a few months prior to his forty-first birthday. He hardly sprang full-blown upon the prairies of Kansas; and much that occurred during his formative years in Indiana shaped his response to situations that subsequently arose in his adopted state.²⁵

Just before the onset of the Great Depression of 1929, Lane biographer Wendell Holmes Stephenson published an article entitled "The Transitional Period in the Career of General James

H. Lane.” The work mainly concerned Jim Lane’s purported “transition from Indiana conservatism to Kansas radicalism, and...the forces that brought about his rapid evolution.” In all probability, the transition that most fundamentally and forever altered Jim Lane’s life began long before he first entertained the notion of settling his family outside of Indiana, or coveted any ambitions of becoming a U.S. senator. The death of little Annie Lane in 1855 was only the latest in a series of tragedies that, although hidden from public view, undermined her father’s mental equilibrium over the course of three decades. Despite their private dimension, their aggregate affect unbalanced him to the point of intruding at times into his public life. They help account for Lane’s bizarre episodes of apparent mental instability and erratic behavior both before and after his emigration to Kansas territory.²⁶

That Lane at times appeared to be psychologically unbalanced is one of the few things his biographers have been able to agree on. The root cause of the imbalance is another matter altogether. Kansas historian William Elsey Connelley averred, for example, that Jim Lane “was a genius, and the wavy line separating genius from insanity is almost imperceptible....I think there is no doubt that Lane was at times of unbalanced mind.” Connelley claimed to have formed his opinions based on interviews with “hundreds of [Lane’s] friends—men who knew him in Kansas territorial days and the stormy period of the Civil War. Many of them believed he had periods of insanity.” Connelley, who focused his research almost exclusively on Kansas’ territorial and Civil War periods, concluded that both Lane’s “genius” and “insanity” were hereditary.²⁷

The personal trauma Jim Lane suffered during his formative years quite probably affected his mental stability at least as much as the fine line which Connelley believed separated genius from insanity.²⁸ The work of Professor Morris Massey suggests that the deaths of several of

Lane's family members between 1836 and 1845 occurred at a time in Lane's life when he was particularly vulnerable. Massey studied the several phases of human mental development in individuals, and how events that occur in each developmental phase can affect their subsequent life trajectories. Predictably, one facet of Massey's work concerned the selection of role models. "We use these models," he argued, "to construct our internal 'ego ideal,' the person we would like to become. . . . The hero models in our lives are very critical people. They are the people we try to behave like, the people that we want to be like when we become adults."²⁹

Massey also emphasized the importance of what he called the period of "early adult transition," which varies in length from individual to individual. Sometime around twenty years old," continued Massey, "actual entry into the adult world is completed. . . . Whatever the length of the transition period, our values are well established [by then] and the basic programming has ended." Individuals emerge from this transition period with a set of values that "is our operating filter for 'viewing' the world for the rest of our lives. This system dominates as the individual moves through a relatively orderly sequence during the adult years." The exceptional series of personal tragedies that Jim Lane suffered between 1836 and 1844 amounted to a prolonged psychological gauntlet. At length, he emerged at the far end, his vision of the world forever skewed by the loss of five close family members.³⁰

As hero models, two of the deceased—John Foote Lane and Arthur St. Clair—for as long as they lived, exhibited traits that Jim Lane aspired to emulate. To his mind at least, both men stood out as paragons of military competence, political attainment, and manly virtues that only Amos Lane, the family patriarch, could rival. These two iconic figures within the family, who died so young and so close together in time many years before Jim Lane first set foot in Kansas, left an indelible mark on his character. Fate left him little choice but to go forward, cherishing

their memory if not judging his own life by their standards. After 1841, the new wife at his side did what she could to salve Lane's mental pain and bolster his resolve to make a fresh start.³¹

Contemplating Lane's character as a politician, Ian Spurgeon rightly observed that "at the heart of the matter stands the issue of consistency."³² Jim Lane's consistent adherence to the principle of popular sovereignty is visible in the historical record if one searches diligently to find it. That said, perhaps the central question regarding the enigma surrounding Lane is the one raised by Nicole Etcheson, namely, "What did James H. Lane represent?" Few would argue that he was a paragon of virtue. Still, analyzing what Etcheson described as "his chameleonlike blending into shifting political backgrounds," begs the follow-on question of whether he was really more of a chameleon than any number of contemporaries with whom he shared the political stage. Filling the historical void that surrounds the unresolved issue of Lane's character is a work-in-progress that requires reaching back in time far enough to examine the contingent variables that shaped him during his formative years.³³

A fictional character in William Faulkner's play, *Requiem for a Nun*, asserts, "The past is never dead. It's not even past." The iconic figures that filled Jim Lane's past at times demonstrated an uncanny proclivity to reach out from the grave and insinuate themselves into his present. John Speer recalled an occasion in Washington when "a few friends deputed me to invite [Lane] to visit [a] celebrated spiritualist." Lane demurred, telling Speer, "In confidence and all seriousness...he believed his mother would appear to him, and he would break down, and it would be quoted against him as an evidence of weakness." Thus, Lane's mother inordinately continued to affect Lane's life several years after her death.³⁴

Besides embodying her son's religious upbringing, Mary Foote Howse Lane also represented a tangible link to the family's trans-Allegheny origins. Although Jim Lane, like his

father, reveled in the purposely cultivated image of a prototypical Westerner, he nonetheless kept reminders of his Eastern heritage near at hand by bringing selected kinfolk with him to Kansas, once a free-soil victory there became certain. A nephew, George Pearson Buell, Jr., accompanied Jim Lane in 1857 to the territory and was elected Leavenworth's first free-state city engineer. "The sudden conversion of all these river towns from bitter pro-slavery in '55 and '56 to rabid Free-state in '57," recalled Charles Robinson, "was as marvelous as the conversion of three-thousand souls on the day of Pentecost." Buell, whose father was both the brother-in-law and confidant of Jim Lane's iconic older brother, John, embodied both the river town conversion to which Robinson referred, and to his uncle, the halcyon days of Andrew Jackson's presidency.³⁵

In early July 1866, Senator James Henry Lane died by his own hand. For purposes of the present study, the contemporary proximate causes of his suicide are less important than unseen factors dating to his pre-Kansas life that plausibly contributed to his last fateful decision. John Speer met with him only a few days before the event. Both Speer and Methodist minister Hugh D. Fisher, who presided at Lane's funeral, like Connelley, attributed the senator's mental instability to heredity. They also believed that he suffered from suicidal tendencies. Speer later averred, "The immediate cause [of Lane's death] was insanity. There was no doubt of that... an overworked brain brought it on."³⁶

Perhaps, as some historians have charged, Jim Lane's professions of religious belief were feigned. If so, he nonetheless invoked scripture when he conversed with John Speer for the last time. "I jokingly told him," recalled Speer, "I heard that he was dangerously ill; but I could see he was worth a dozen dead men yet. [Lane] said: 'The pitcher is broken at the fountain. My life is ended; I want you to do my memory justice; I ask nothing more.'" Lane's allusion to

Ecclesiastes is significant, for his zealously religious mother made mention in her diary of family and friends departed for “their long homes.” When at length earthly pressures became unbearable, her son, too, sought refuge in a long home whose inhabitants, loved ones long dead, made the years of his youth seem like a much happier time in comparison to his embattled present. For James H. Lane, life represented a silver cord that reached far into a distant past.³⁷

And what of a last political judgment? Jim Lane, like the majority of Kansans in his day, subscribed to views on race that many would consider dysfunctional if not reprehensible by twenty-first century standards. This inconvenient truth hardly relieves historians from the obligation to chronicle accurately his undeniable contribution to the anti-slavery cause.³⁸

Introduction

¹ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, Mo., and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 2.

² Mary Foote Howse Lane, "Mary Lane, 1829-1852," Folder 1, Box 28 (Microfilm Reel No. 9), *The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., Entries for October 10, 1829, January 17, 1830, March 20, 1830 (Frames 1203, 1205), Cited hereafter as *Mary Lane's Diary*. Numbers cited refer to frame numbers on the microfilm reel. Edward J. Renehan, Jr., *The Secret Six: The True Tale of the Men Who Conspired with John Brown* (New York, New York: Crown Publishing, Inc., 1995), 1-5.

³ Thomas Wentworth Higginson as quoted in Renehan, *The Secret Six*, 5; Oswald Garrison Villard, *John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography Fifty Years After* (London, Boston, and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910), vii-ix.

⁴ Nicole Etcheson, "James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical," in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33.

⁵ Noble L. Prentis, *Kansas Miscellanies* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas Publishing House, 1889), 104, 105; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 2.

⁶ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 4, 19; Albert E. Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 1997. Originally published in 1958 by Cornell University Press as *A Frontier State at War: Kansas, 1861-1865*), 234. Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Indiana, November 25, 1853, to Hon. James H. Lane, James H. Lane papers, Kansas Collection (MS Collection 28, Folder 5), Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence; Mary Lane Obituary, Lawrenceburg *Democratic Register*, February 15, 1855; *Kansas Free State*, April 30, 1855, as quoted in Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, 1930), 41.

⁷ "George W. Lane," Aurora, Indiana *Dearborn Independent*, December 10, 1891; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana from their Earliest Settlement Containing a History of the Counties; Their Cities, Townships, Towns, Villages, Schools, and Churches; Reminiscences, Extracts, Etc.; Local Statistics; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; Preliminary Chapters on the History of the Northwest Territory, the State of Indiana, and the Indians* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co. Publishers, 1885), vi, 150, 648, 805-808.

⁸ William E. Connelley, "Introduction," in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 5,6; Alberta Pantle, Comp., "Death Notices From Kansas Territorial Newspapers, 1854-1861, Part One," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 21 (Summer, 1955): 322.

⁹ Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Dean, *John Brown to Bob Dole*, 33; Renehan, *The Secret Six*, 5; E.B. Long with Barbara Long, *The Civil War Day By Day: An Almanac 1861-1865* (New York: Da Capo Press Paperback Edition, 1971), xiii.

¹⁰ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 15n35. Stephenson’s seminal biography of Lane, while discussing all of Amos and Mary Lane’s three surviving sons, mentions none of the daughters by name. He notes only that “the three daughters married men of high standing—Arthur St. Clair, George P. Buell, and Judge Huntington.”

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 40; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 2, 32.

¹² Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 7; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “The Transitional period in the Career of General James H. Lane,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 25 No.2 (June, 1929): 75, 78; Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Dean, *John Brown to Bob Dole*, 33.

¹³ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 80-83, 93.

¹⁴ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 115.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 80-83, 93; Stephenson, “Transitional period in the Career of General James H. Lane,” 75, 78.

¹⁶ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, ‘The Liberator of Kansas* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 10, 11; Harrison Ellery, ed., *The Memoirs of Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, L.L. D., U.S.A., First Graduate of the Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer U.S.A. From 1812 to 1818: to Which is Added a Genealogy of the Family of Thomas Swift of Dorchester, Mass., 1634* (Worcester, MA: F. S. Blanchard & Co., 1890), 115, 116, 122, 123; Abram W. Foote, *Foote Family, Comprising the Genealogy and History of Nathaniel Foote of Wethersfield, Conn. And His Descendants* (Rutland, VT: Marble City Press—The Tuttle Co., 1907), 1: 72, 73; Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 67, 68; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, “201 Years of Mathematics at West Point,” in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, TX: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593, 594.

¹⁷ Carl Sandburg, *The Prairie Years*, vol. 1 of *Abraham Lincoln* (1925; Sangamon Edition, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1943), vii.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Chapter One

- ¹ Craig Miner, "Lane and Lincoln: A Mysterious Connection," *Kansas History* XXIV (Autumn 2000): 190.
- ² J.G. Randall, *Lincoln the President*, as quoted in Joshua Wolf Shenk, *Lincoln's Melancholy: How Depression Challenged a President and Fueled His Greatness* (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2005), 5.
- ³ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri press, 2008), 5; Charles Robinson, *The Kansas Conflict* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1892), 463. For a detailed by-author discussion of Spurgeon's historiographical categories and the most notable works within each, see his *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, pp. 5-15.
- ⁴ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 5, 7; James Malin, *John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six* (Philadelphia, PA: Lancaster Press, 1942), 371.
- ⁵ Julie Courtwright, "'A Goblin that Drives Her Insane': Sara Robinson and the History Wars of Kansas, 1894-1911," *Ozark Historical Review* XXX (Spring 2001): 28; Miner, "Lane and Lincoln," 189.
- ⁶ Noble L. Prentis, *Kansas Miscellanies* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas Publishing House, 1889), 105; James C. Malin, "Notes on the Writing of General Histories of Kansas: Part Five: The 'Vanity' Histories," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 22, No. 4 (Winter 1955): 598,599.
- ⁷ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 3; Gunja SenGupta, "Bleeding Kansas," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 24 No.4 (Winter 2001/2002), 320;
- ⁸ Frank W. Blackmar, ed., *Kansas: A Cyclopedia of State History, Embracing Events, Institutions, Industries, Counties, Cities, Towns, Prominent Persons, etc.* (Chicago: Standard Publishing Co., 1912), 2: 578, 579; "Sketch of James H. Lane By Milton W. Reynolds," in William Elsey Connelley, *James Henry Lane, The "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas* (Topeka, Kans.: Crane & Co., 1899), 114, 118.
- ⁹ Connelley, *James Henry Lane, The "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas*, 6, 9.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 118.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "The Traditional Period in the Career of General James H. Lane," *Indiana Magazine of History* 25 No.2 (June, 1929): 81n33; Blackmar, *Kansas: A Cyclopedia of State History*, 578, 579.
- ¹² Nicole Etcheson, "James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical," in Virgil W. Dean, ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 33; Jacob Stringfellow, "Jim Lane," *Lippincott's Magazine of Literature, Science, and Education* 5 (March, 1870): 266.

- ¹³ Donald R. Gilmore, *Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border* (Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Co., Inc., 2006), 65; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 12-14.
- ¹⁴ Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” 33; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 19, 81.
- ¹⁵ Todd Mildfelt, *The Secret Danites: Kansas’ First Jayhawkers* (Richmond, Kans.: Todd Mildfelt Publishing, 2003), vi.
- ¹⁶ Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1845, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, cited hereafter as Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane, 1829-1852, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), in *Ibid.*, cited hereafter as Mary Lane’s Diary, Buell-Brien Papers; U.S. Congress, Senate, 1834, *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration on Indians, Between the 30th of November, 1831, and 27th December, 1833*, 23rd Cong., 1st sess. S Doc 512; Entry 201 (Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General of Subsistence from Army Officers, Disbursing Officers, Indian Agents, The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Individual Indians), 1832 Ohio emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C.
- ¹⁷ Gunja SenGupta, “Bleeding Kansas,” *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 24 (Winter 2001/2002): 318-341; Stephen Aron, *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006), xv.
- ¹⁸ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 267.
- ¹⁹ Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 476, 485, 491, 492.
- ²⁰ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane “The Liberator of Kansas” with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 9-12; Connelley, *James Henry Lane, The “Grim Chieftain” of Kansas*, 38-42; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James Henry Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, 1930), 11-18; Kendall E. Bailes, *Rider on the Wind: Jim Lane and Kansas* (Shawnee Mission, Kans.: Wagon Wheel Press, 1962), 13, 14; Robert Collins, *Jim Lane: Scoundrel, Statesman, Kansan* (Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Co., 2007), 13-21; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 18-21.
- ²¹ Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 9-12; Mary Lane’s Diary, entries for January 7, 1833 (Frames 1218, 1219), January 24, 1838 (Frames 1223, 1224), and April 7, 1847 (Frames 1262, 1263), Buell-Brien Papers.
- ²² Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 9-12; Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir. A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (Privately printed, 1895), 50, 51; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, “201 Years of Mathematics at West Point,” in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two*

Centuries and Beyond (Abilene, Tex.: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593, 594; Mary Lane's Diary, entry for January 24, 1838 (Frames 1223, 1224), Buell-Brien Papers.

²³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 11; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 10, 11.

²⁴ William Elsey Connelley, "Introduction," in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 6; Larry O. Jochims and Virgil W. Dean, "Pillars of Society: A Brief History of the Kansas State Historical Society," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 18 No.3 (Autumn, 1995): 148.

²⁵ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for January 24, 1838 (Frames 1223, 1224), Buell-Brien Papers; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 15, 16; "War in Florida: From the Florida Herald—Extra, Oct 21. From the Same," *Niles Weekly Register*, Baltimore: November 10, 1836, Vol.1 No.10, 148.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ SenGupta, "Bleeding Kansas," 320; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 15n35; Bailes, *Rider on the Wind*, 7, 14.

²⁸ Amos Lane to My Dear Son, May 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; John Lane to Ann Lane Buell, May 3, 1832, in Ibid.; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," Mary Lane's Diary, Frames 1291-1293, in Ibid.

²⁹ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930): 217.

³⁰ Connelley, "Introduction," in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 5; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 32; James C. Malin, "The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered: Origins," in *Territorial Kansas: Studies Commemorating the Centennial* (Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Publications, 1954), 46.

³¹ Craig Miner, "Historic Ground: The Ongoing Enterprise of Kansas Territorial History," in Dean, *John Brown to Bob Dole*, 3.

³² SenGupta, "Bleeding Kansas," 341.

Chapter Two

¹ John Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane, "The Liberator of Kansas" with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, KS: John Speer Printer, 1897), 9; William Elsey Connelley, *James Henry Lane, The "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas* (Topeka, KS: Crane & Co., 1899), 38-42; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1930), 11; Kendall E. Bailes, *Rider on the Wind: Jim*

Lane and Kansas (Shawnee Mission, KS: Wagon Wheel Press, 1962), 13, 14; Robert Collins, *Jim Lane: Scoundrel, Statesman, Kansan* (Gretna, LA: Pelican Publishing Co., 2007), 13; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas, Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, MO. and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 18.

² Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane*, 10, 11; Persis Yates Boyesen and Elizabeth Baxter, *Historic Ogdensburg* (Ogdensburg, NY: Ryan Press, Inc., 1995), 5; Mary Foote Howse Lane, "Mary Lane, 1829-1852," Folder 1, Box 28 (Microfilm Reel No. 9), *The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, TN, Frames 1272-73; Cited hereafter as *Mary Lane's Diary*. Numbers cited correspond to frame numbers on the microfilm reel; Gates Curtis, *Our Country and its People: A Memorial Record of St. Lawrence County, New York* (Syracuse, NY: D. Mason & Co., 1894), 255. In this study, readers will find two different spellings for *Ogdensburg*. Speer's spelling convention was applicable to a middle period that began in April 1817 and ended in 1868 when the hamlet at the confluence of the St. Lawrence and Oswegatchie Rivers was formally designated a village. As the brochure explains, founders dropped the "h" from the end of the word later after the village subsequently became a city.

³ Carl Becker, "Everyman His Own Historian," *American Historical Review* 37, No.2 (January, 1932): 222-226.

⁴ *Mary Lane's Diary*, frames 1202, 1260, 1295-6; "From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane," Lawrenceburg [Indiana] *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

⁵ Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 31, 51.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 50, 51.

⁷ *Ibid.*; Franklin B. Hough, *A History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties, New York, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (Albany, NY: 1853; Baltimore, MD: Facsimile Edition under the sponsorship of St. Lawrence Co. Historical Association: 1970), 585; Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg, 1749-1907* (New York, Boston, Chicago: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1907), 18.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Davies, *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph*, 51; "From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane," Lawrenceburg [Indiana] *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

¹⁰ "Autobiography of General James H. Lane," *New York Times*, February 19, 1858, hereafter cited as "Lane Autobiography."

¹¹ Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 16.

¹² Curtis, *Our Country and its People*, 255; Hough, *A History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties*, 585; United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, Department of Mathematics, “Charles Davies,” <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/DeptHeads/Davies.html>, (accessed April 4, 2007); United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, Department of Mathematics, “Obituary of Charles Davies from the *Fishkill Standard*,” <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/DeptHeads/Davies-Obit.htm>, (accessed April 30, 2007).

¹³ Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 14-15, 25; Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 182; Curtis, *Our Country and its People*, 255.

¹⁴ . Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 13, 14, 19; Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 182; Boyesen and Baxter, *Historic Ogdensburg*, 25.

¹⁵ Ibid.; The Durham Township Historical Society, Durham PA, “History of the Durham Boat,” <http://durhamhistoricalsociety.org/history2.html> (accessed March 31, 2010). The Durham boat, sometimes called a keelboat, bore the name of its purported town of origin, Durham, Pennsylvania. It was flat-bottomed, something over sixty feet long, and employed a crew of three to six men, who propelled the boat by pushing steel-tipped poles against the river bed. Such boats could carry from ten to seventeen tons of cargo. As indicated in the website, the design “of the boat was simply the best form to be used to move cargo up and down the extensive, large, and occasionally shallow rivers” that crisscrossed the eastern seaboard.

¹⁶ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 26, No. 3 (September, 1930): 178, 179; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, frame 1221.

¹⁷ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 178.

¹⁸ Ibid., 178, 179; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, frame 1221; “From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg [Indiana] *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

¹⁹ Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 51; Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 25; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 178; Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 182, 183.

²⁰ Ralph Lefevre, *History of New Paltz, New York and Its Old Families (from 1678 to 1820) Including the Huguenot Pioneers and Others Who Settled in New Paltz Previous to the Revolution* (Albany, NY: Fort Orange Press, 1903), 385; Lonnie Chrisman, “Individuals from Chrisman Pedigree, p.11,” Chrisman Families, <http://chrisman.org/pedigree/out11.htm#RIN4001> (accessed April 3, 2010); Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds.,

Reminiscences of Ogdensburg, 13, 14; Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 183, 184; Boyesen and Baxter, *Historic Ogdensburg*, 5; L. Merrill Miller, *Historical Discourse and Manual of the First Presbyterian Church of Ogdensburgh, N.Y.* (Ogdensburgh, NY: Republican and Journal Print, 1865), 6; Edward C. Emerson, ed., *Our County and its People: A Descriptive Work on Jefferson County, New York* (Boston: The Boston History Co., 1898), 454, 455.

²¹ Photograph of Catherine Banks Hasbroucks's headstone, taken in 2005 by Anne M. Cady, in <http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~stlawgen/CEMETERY/Ogdensburgh/D> (accessed April 2, 2010); Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 19, 20, 25.

²² Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 20.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., 21, 22; *Mary Lane's Diary*, frames 1264-1270; Boyesen and Baxter, *Historic Ogdensburg*, 8.

²⁵ *Mary Lane's Diary*, frames 1200-1201, 1295-1296, 1320; Albert Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence, KS: 1997), 19-20.

²⁶ "From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane," Lawrenceburg [Indiana] *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

²⁷ *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entry for September 27, 1829 (Frame 1202), Buell-Brien Papers; Miller, *First Presbyterian Church of Ogdensburgh*, 7; Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 25.

²⁸ Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 184; Miller, *First Presbyterian Church of Ogdensburgh*, 7; Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 25.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entry for September 20, 1829 (Frame 1202), Buell-Brien Papers.

³¹ Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 185.

³² Ibid., 182, 185; Swe-Kat-Si- Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds., *Reminiscences of Ogdensburg*, 13.

³³ Nathan Ford, Ogdensburg, to Samuel Ogden, August 18, 1807 as quoted in Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*, 185.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., 179, 180.

³⁶ Ibid., 179, 185; Emerson, *Our County and its People*, 454, 455; *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entry for September 20, 1829 (Frame 1202), Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁷ *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entries for September 27, 1829 and April 24, 1830 (Frames 1202, 1206), Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁸ Ibid.; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," Frames 1291-1293 in Ibid.; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 179.

³⁹ Ibid.

Chapter Three

¹ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 1995), 106.

² Alvah H. Sawyer, *A History of the Northern Peninsula of Michigan and its People* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911), 3: 1383, 1384.

³ George Julian, as quoted in Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 198; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," Mary Foote Howse Lane, "Mary Lane, 1829-1852," Folder 1, Box 28 (Microfilm Reel No. 9), *The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, TN, Frames 1291- 1293, Cited hereafter as *Mary Lane's Diary*. Numbers cited correspond to frame numbers on the microfilm reel.

⁴ "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," *Mary Lane's Diary*, Frame 1291.

⁵ Ibid; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana. From their Earliest Settlement. Containing a History of the Counties; Their Cities, Townships, Towns, Villages, Schools, and Churches; Reminiscences, Extracts, Etc; Local Statistics; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; Preliminary Chapters on the History of the North-West Territory, the State of Indiana, and the Indians.* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co., 1885), 31.

⁶ Stephen Harding Hart, "Zebulon M. Pike: His Life and Papers," as quoted in Mark L. Gardner, ed., *The Southwestern Journals of Zebulon Pike, 1806-1807, Stephen Harding Hart and Archer Butler Hurlbert, eds.*, (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 2006), 12-13; Charles J. Peterson, *Military Heroes of the War of 1812: With a Narrative of the War*, Third Edition (Philadelphia: William A. Leary & Co., 1849), 88-91.

⁷ Ibid.; Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio in Two Volumes. An Encyclopedia of the State: History Both General and Local, Geography with Descriptions of its Counties, Cities, and Villages, its Agricultural, Manufacturing, Mining and Business Development, Sketches of Eminent and Interesting Characters, etc., with Notes of a Tour Over It in 1886*, 2nd ed., 1902 (Cincinnati: C.J. Krehbiel & Co., 1888), 1:860; See also “A Brief History of Boone County (1847)” at Boone County, Kentucky History and Genealogy website, <http://www.boonecountky.us/> (accessed April 14, 2010).

⁸ John Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane, “The Liberator of Kansas” with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, KS: John Speer Printer, 1897), 136, 137; Kendall Bailes, *Rider on the Wind: Jim Lane and Kansas* (Shawnee Mission, Kans.: Wagon Wheel Press, 1962), 95.

⁹ “Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel,” *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Frame 1291; Stephen Aron, *How the West was Lost: The Transformation of Kentucky from Daniel Boone to Henry Clay* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 128; “Boone County, Kentucky Slaves & Owners Enumerated in the 1810 U.S. Census,” <http://www.boonecountky.us/slave-schedules-1810.htm> (accessed April 22, 2010).

¹⁰ Ibid.; MS, “Tousey Cemetery,” Family Cemetery Register, Boone County, Kentucky Historic Preservation Review Board, April 9, 1988.

¹¹ “From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855; Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio*, 2:109; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1930), 13; “Piatt Family,” *Chronicles of Boone County*, Boone County (Kentucky) Public Library, http://www.bcpl.org/1hg/cbc/doku.php/piatt_family (accessed April 14, 2010).

¹² “From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855; Archibald Shaw, ed., *History of Dearborn County, Indiana: Her People, Industries, and Institutions* (Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co. Inc., 1915), 1: 345.

¹³ *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for November 16, 1833 (Frame 1219), Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁴ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 173.

¹⁵ Paul Conkin, *Cane Ridge, American Pentecost* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press), 3 as quoted in Aron, *How The West Was Lost*, 171.

¹⁶ “From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

¹⁷ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 181, 182.

¹⁸ . “From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg *Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for November 9, 1831 (Frame 1215), Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁹ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 133, 195.

²⁰ Ibid., 171; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for March 6, 1842 (Frame 1230), Buell-Brien Papers.

²¹ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 128-129, 133, 135

²² Ibid., 129; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 42, 43.

²³ Leslie Henshaw, “The Aaron Burr Conspiracy in the Ohio Valley,” *Ohio Archeological and Historical Publications* 24 (1915): 121.

²⁴ Ibid., 125, 126; Lowell H. Harrison and James C. Klotter, *A New History of Kentucky* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1997), 85-87; James D. Richardson, comp., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908* (Washington, DC: Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1897-1909), 1: 404, 405.

²⁵ Albert Welles, comp., *History of the Buell Family in England, From the Remotest Times Ascertained from our Ancient Histories, and in America, From Town, Parish, Church and Family Records* (New York: Society Library, 1881), 278; Henshaw, “Aaron Burr Conspiracy in the Ohio Valley,” 122-123, 131-132; Peterson, *Heroes of the War of 1812*, 88; Harrison and Klotter, *New History of Kentucky*, 85-87; Dorothy Riker and Gayle Thornbrough, eds., *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana, 1805-1815*, Vol. 32 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950), 1006, 1007.

²⁶ Return Jonathan Meigs, Jr., Marietta, Ohio, to Joseph Buell, Esq., December 10, 1806, as quoted in Martin R. Andrews, ed., *History of Marietta and Washington County, Ohio and Representative Citizens* (Chicago: Biographical Publishing Co., 1902), 111.

²⁷ Andrews, *History of Marietta and Washington County*, 96; Welles, *History of the Buell Family*, 255, 256, 278.

²⁸ Charles J. Peterson, *The Military Heroes of the War of 1812 with a Narrative of the War* (Philadelphia: William A. Leary & Co., 1849), 88.

²⁹ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 132, 133; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 115.

³⁰ O.F. Roberts, “The Lane Family,” *Kansas Historical Collections* XXVI (1923-1925): 29; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 12, 13.

³¹ Aron, *How the West Was Lost*, 133, 134.

- ³² Shaw, *History of Dearborn County*, 1:342.
- ³³ Ibid., 341; Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 966.
- ³⁴ Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 966.
- ³⁵ Logan Esarey, *A History of Indiana From Its Exploration to 1850* (Indianapolis: W.K. Stewart Co., 1915), 1: 173, 174n13.
- ³⁶ Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 966, 967; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 148.
- ³⁷ Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 966, 967; *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entry for September 20, 1829 (Frame 1202), Buell-Brien Papers; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 18; Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 154, 155; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties Indiana*, 23; A. Merriam-Webster, *Webster's American Military Biographies* (Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1978), 365.
- ³⁸ Merriam-Webster, *American Military Biographies*, 365; Shaw, *History of Dearborn County*, 1: 342, 343; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 12, 13; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 29-32.
- ³⁹ Roberts, "The Lane Family," 29, 30; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," *Mary Lane's Diary*, Frames 1291-1293, Buell-Brien Papers; Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 969.
- ⁴⁰ "From the Western Christian Advocate: Mrs. Mary Lane," *Lawrenceburg Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.
- ⁴¹ Roberts, "The Lane Family," 30; Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 179.
- ⁴² Roberts, "The Lane Family," 29; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," *Mary Lane's Diary*, Frames 1291-1293, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ⁴³ Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 156, 160, 162-163, 183.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., 188, 189; "Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel," *Mary Lane's Diary*, Frames 1291-1293, Buell-Brien Papers; Riker and Thornbrough, *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana*, 967.
- ⁴⁵ *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties Indiana*, 200, 201; Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir: A Geneological and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 67, 68; Phillip Shaw Pauldon, "A People's Contest:" *The Union and the Civil War, 1861-1865* (New York, Grand

Rapids, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, London, Singapore, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988), 53, 54.

Chapter Four

¹ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 36 No.3 (September 1930), 179, 180.

² Ibid; "From the *Western Christian Advocate*: Mrs. Mary Lane," *Lawrenceburg Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855; O.F. Roberts, "The Lane Family," *Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society* 26 (1923-1925), 29; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1930): 16.

³ . Dorothy Riker and Gayle Thornbrough, eds., *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana, 1805-1815*, Vol. 32 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950), 967, 968. In march 1809 Dill received a commission as captain in the Dearborn County Militia. Three years later he was promoted to colonel, and ultimately became one of two brigadier generals appointed under the authority of Indiana's territorial governor.

⁴ Elizabeth Baxter and Persis Yates Boyesen, *Historic Ogdensburg*, rev. ed. (Ogdensburg, New York: Ryan Press, Inc., 1995), 5; Franklin B. Hough, *A History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties, New York, From the Earliest Period To the Present Time* (1853; repr., Baltimore: St. Lawrence Co. Historical Association & Franklin Co. Historical & Museum Society, 1970), 585, 612; Abram W. Foote, *Foote Family, Comprising the Genealogy and History of Nathaniel Foote of Wethersfield, Conn. And His Descendants* (Rutland, VT: Marble City Press—The Tuttle Co., 1907), 1: 72, 73; "Record of Mary Lane's Family," in Mary Foote Howse Lane, "Mary Lane, 1829-1852," Folder 1, Box 28 (Microfilm Reel No. 9), *The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, TN, Frames 1272 - 1273, Cited hereafter as *Mary Lane's Diary*. Numbers cited correspond to frame numbers on the microfilm reel.

⁵ A. Merriam-Webster, *Webster's American Military Biographies* (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1978), 318.

⁶ Harrison Ellery, ed., *The Memoirs of Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, L.L. D., U.S.A., First Graduate of the Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer U.S.A. From 1812 to 1818: to Which is Added a Genealogy of the Family of Thomas Swift of Dorchester, Mass., 1634* (Worcester, Mass.: F. S. Blanchard & Co., 1890), 96, 97, 112, cited hereafter as *Swift Memoirs*.

⁷ Ellery, *Swift Memoirs*, 111-113.

⁸ Ibid., 115, 116.

⁹ Ibid.; Hough, *History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties*, 612; Foote, *Foote Family Genealogy and History*, 73; "Record of Mary Lane's Family," *Mary Lane's Diary*, Frames 1272,

1273. Hough indicates that “for three years [York] held the post of deputy sheriff under Thomas J. Davies, when he succeeded that gentleman and held the office of sheriff for four years.” When the British captured Ogdensburg in February 1813, they imprisoned York across the river in Prescott before exchanging him a few weeks later.

¹⁰ Ellery, *Swift Memoirs*, 122, 123.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 117.

¹² Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 52; Hough, *History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties*, 585.

¹³ “Clinton, George, (1739-1812),” *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=C000527> (accessed August 13, 2010); Nathaniel Goodwin, comp., *The Foote Family: Or the Descendants of Nathaniel Foote, One of the First Settlers of Wethersfield, Conn., With Genealogical Notes of Pasco Foote and Others of the Name, Who Settled More Recently in New York* (Hartford: Press of Case, Tiffany & Co., 1849), 314, 315. It is important to distinguish this 1849 rendition of the Foote family history from the reference cited above in Note 4. Because a gap of more than half a century separates these respective editions and their compilers, they vary in details even as both mutually complement each other. Hereafter both will be cited as “*Foote Family history*”, with the appropriate publication year indicated.

¹⁴ “Clinton, George, (1739-1812),” *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=C000527> (accessed August 13, 2010); Nathaniel Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849, 314, 315.

¹⁵ “The Battle of the Thames,” *Ohio History Central: An Online Encyclopedia of Ohio History*, Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Oh; <http://www.ohiohistorycentral.org/entry.php?rec=481> (accessed August 17, 2010); Nathaniel Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849, 206.

¹⁶ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, “The Liberator of Kansas,”* (Garden City, KS: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 9; “The Battle of Horseshoe Bend: Collision of Cultures,” *National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior*, <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/twhp/lessons/54> (accessed August 17, 2010); Robert V. Remini, *The Battle of New Orleans: Andrew Jackson and America’s First Military Victory* (New York: Penguin Putnam Inc., 1999), 13-15.

¹⁷ O.F. Roberts, “The Lane Family,” *Collections of the Kansas State Historical Society* 26 (1923-1925): 30; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 13.

¹⁸ Nathaniel Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849, 206; Abram Foote, *Foote Family history*, 1907, 1: 72; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for January 24, 1847 (Frame 1260), Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁹ Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849, 314, 315; “Written on the death of Ebenezer Foote, Esq., who died in Albany—August 1814,” *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Frames 1297, 1298, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁰ . “Written on the death of Ebenezer Foote, Esq., who died in Albany—August 1814,” *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Frames 1297, 1298, Buell-Brien Papers.

²¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 13; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 183; Dorothy Riker, ed., *Executive Proceedings of the State of Indiana, 1816-1836*, vol. 29 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1947), 21, 25, 26; Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 10. In the early days immediately following Indiana’s entry into the Union, governors appointed two associate judges in each county, who in-turn appointed a county prosecuting attorney.

²² Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 13, 14, 14n19.

²³ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 182, 185, 186; William Wesley Woollen, *Biographical And Historical Sketches of Early Indiana* (Indianapolis: Hammond & Co., 1883), 179, 344.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frame 1223), Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁶ Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 67, 68; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, “201 Years of Mathematics at West Point,” in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, TX: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593, 594.

²⁷ *Ibid.* James L. Morrison, Jr., “*The Best School in the World:*” *West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years, 1833-1866* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1986), 23, 24.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Dorothy Riker and Gayle Thornbrough, comps., *Indiana Election Returns: 1816-1851* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1960), 183, 184; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 13, 14; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 183-185; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for January 24, 1830 (Frame 1205), Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁰ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 183; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 13 n.14; Leander J. Monks, Logan Esarey, and Ernest V. Shockley, eds., *Courts and Lawyers of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Federal Publishing Co., Inc., 1916), 1:155. For full details surrounding the trial, see *Histories of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 252-255.

³¹ Riker and Thornbrough, *Indiana Election Returns: 1816-1851*, 187, 188; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 185; Nathaniel Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849, 206; Abram W. Foote, *Foote Family history*, 1907, 72.

³² *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for September 20, 1829 (Frame 1202), Entry for November 28, 1829 (Frame 1204), Buell-Brien Papers; “Sacred to the Memory of Mrs. Buel,” Frames 1291-1293 in *Ibid.*; William Henry Egle, ed., *Notes and Queries Historical, Biographical, and Genealogical Relating Chiefly to Interior Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg: Harrisburg Publishing Co., 1898), 55, 56, 68, 69.

³³ Stephen Douglas Engle, *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 2.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2-4; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 647, 648; Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 11; Alvah H. Sawyer, *A History of the Northern Peninsula of Michigan and Its People: Its Mining, Lumber, and Agricultural Industries* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911), 3: 1383, 1384; Norris F. Schneider, *History of Lowell and Adams Township* (Lowell, OH: Midwest Book Co., 1946), 8,9; ; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, I: 140,141.

³⁵ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All*, 5; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for November 28, 1829 (Frame 1204), Buell-Brien Papers; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 647, 648.

³⁶ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All*, 4; Milton A. Masing, comp., *Dearborn County, Indiana Cemetery Records* (Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc.), 1:770; *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Entry for January 24, 1830 (Frame 1205), Buell-Brien Papers; Goodwin, *Foote Family history*, 1849 edition, 206; Foote, *Foote Family history*, 1907 edition, 72; “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

³⁷ Benjamin Lee Huggins, “The Nationalist Moment: John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and the Mind of Republican Nationalism in the Monroe Years” (major paper, George Mason University, 2003), 9, 14, 17, found on the Internet at mason.gmu.edu/~bhuggins/MajorPaper.pdf (accessed April 1, 2010); Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, 100, 476.

³⁸ . Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 15; “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

³⁹ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, 41, 81, 476-478.

⁴⁰ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 185-188.

Chapter Five

¹ Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 68; Benjamin Lee Huggins, “The Nationalist Moment: John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and the Mind of Republican Nationalism in the Monroe Years” (major paper, George Mason University, 2003), 1, found on the Internet at

mason.gmu.edu/~bhuggins/MajorPaper.pdf (accessed April 1, 2010); V. Frederick Rickey, "The First Century of Mathematics at West Point," in Amy Shell-Gellasch, ed., *History of Undergraduate Mathematics in America, Proceedings of a Conference Held at the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, June 21-24 (2001)*, 2001, 2. Several sources indicate that Davies resigned from the army in December 1816. That he actually began teaching at West Point the following March is inferred from V. Frederick Rickey's observation that "because of the bitter winters, it was customary to have winter vacation from December first until March 15."

² Huggins, "The Nationalist Moment," 1n.

³ Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 476, 485; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, TX: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593.

⁴ James L. Morrison, Jr., *The Best School in the World: West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years, 1833-1866* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1986), 3; James R. Endler, *Other Leaders, Other Heroes: West Point's Legacy to America Beyond the Field of Battle* (Westport, CT & London: Praeger, 1998), 4, 5; Theodore J. Crackel, *West Point: A Bicentennial History* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2002), 48, 81; "Charles Davies," <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/DeptHeads/Davies.html> (accessed April 30, 2007).

⁵ "Charles Davies," <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/DeptHeads/Davies.html> (accessed April 30, 2007; Rickey, "First Century of Mathematics at West Point," 10; Endler, *Other Leaders, Other Heroes*, 9.

⁶ Rickey and Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," 588, 593; Morrison, *Best School in the World*, 43.

⁷ Morrison, *Best School in the World*, 150, 151; Rickey and Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," 588, 593; ; George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. from its Earliest Establishment, in 1802, to 1890 With the Early History of the Academy*, 3rd ed. (Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891), 1: 409.

⁸ Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 65,66; Mary Foote Howse Lane, *Mary Lane's Diary*, frame 1200.

⁹ John Lane, Lawrenceburg, Indiana, April 2, 1824 to Hon. John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, U.S. Military Academy Cadet Application Papers, 1805-1866, Special Collections, U.S. Military Academy Library, West Point, New York; Amos Lane to Hon. John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, April 5, 1824 in Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Gerald M. Capers, *John C. Calhoun—Opportunist* (Tallahassee: University of Florida Press, 1960), 62, as quoted in Huggins, “The Nationalist Moment,” 19; Clyde N. Wilson, ed., *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*, vol. 2 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1959), xxxv, as quoted in Ibid., 19.

¹² Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 115, 456, 458, 476.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid., 480, 481; Glyndon Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed: Wizard of the Lobby* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1947), 29; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 185, 186.

¹⁵ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 476; John B. Stoll, *History of the Indiana Democracy, 1816-1916* (Indianapolis: Indiana Democratic Publishing Co., 1917), 16.

¹⁶ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of James H. Lane*, vol. 3 of *Publications of the Kansas State Historical Society* (Topeka: Kansas State Printing Plant), 14; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September 1930), 185.

¹⁷ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 464; Logan Esarey, *A History of Indiana From Its Exploration to 1850* (Indianapolis: W.K. Stewart Co., 1915), 1:296, 297; Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 24, 25, 27-29.

¹⁸ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane “The Liberator of Kansas” with Coroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, KS: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 11.

¹⁹ Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 1:296, 297; Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 24-26, 28, 29; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 486.

²⁰ Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 23, 24.

²¹ James B. Agnew, *Eggnog Riot: The Christmas Mutiny at West Point* (San Rafael, CA & London, England: Presidio Press, 1979), 124.

²² Ibid.

²³ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane “The Liberator of Kansas” with Coroborative Incidents of Pioneer History* (Garden City, KS: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 11.

²⁴ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 82, 482-482; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 186-188.

²⁵ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 185-188; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 14; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 82, 114, 115.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 187.

²⁸ Ibid.; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 482; .; “Thomas Hart Benton in Defense of Dueling,” Worldwide Web *Civil War St. Louis*, <http://www.civilwarstlouis.com/History/Benton.htm> (accessed October 19, 2009)

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.; Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 137.

³¹ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 32, 267; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 178, 185, 186, 188, 189; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 476, 477, 493; Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 1:297, 300-302, 304.

³² Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 29.

³³ Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 1:296, 297.

³⁴ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 179; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 486, 493; Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 28, 29.

³⁵ Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 1:297; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 36, 37.

³⁶ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 112, 493; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 185, 186.

³⁷ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 493, 808n181; Entry for September 20, 1829 (Frame 1218), Mary Foote House Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, hereafter cited as Mary Lane’s Diary, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁸ Amos Lane to Henry Clay, in James F. Hopkins, ed., *Secretary of State, 1825*, vol. 4 of *The Papers of Henry Clay* (Kent, Ohio: University Press of Kentucky, 1972), 708, as quoted in Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 493.

³⁹ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 492, 493, 808n181; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 187; Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, *Annual Report of the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy* (Washington, DC: Government Printing office, 1819), 5; Board of Visitors, *Annual Report of the Board of Visitors*, 1826, 13, 14, 16.

⁴⁰ Van Deusen, *Thurlow Weed*, 28, 29.

⁴¹ "DeWitt Clinton," <http://www.eriecanal.org/UnionCollege/Clinton.html> (accessed September 24, 2010); Thurlow Weed, *Life of Thurlow Weed Including his Autobiography and a Memoir* (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1884), 1: 299.

⁴² Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 491; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 189.

⁴³ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 186, 187; Agnew, *Eggnog Riot*, 70, 71.

Chapter Six

¹ Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., Frame 1204; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley, 1885), 647-49; Albert Welles, *History of the Buell Family* (New York: New York Historical Society Library, 2:257; Stephen D. Engle, *Don Carlos Buell, Most Promising of All* (Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 5, 9; James L. Morrison, "The Best School in the World: West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1986), 65, 66; William C. Davis, *Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Hour* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1991), 25, 26.

² Davis, *Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Hour*, 25, 26; Morrison, "The Best School in the World," 71.

³ Morrison, *The Best School in the World*, " 65.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Davis, *Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Hour*, 25, 26.

⁵ Correspondence – Family Letterbooks, Non-military, Box 24, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶ John Lane, West Point, NY to Mrs. A Buel, September 13, 1825, Buell-Brien Papers; Welles, *History of the Buell Family*, 2: 257; Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 5.

⁷ Mary Lane's Diary, Entries for December 21, 1841, and January 25, 1842 (Frame 1225), Buell-Brien Papers; *Dearborn Independent*, December 24, 1891.

⁸ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 5.

⁹ *Dearborn Independent*, December 24, 1891.

¹⁰ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 48, 68; Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frame 1223), Buell-Brien Papers; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties*, 807; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas State Printing Plant, 1930), 16.

¹¹ John Lane, West Point, NY to Mrs. A Buell, September 13, 1825, Buell-Brien Letters.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Morrison, "*The Best School in the World*," 89, 90.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 69, 70; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930): 188n66. According to West Point historian James L. Morrison, "the second (junior) class spent the summer on furlough, the only extended leave of absence granted cadets in their entire stay at the academy."

¹⁵ Morrison, "*The Best School in the World*," 69, 70.

¹⁶ George Ticknor, West Point NY, to his wife, June 5, 1826, as quoted in Augusta Blanche Berard, ed., *Reminiscences of West Point in the Olden Time. Derived from Various Sources and Register of Graduates of the United States Military Academy* (East Saginaw, Mich.: Evening News Printing and Binding House, 1886), 28.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 17; *The Cyclopedia of American Biography. Being the History of the United States as Illustrated in the Lives of the Founders, Builders, and Defenders of the Republic, and of the Men and Women Who Are Doing the Work and the Thought of the Present Time* (New York: James T. White & Co., 1893), 3:26.

¹⁸ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 183, 184; Logan Esarey, ed., *A History of Indiana From Its Exploration To 1850* (Indianapolis: W. K. Stewart Co., 1915), 1:301.

¹⁹ John Lane, West Point, NY to Mrs. George P. Buell, August 10, 1826, Buell Brien Papers.

²⁰ *Ibid.*; Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for October 27, 1844 (Frame 1252), Buell-Brien Papers; Henry Eugene Davies, ed., *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendents of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 68, 73-74, 99.

²¹ Davis, *Jefferson Davis*, 28; George Julian as quoted in Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 1995), 198; James B. Agnew, *Eggnog Riot: The Christmas Mutiny at West*

Point (San Rafael, CA and London, England: Presidio Press, 1979), 71, 151; John Lane, West Point, NY to Mrs. Ann Buell, Esq., May 19, 1827, Buell Brien Papers.

²² Agnew, *Eggnog Riot*, ix, xxiv, 95; Davis, *Jefferson Davis*, 35.

²³ Davis, *Jefferson Davis*, 35, 36; Agnew, *Eggnog Riot*, 119, 120, 136, 138.

²⁴ Agnew, *Eggnog Riot*, 85, 91, 118, 191, 194.

²⁵ Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 115.

²⁶ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 184.

²⁷ Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Palladium*, August 18, 1827, as quoted in *Ibid.*, 184.

²⁸ J.F. Lane, West Point, NY, January 13, 1827, to Dear Sister, Buell Brien Papers.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 115, 116, 131, 137.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 116.

³² *Ibid.*, 116-118.

³³ *Ibid.*, 116; Brevet Major General George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. From Its Establishment in 1802 to 1890 With the Early History of the United States Military Academy* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891), 1:409; J.F. Lane, West Point, NY, January 13, 1827, to Dear Sister, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁴ J.F. Lane, West Point, NY, January 13, 1827, to Dear Sister, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ "Cadets Arranged in Order of Merit In Their Respective Classes, As Determined at the General Examination, in June, 1826," in *Register of the Officers and Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy, June 1826* (West Point, NY: U.S. Military Academy; Official Reprint, 1884), 10-11.

³⁸ "Roll of the Cadets Arranged According to Merit in Conduct, For the Year Ending 30th June 1826," in *Ibid.*, 6. Note: each respective category of merit ranking, both for academic standing and for conduct, has its own separate pagination within the *Register of the Officers and Cadets*.

³⁹ V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, “201 Years of Mathematics at West Point,” in Lance A. Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, TX: McWhitney Foundation Press, 2004), 593-94.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 591; James R. Endler, *Other Leaders, Other Heroes: West Point’s Legacy to America Beyond the Field of Battle* (Westport, CT and London, England: Praeger Press, 1998), 4, 5; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, “Mathematics Education at West Point: The First Hundred Years,” *Mathematics Association of America Mathematical Sciences Digital Library*, <http://mathdl.maa.org/mathDL/47/?pa=contents&sa=viewDocuments&nodeId=1796&pf=1> (Accessed June 18, 2010), 1, 2; *Annual Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy Made to Congress and the Secretary of War for the Year 1821*, 27, 28; “Charles Davies,” <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/DeptHeads/Davies.html> (Accessed April 30, 2007).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*; See also Harrison Ellery, ed., *The Memoirs of Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, L.L.D., U.S.A. First Graduate of the United States Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer U.S.A. from 1812 to 1818: 1800-1865: to which is added a Genealogy of the Family of Thomas Swift of Dorchester, Mass., 1634* (Worcester, MA: F.S. Blanchard & Co., 1890), 141-45. After the War of 1812, as the army’s size shrank to peacetime levels, the President and Congress established a committee headed by a hand-picked French general of engineers. Its purpose was to ensure the most efficient use of reduced funds earmarked for American harbors and coastal defenses. General Swift wrote, “this humiliating act of my country made me very unhappy.” It influenced his decision to resign from the army shortly thereafter.

⁴² Rickey and Shell-Gellasch, “201 Years of Mathematics at West Point,” 593-94.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy, 188.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 188, 189; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 808n181.

⁴⁶ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 811-12n5.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 503, 504, 808n181, 808n183.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 126, 127.

⁴⁹ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy, 189.

⁵⁰ Amos Lane, as quoted in *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Ibid., 177, 217; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, MO and London, England: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 13, 32.

⁵² Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 808n181; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 32.

⁵³ Mary St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, November 20, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, 409-10.

⁵⁴ Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, 409-10; Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 68; Rickey and Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," 591-92. These two historians indicate that since years later, Davies' successor, Professor Albert E. Church, turned down U.H. Grant's request to be an instructor in West Point's mathematics department, "wags claim that 'it is harder to become an instructor in mathematics at West Point than President of the United States.'"

⁵⁵ John Foote Lane, West Point, NY to Dear Sister, July 17, 1828, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

Chapter Seven

¹ Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, August 12, 1829, Frame 1201, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn.; George W. Cullum, ed., *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. From Its Establishment in 1802., to 1890 With the Early History of the United States Military Academy*, 3rd ed. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1891), 1: 409-410.

² Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *A History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 493, 515, 804n144, 805n145, 808n181, 811-812n5; James F. Hopkins, ed., *The Papers of Henry Clay* (Kent, Ohio: University Press of Kentucky, 1972), 4:708; Mary Foote Howse Lane's Diary, August 16, 1829, Frame 1202, Buell-Brien Papers; William Henry Egle, ed., *Notes and Queries, Historical, Biographical and Genealogical Relating Chiefly to Interior Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Harrisburg Publishing Co., 1898), 68-69; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September 1930), 179-180.

³ Egle, *Notes and Queries*, 55-56, 67-69.

- ⁴ Ibid., 67, 69; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 179, 180.
- ⁵ “Ann Crooker St. Clair: Her Ancestors and Descendents,” *American Monthly Magazine* 27 No.4 (October 1905), 693; Egle, *Notes and Queries*, 69; Ann Crooker St. Clair Chapter, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Effingham, Ill., “Ann Crooker St. Clair,” <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~ildar/anncrookerstclair> (accessed December 16, 2010).
- ⁶ “Ann Crooker St. Clair: Her Ancestors and Descendents,” 693; Egle, *Notes and Queries*, 67-68.
- ⁷ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, July 4, 1830 (Frames 1208-1209), Buell-Brien Papers.
- ⁸ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 188-190.
- ⁹ Ibid., 190; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 532, 533.
- ¹⁰ Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, November 1, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, November 20, 1831 in Ibid.
- ¹¹ Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, October 30, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ¹² P.H. Drake, Indianapolis, to J.F. Lane, n.d., Buell-Brien Papers. Although this letter bears no date, it is clear from its context and correlation in time and place with other Lane family correspondence generated during this period that it was written in 1831 sometime during the first week of November.
- ¹³ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 534-536; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, November 20, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Amos Lane, New Orleans, to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, December 20, 1831 in Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, January 5, 1834, Frame 1221, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Amos Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son John, May 1, 1832 in Ibid.; John Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland, April 1832 to Dear Sis Jane in Ibid.
- ¹⁵ John F. Lane, West Point, N.Y. to Ann Lane Buell, July 17, 1828, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ¹⁶ John F. Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland to Dear Sister Ann, May 3, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ¹⁷ John Lane. Fort McHenry, Maryland to Miss Jane Lane, April 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ¹⁸ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, August 12, 1829, Frame 1201, Buell-Brien Papers; J.F. Lane, Baltimore, to Mrs. A. Buell, October 10, 1829, Buell-Brien Papers.
- ¹⁹ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, November 19, 1831, Frame 1215, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, November 1, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers;

George Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Dear Brother, November 1, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, October 30, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Albert Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997 [Originally published as *A Frontier State at War: Kansas 1861-1865*, 1958]), 19-20. Castel opined that James H. Lane's "private life was that of a satyr, and he was utterly irreligious except at election time."

²⁰ Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, November 1, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; George Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Dear Brother, November 1, 1831 in *Ibid.*

²¹ Amos Lane, New Orleans, to LT. J.F. Lane, December 20, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Lieut. J.F. Lane, December 31, 1831 in *Ibid.*; Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832 in *Ibid.*; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother, March 12, 1832 in *Ibid.*; Amos Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, May 1, 1832 in *Ibid.*

²⁴ Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; John Spencer, Washington, D.C., to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, December 1, 1831 in *Ibid.*; Willard Carl Klunder, *Lewis Cass and the Politics of Moderation* (Kent, Ohio and London, England: Kent State University Press, 1996), 59; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 815n39, 824n124. John Spencer was a pro-Jackson Indiana politician who in 1835 served as a delegate to the Democratic national convention in Baltimore that nominated Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky as Martin Van Buren's vice-presidential running mate. Ratliff Boon and Jonathan McCarty were both pro-Jackson Indiana congressmen when Amos Lane's appointment was pending. Lewis Cass, formerly the governor of Michigan Territory, began his tenure as President Andrew Jackson's Secretary of War in August 1831.

²⁵ Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Lieut. John F. Lane, December 21, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Although Mary does not clarify the identity of Colonel Tappan, her New York cousin (and Mary Foote Howse Lane's nephew), Henry Ebenezer Foote, married a Rebecca Waldo Tappan, whose father, according to the Davies family memoir, was "John Tappan, a prosperous and well-known merchant of Boston, Mass." See Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir, A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 78, 79; R. David Edmunds, "The Prairie Potawatomi Removal of 1833," *Indiana Magazine of History* 68 No.3 (September 1972), 246n34. The General Marshall to whom Mary Lane St. Clair refers is William Marshall, who served as a United States marshal in the federal district of Indiana. In February 1832 he was appointed as Indiana's sole Indian agent. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 493, 497, 509; Senator Tipton was John Tipton, formerly United States Indian agent in Indiana, who was elected U.S. senator in December 1831 to fill a vacancy created by the death of the incumbent, James Noble. See also "Tipton, John, (1832-1839)," *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*,

1774-Present, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=t000284> (accessed February 2, 2011).

²⁶ George Lane and James Henry Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Dear Brother, December 25, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832m Buell-Brien Papers; John Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland, to Miss Jane Lane, April 1832 in Ibid.

³⁰ J.F. Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland to Dear Sirs, January 3, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

³¹ Gayle Thornbrough and Dorothy Riker, eds., *Journals of the General Assembly of the Indiana Territory, 1805-1815*, vol. 32 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950), 966-969; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 539, 540-42; Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832, Buell Brien Papers; Mary Foote Howse Lane's Diary, January 1, 1833, Frame 1217 in Ibid.

³² Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Lieut. J.F. Lane, December 31, 1831 in Ibid.; Mary Lane St. Clair, Indianapolis, to My Dear Brother John, March 12, 1832 in Ibid.; John Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland, to Miss Jane Lane, April 1832 in Ibid.; Amos Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, May 1, 1832 in Ibid.

³³ Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, May 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁴ John Lane, Fort McHenry, Maryland to Dear Sister Ann, n.d., Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁵ G.M. Danyer, Indianapolis, to LT Lane, March 18, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ James B. Gardiner, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, July 26, 1832, in Harriet E. Gardiner, et al., "Removal of Indians from Ohio: Dunihue Correspondence of 1832," *Indiana Magazine of History* 35 No.4 (December 1939), 414; Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates*, 1: 409-410.

³⁸ Reginald Horseman, "American Indian Policy and the Origins of Manifest Destiny," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 11 (1968), 138-140; "The Indian Removal Act (28 May 1830)," <http://www.humanitiesweb.org/human.php?s=h&p=d&a=ID=40> (accessed January 2, 2011.)

³⁹ . Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, June 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Klunder, *Lewis Cass*, 69; Ella Lonn, “Ripples of the Black Hawk War in Northern Indiana,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 20 (September 1924), 288; Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 812n5. The General Drake to whom Mary Lane referred was James P. Drake, receiver of public monies at the Indianapolis federal land office where Arthur St. Clair was register. Drake was related to the Lanes through his marriage to Priscilla Holmes Buell. See Albert Welles, comp., *History of the Buell Family in England...and in America* (New York: American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History and Heraldry, 1881), 258; and Carrie Loftus, *Indiana Militia in the Black Hawk War* (San Antonio, Tex.: Frances T. Ingmire, 1986?), 3.

⁴⁰ Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to My Dear Son, June 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, August 1832, Frame 1216 in *Ibid*; D.R. Dunihue, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, September 11, 1832 in Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 419.

⁴¹ Harriet E. Gardiner, Lebanon, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, March 27, 1832 in Gardiner, et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 409-411; D.R. Dunihue, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander H. Dunihue, July 20, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 411, 412; Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, August 1832, Frame 1216, Buell-Brien Papers; Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates*, 1: 409-410.

⁴² J.B. Gardiner, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, July 26, 1832 in Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 414; Daniel R. Dunihue, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, September 11, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 418, 419; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, January 24, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴³ Daniel R. Dunihue, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, September 11, 1832 in Gardiner, et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 418, 419.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*; Obituary of George W. Lane, Aurora, Indiana *Dearborn Independent*, December 10, 1891.

⁴⁵ . J.B. Gardiner, Bellefontaine, Ohio to Alexander Dunihue, September 11, 1832 in Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 414.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ E.M. Huntington, Lafayette, Indiana to Miss Jane Lane, June 15, 1832 in Buell-Brien Papers; Thomas James De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 23 No. 2 (June 1927), 117-118; “Huntington, Elisha Mills,” *Biographical Directory of Federal Judges*, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C., <http://www.fjc.gov/servlet/nGetInfo?jid=1131> (accessed January 26, 2011); Loftus, *Indiana Militia in the Black Hawk War*, 5.

⁴⁹ Ibid.; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, April 5, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁰ E.M. Huntington, Lafayette, Indiana to Miss Jane Lane, June 15, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Mary Foote Howse Lane, Lawrenceburg, to Lieut. Jno. F. Lane, January 1, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Ann Lane Buell, Lawrenceburg, to John F. Lane, July 12, 1832 in Ibid; Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832 in Ibid; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co., 1883), 648; R. Douglas Hurt, *The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), 353-354.

⁵³ E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, to Jane Lane, September 10, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832 in Ibid.; Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 411, 414.

⁵⁴ Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 424.

⁵⁵ Daniel R. Dunihue, Vandalia, Illinois, to Alexander H. Dunihue, October 23, 1832, in Gardiner, et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 423.

⁵⁶ Daniel R. Dunihue, Belleville, Illinois, to Alexander H. Dunihue, November 1, 1832, in Gardiner, et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 424.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁹ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁰ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 648. George W. Lane was yet living in 1883 when this county history was published. He was a major contributor to a biographical sketch it contained on George P. Buell, Sr. According to this history, Buell gave the two brothers, George and James Henry, “their first start...in the Western pork trade.” To say as much, said George Lane, simply “gave credit to him to whom it justly belongs.”

⁶¹ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶² Reel 8, Frame 223, Entry 201 (Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General of Subsistence from Army Officers, Disbursing Officers, Indian Agents, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Individual Indians), 1832 Ohio Emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C. The archivists who catalogued these documents, in attempting to decipher the handwriting of the various correspondents, apparently mistook John F. Lane for Jeremiah F. Lane. That these are one-in-the same person, however, is reflected in the “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832 as well as the contents of the Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶³ Daniel R. Dunihue, Richmond, Indiana, to Alexander H. Dunihue, September 29, 1832, in Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 420-421.

⁶⁴ Entry 201, 1832 Ohio Emigration, Frame 223, Record Group 75, National Archives.

⁶⁵ Daniel R. Dunihue, Belleville, Illinois, to Alexander H. Dunihue, November 1, 1832, in Gardiner et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 424.

⁶⁶ Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218 in Ibid.; John Lane, Washington, D.C., to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Brien-Buell Papers; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Dear John, October 31, 1833 in Ibid.

⁶⁷ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, January 1, 1833, Frame 1217, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁸ Chapter 7, “Exposition and Protest,” in H. Lee Cheek, Jr., ed., *John C. Calhoun: Selected Writings and Speeches* (Lanham, Md.: National Book Network, 2003), 267.

⁶⁹ “South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, November 24, 1832,” *The Avalon Project*, Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/states/sc/ordnul.htm> (accessed December 5, 2007).

⁷⁰ “President Jackson’s Proclamation Regarding Nullification, December 10, 1832,” *Avalon Project*, Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/proclamations> (accessed December 5, 2007).

⁷¹ Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, January 1, 1833, Frame 1217, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷² John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, to Jane Lane, September 10, 1832 in Ibid.; Jane Lane and Mary Foote Howse Lane, Indianapolis, respectively to Ann Lane Buell and Amos Lane, November 2, 1832 in Ibid.; John Lane, Washington, D.C., to George P. Buell, April 5, 1833 in Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, to Miss Jane Lane, May 10, 1833 in Ibid.

⁷³ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 523; Elisha M. Huntington as quoted in Ibid., 523-524.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 524.

⁷⁵ “Andrew Jackson Second Inaugural Address” in James D. Richardson, comp., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1909* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1909), 3: 3-5.

⁷⁶ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 110.

⁷⁷ John F. Lane, Washington, D.C., to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.; Mary Foote Howse Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁸² John F. Lane, Washington, D.C., to George P. Buell, April 5, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁸³ Ibid.

Chapter Eight

¹ John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Frame 447, Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn.; John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, April 5, 1833, in Ibid.; R. David Edmonds, “The prairie Potawatomie Removal of 1833,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 68 (September, 1972), 241, 242.

² Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), Buell-Brien Papers, hereinafter referred to as Mary Lane’s Diary; John Lane, Louisville, Kentucky, to George Buell, August 6, 1833, Frame 445, Buell-Brien Papers; “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

³ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Frame 447, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴ J.H. Hook, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J. F. Lane, May 15, 1833 in U.S. Congress, Senate, 1834, *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration on Indians, Between the 30th of November, 1831, and 27th December, 1833*, 23rd Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc. 512, 1:256, hereinafter

referred to as Senate Document 512; George G. Gibson, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, May 25, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 1:261.

⁵ John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George Buell, January 24, 1833, Frame 447, Buell-Brien Papers; James B. Gardiner, Belleville, Indiana to General George Gibson, October 8, 1832, Reel 8, Frames 262-266, Entry 201 (Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General of Subsistence from Army Officers, Disbursing Officers, Indian Agents, The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Individual Indians), 1832 Ohio emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C.; J.F. Lane, near St. Louis, to General George Gibson, October 28, 1832 in Senate Document 512, 1:735, 736.

⁶ J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, April 6, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1: 743.

⁷ General George Gibson, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, April 13, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1:243.

⁸ Mary Lane's Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers; J.F. Lane to General George Gibson, December 11, 1832 in Senate Document 512, 1:739; Daniel R. Dunihue to Alexander H. Dunihue, November 1, 1832 in Daniel R. Dunihue et al., "Removal of Indians from Ohio: Dunihue Correspondence of 1832," *Indiana Magazine of History* 35 No. 4 (December, 1939), 424; Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers, 1828-1833*, vol. 25 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942) 2: 851n31, 865n42.

⁹ John Lane to George Buell, August 6, 1833, Frame 445, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² James B. Gardiner, Belleville, Indiana to General George Gibson, October 8, 1832, Frames 262-266, Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General of subsistence, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

¹³ *Ibid.*; John F. Lane, Lawrenceburg, to John Tipton, August 8, 1832 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2: 679; *Ibid.*, n5,n6; Daniel R. Dunihue, Belleville, Illinois, to Alexander H. Dunihue in Dunihue et al., "Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,"

¹⁴ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln :The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 130, 261, 262, 264; "Autobiography of General James H. Lane," *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; John F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, January 24, 1833, Frame 447, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁵ John Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to Dear Friends, August 13, 1833, Frame 443, Buell-Brien Papers; John Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to Dear Buell, August 131833, Frame 441 in Ibid.

¹⁶ Mary Lane's Diary, November 10, 1833, Frames 1218, 1219, Buell-Brien Papers; Albert Welles, comp., *History of the Buell Family in England...and in America* (New York: Society Library, American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History, and Heraldry, 1881), 257; John H.B. Nowland, *Sketches of Prominent Citizens of 1876, With a Few of the Pioneers Who Have Passed Away* (Indianapolis: Tifford and Carlon Printers, 1877), 553, 554; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley and Co. Publishers, 1885), 153, 154, 697, 698; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane: Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930), 207-209; Mary Foote Howse Lane Obituary, Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

¹⁷ Abel C. Pepper, Rising Sun, Ind. To Hon. John Tipton, August 10, 1832 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:682, 682n11; Stephenson, "Amos Lane: Advocate of Western Democracy," 207-209; "Lieutenant J.F. Lane's Quarterly Statement of Agents and Others in the Removal and Subsistence of the Ohio Emigrating Indians for the Quarter Ending September 30, 1832," Reel 8, Frames 218, 219, Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General for Subsistence, 1832 Ohio Emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

¹⁸ Nowland, *Sketches of Prominent Citizens*, 553; Jacob Piatt Dunn, ed., *Indiana and Indianians: A History of Aboriginal and Territorial Indiana and the Century of Statehood* (Chicago and New York: American Historical Society, 1919), 5: 2289, 2290; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, April 5, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁹ John Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to George P. Buell, August 13, 1833, Frame 441, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁰ Arthur H. DeRosier, Jr., *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970), 119-128, 144, 145, 154, 158.

²¹ Ibid., 158-161; J.H. Hook, Acting C.G.S., Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, May 15, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1: 256; General George Gibson, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, May 25, 1833 in Ibid., 261; Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Rendezvous on the Chunka to General George Gibson, September 6, 1833, Reel 8, Frames 00919, 00, 00920, Letters Received From the Commissary General of Subsistence, 1833 Choctaw Emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C. "Chunky River," *East Mississippi Foothills Land Trust*, <http://www.emflt.org/chunky.html> (accessed February 17, 2011). Because native peoples named the river at the rendezvous location, its spellings have varied over time.

²² John Lane, Nashville, Tenn. To George P. Buell, August 13, 1833, Frame 441, Buell-Brien Papers; Carolyn Thomas Forman, "Report of Captain John Stuart on the Construction of the Road From Fort Smith to Horse Prairie on Red River," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 5 No. 3 (September, 1927), 333-347; Jordan H. Glenn, "Choctaw Colonization of Oklahoma," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 54 (Spring, 1976), 29, 30.

²³ John Lane, Nashville, Tenn. to George C. Buell, August 13, 1833, Frame 441, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ J.F. Lane, Columbus, Miss., to Brigadier General George Gibson, August 23, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1: 744; J.F. Lane, Old Choctaw Agency, to General George Gibson, September 2, 1833 in Ibid., 745.

²⁶ J.F. Lane, Rendezvous on the Chunka, to General George Gibson, September 6, 1833 in Ibid., 745.

²⁷ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Choctaw Agency, to General George Gibson, September 24, 1833 in Ibid., 745, 746.

²⁸ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to General George Gibson, October 16, 1833 in Ibid., 746, 747.

²⁹ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Choctaw Agency, to General George Gibson, September 24, 1833 in Ibid., 745, 746.

³⁰ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to General George Gibson, October 16, 1833 in Ibid., 746, 747.

³¹ DeRosier, *Removal of the Choctaw Indians*, 161, 162; Mary Lane's Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers.

³² John Lane, Nashville, Tenn., to George P. Buell, August 13, 1833, Frame 441, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane's Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Buell-Brien Papers.

³³ E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 25, 1833, Frame 234 in Buell-Brien Papers; A. St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 25, 1833, Frame 230 in Ibid.

³⁴ E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 25, 1833, Frame 234 in Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ A. St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 25, 1833, Frame 230 in Ibid.; *Register of the Officers and Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy, June 1825* (West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy, Official Reprint, 1884), 10; John H. Eicher and David J. Eicher, eds., *Civil War High Commands* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 2001), 429, 540; Ver Planck Van Antwerp, "Reminiscences of Early Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History* 52 (1954), 343.

- ³⁷ A. St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 25, 1833, Frame 230, Buell-Brien Letter; Welles, *History of the Buell Family*, 258.
- ³⁸ Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Lane, October 3, 1833, Frame 229, Buell-Brien letters.
- ³⁹ William Hendricks, Madison, Indiana to Mr. Lane, October 25, 1833, Buell-Brien Letters.
- ⁴⁰ Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Lane, October 31, 1833, Frame 231, Buell-Brien letters.
- ⁴¹ Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2: 851, 865.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*; William Hendricks, Madison, Indiana to Mr. Lane, October 25, 1833, Buell-Brien Letters; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 3, 1833 in *Ibid.*; J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, April 6, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1:743; J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, December 12, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 747. The dialogue between Lieutenant John F. Lane and The Commissary General's office relative to the Ohio Indian Emigration was finally nearing completion in the last month of 1833, almost a year after the emigration ended, and three months after Lane returned from his second round of Indian removal duties with the southern Choctaws.
- ⁴³ Lieutenant John F. Lane, Bellefontaine, Ohio to General George Gibson, September 16, 1832 in Senate Document 512, 1:731; Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Piqua, Indiana to General George Gibson, September 23, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 729, 730; Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Piqua, Indiana to General George Gibson, September 25, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 730.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 730; Horace Bassett, Bellefontaine, Ohio to John Tipton, September 13, 1832 in *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:709, 710.
- ⁴⁵ Daniel R. Dunihue, near Richmond, Indiana to Alexander H. Dunihue, September 29, 1832 in Dunihue et al., "Dunihue Correspondence of 1832," 421; Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Piqua, Ohio to General George Gibson, September 25, 1832 in Senate Document 512, 1:730.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ J.J. Abert, Washington, D.C. to James B. Gardiner, October 4, 1834 in Senate Document 512, 1:1178,1179; J.J. Abert, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, October 6, 1834 in *Ibid.*, 1178.
- ⁴⁸ "In the Senate of the United States," December 23, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 1:4.
- ⁴⁹ J.J. Abert, Piqua, Ohio to General G. Gibson, October 12, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 1:384.
- ⁵⁰ J.J. Abert, Washington, D.C. to James B. Gardiner, October 4, 1834 in *Ibid.*, 1:1178, 1179.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² “In the Senate of the United States,” December 23, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 1:4.

⁵³ Paul Wallace Gates, “Introduction,” in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:52, 53.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*; “In the Senate of the United States,” December 23, 1833 in Senate Document 512, 1:4.

⁵⁵ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, April 12, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 1:743; Daniel R. Dunihue, Belleville, Illinois, to Alexander H. Dunihue, November 1, 1832 in Dunihue et al., “Dunihue Correspondence of 1832,” 424; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, October 31, 1833, Buell-Brien Letters; William Hendricks, Madison, Indiana, to Mr. Lane, October 25, 1833 in *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Seneca Agency, to General George Gibson, December 31, 1832 in Senate Document 512, 1: 739, 740; Lieutenant J.F. Lane, Seneca Agency, to Captain Jacob Brown, December 11, 1832 in *Ibid.*, 1:505, 506; J.H. Hook, Acting Commissary General of Subsistence, Washington, D.C., to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, May 15, 1833 in *Ibid.*, 1:256.

⁵⁷ J.J. Abert, Alton, Illinois, to General George Gibson, November 2, 1832, in *Ibid.*, 1:392.

Chapter Nine

¹ Dorothy Riker and Gayle Thornbrough, Comps., *Indiana Election Returns, 1816-1861* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1960), 87-90; U.S. Congress, *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress, 1774-2005*, Andrew R. Dodge and Betty K. Koed, eds., House Document No. 108-222 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2005), 107; Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-Military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1888, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, hereafter cited as Mary Lane’s Diary.

² Mary Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218.

³ *Ibid.*; “Officers of the City of Leavenworth Since its Organization” in Jesse A. Hall and Leroy T. Hand, *History of Leavenworth County, Kansas* (Topeka, Kans.: Historical Publishing Co., 1921), 201.

⁴ Mary Lane’s Diary, November 10, 1833, Frame 1218.

⁵ *Ibid.*; Jane Lane Huntington, Terre Haute, Ind. to Lieutenant John F. Lane, November 1833, Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., hereafter cited as Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶ Jane Lane Huntington, Terre Haute, Ind. to Lieutenant John F. Lane, November 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷ Ibid.; John F. Lane, West Point, New York, to Ann Lane Buell, July 17, 1828 in Ibid.; Mary Lane's Diary, December 4, 1833 (Frame 1220) in Ibid; Riker and Thornbrough, *Indiana Election Returns, 1816-1861*, 214, 217.

⁸ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930), 208; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to Mr. George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁹ George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.*, 3rd ed. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1891), 1:409; George W. Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Dear Brother, December 25, 1831 in Buell-Brien Papers; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, Ind. to Dear John, October 31, 1833 in Ibid; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to Mr. George P. Buell, December 14, 1833 in Ibid.

¹⁰ John Lane, Washington, D.C. to Mr. George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, January 30, 1834, Reel 8, Frame 539, Entry 201 (Letters Received by the Office of the Commissary General of Subsistence from Army Officers, Disbursing Officers, Indian Agents, The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Individual Indians), 1832 Ohio emigration, Records Group 75, National Archives, Washington, D.C.; James L. Morrison, *"The Best School in the World:" West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years, 1833-1866* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 14; John K. Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842*, Revised ed. (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1991), 193. As Morrison explains, General Jesup "became quartermaster general in 1818 and, except for field service in the Florida War, retained that office until his death forty-two years later."

¹⁴ J.F. Lane, Washington, D.C. to General George Gibson, January 30, 1834, Reel 8, Frame 539, Records Group 75, National Archives.

¹⁵ U.S. Congress, Senate, 1834, *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th of November, 1831, and the 27th December, 1833*, 23rd Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc. 512, 1:4, hereinafter cited as Senate Document 512; U.S. Congress, Senate, February 4, 1835, *On Printing Ordered by the Senate at the Last and Present Sessions*, 23rd Cong., 2nd sess. S. Doc 100; Mary Lane's Diary, entry for April 4, 1834, Frame 1222, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁶ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for April 4, 1834, Frame 1222, Buell-Brien Papers.

¹⁷ “The Delaware Breakwater and Ice Breaker,” in Frank E. Snyder and Brian H. Guss, *The District: A History of the Philadelphia District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1866-1971* (Philadelphia: U.S. Army Engineer District Philadelphia, 1974), 5-10; Lewis Cass, Washington, D.C. to The Hon. Speaker of the House of Representatives, May 17, 1834 in U.S. Congress, House, 1834, *Delaware Breakwater—Names and Compensation of Superintendents*, 23rd Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. 422, cited hereafter as House Document 422; Barton C. Hacker, “Engineering a New Order: Military Institutions, Technical Education, and the Rise of the Industrial State,” *Technology and Culture* 34 (1993), 13.

¹⁸ Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 6,7.

¹⁹ Ibid., 7,8, 10; Thomas S. Jesup, Washington, D.C. to Hon. Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, May 16, 1834, in U.S. Congress, House, 1834, House Document 422.

²⁰ Richard L. Watson, Jr., “Congressional Attitudes Toward Military Preparedness, 1829-1835,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 34 No. 4 (March, 1948), 617n18.

²¹ Cullum, *Biographical Register of Officers and Graduates*, 1:409, 410.

²² Mary Lane’s Diary, entry for April 4, 1834, Frame 1222, Buell-Brien Papers.; Lewis Cass, Washington, D.C. to Hon. Speaker of the House of Representatives, May 17, 1834, in U.S. Congress, House, 1834, House Document 422; Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 6,7.

²³ Henry Eugene Davies, comp., *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 74, 75, 82; Ruth Foote Davies obituary, *New York Times*, September 23, 1852; Thomas Alfred Davies obituary, *New York Times*, August 20, 1899.

²⁴ A.F. Momson, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, March 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Lane’s Diary, entry for April 4, 1834, Frame 1222, in Ibid.; Samuel A. Foote, New York, to Lieutenant John F. Lane, May 23, 1834 in Ibid.; Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Lieutenant John F. Lane, June 1, 1834 in Ibid; Samuel A. Foote, New York to Lieutenant John F. Lane, June 5, 1834 in Ibid.

²⁵ Samuel A. Foote, New York to Lieutenant John F. Lane, June 16, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁶ Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 10; Logan Esarey, *A History of Indiana From Its Exploration to 1850* (Indianapolis: W.K. Stewart Co., 1915), 297; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Dear John, October 31, 1833 in Buell-Brien Papers; John Lane, Washington, to Mr. George P. Buell, December 14, 1833 in Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Washington, to Mrs. E.M. Huntington June 18, 1834 in Ibid.

²⁷ John Lane, Washington, D.C. to Mr. George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁸Elisha M. Huntington to John Tipton, December 15, 1833 in Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 2:865, 866.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Riker and Thornbrough, *Indiana Election Returns, 1815-1861*, 210, 211, 214, 217; Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 10.

³¹ Harry Williams, "The Attack Upon West Point During the Civil War," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25 No. 4 (March, 1939), 495n18, 503; U.S. Congress, Senate, Doc. 247, 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834; Morrison, "*The Best School in the World*," 61.

³² J.F. Lane, "The Military Academy," (Washington, D.C.) *Daily National Intelligencer*, November 17, 1834; E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to My Dear Wife, November 30, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.; Samuel A. Foote, New York, to Lieutenant John F. Lane, May 23, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; Mary Foote Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Lieutenant John F. Lane, June 1, 1834, in Ibid.

³⁶ Mary Foote Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to John F. Lane, August 3, 1834, in Buell-Brien Papers; Charles Davies, West Point, New York, to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, June 4, 1834, in Ibid.; V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, Tex.: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593, 594.

³⁷ Charles Davies, West Point, New York, to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, June 4, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁸ "Autobiography of General James H. Lane," *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

³⁹ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 196; Amos Lane, New Orleans, to Lieutenant J.F. Lane, December 20, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴⁰ Walter Johnson, *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1999), 1,2.

⁴¹ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for January 7, 1833, Frames 1217, 1218, Buell-Brien Papers; John Wesley, Balam, England to William Wilberforce, February 24, 1791, as quoted in "John Wesley: Letter to William Wilberforce," <http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/wesley/wilber.stm> (Accessed March 6, 2008).

⁴² Philip Van Doren Stern, ed., *The Life and Writing of Abraham Lincoln* (1940; repr., New York: Modern Library Paperback Edition, 2000), 13-15.

⁴³ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, "The Liberator of Kansas"* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, 1897), 126, 127; Kendall E. Bailes, *Rider on the Wind: Jim Lane and Kansas* (Shawnee Mission, Kans.: Wagon Wheel Press, 1962), 75, 76, 213n9.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 60, 61, 110, 111. According to Foner, "to most radicals, economic issues were only peripheral to the basically moral question of slavery....[They] consistently stressed the cruelties and injustices inflicted on the slaves." Conversely, avers Foner, "anti-slavery Democrats were heirs of the Jacksonian political tradition, and were accustomed to couch their political arguments in terms which would appeal to labor." Foner proceeds to quote George Rathborn, a delegate to the Albany Democratic antislavery convention of 1848: "I do not pretend to know, nor is it necessary...whether the effect of slavery is beneficial or injurious to [the slave.] I am looking to its effect upon the white man, the free white man of this country." Jim Lane's first-hand reaction to slavery during his flatboat river journey in the early 1830s prefigured Rathborn's commentary.

⁴⁶ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 184, 185, 254; Elisha M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, December 11, 1832 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2: 742.

⁴⁷ U.S. Congress, Senate, Doc. 251, 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834; Dodge and Koed, *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress*, 109; R. J. Brukinsly, Baltimore, to Dear Sir, December 31, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴⁸ R. J. Brukinsly, Baltimore, to Dear Sir, December 31, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.; Dodge and Koed, *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress*, 109.

⁵² Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, December 10, 1829 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2: 229.

⁵³ William Marshall, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, May 9, 1829 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2: 163, 164; Ibid., 163n36; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, May 28, 1830 in Ibid., 2: 277, 278.

⁵⁴ John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁵ A.F. Momson, Washington, D.C. to Lieutenant John F. Lane, March 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁶ Mary Foote Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Lieutenant John F. Lane, June 1, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁵⁷ Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to Dear Brother, August 20, 1834 in Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to Dear Wife, November 30, 1834 in Ibid.

⁵⁸ Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 10; John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C. to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834 in Ibid.

⁵⁹ John Lane, Washington, D.C. to George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁰ E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 23, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶³ Ibid.; Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau & Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 115, 514, 515, 540.

⁶⁴ E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to Dear Brother, August 20, 1834 in Ibid.

⁶⁵ E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 23, 1834 in Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Carmony, *Indiana 1816-1850*, 538, 539, 822n109; A.F. Morrison, Greenfield, Ind., to John Tipton, December 12, 1832 in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:743-746.

⁶⁸ Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834 in Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁹ E. M. Huntington, Washington, D.C. to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 23, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C. to Jane Lane Huntington, June 29, 1834 in Ibid. Elisha Huntington's letter, though dated June 29, 1834, was actually written over the two-day period that ended on Monday, June 30, the same day that congress adjourned.

⁷⁰ E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C. to Jane Lane Huntington, June 29, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. Jane Livinia Lane Huntington, July 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷³ U.S. Congress, Senate, 1834, *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th of November, 1831, and 27th December, 1833*, 23^d Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc 512, 1:4; U.S. Congress, Senate, 1835, *On Printing Ordered By the Senate at Last and Present Sessions*, 23d Cong., 2d sess. S. Doc 100.

⁷⁴ E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. Jane Livinia Lane Huntington, July 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷⁵ George P. Buell, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Dear John, July 19, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.; Mary Foote Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to John F. Lane, August 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, Ind., to Mrs. Jane L. Huntington, July 31, 1834 in Ibid.

⁷⁸ Mary Foote Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to John F. Lane, August 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ James Henry Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to Dear Brother, August 19, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁸¹ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for May 21, 1834, Frame 1223, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁸² O.F. Roberts, "The Lane Family" in William Elsey Connelley, ed., vol. 16, *Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society*, (Topeka, 1925), 30; Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 5, 11; E.M. Huntington, Washington, D.C., to Mrs. Jane Livinia Lane Huntington, July 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

Chapter Ten

¹John Lane, Lewes, Del., to G.P. Buell, August 3, 1834, Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., hereafter cited as Buell-Brien Papers.

² Ibid.

³ Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to John F. Lane, August 3, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴ William Strickland, Lewes, Del. to The Hon. Lewis Cass, September 5, 1834, U.S. Congress. House. 1835. Letter from the Secretary of War, Transmitting Information in Relation to the Delaware breakwater. 23d Cong. 2d sess. H. Doc. 145; Frank E. Snyder and Brian H. Guss, *The District: A History of the Philadelphia District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1866-1971* (Philadelphia: U.S. Army Engineer District Philadelphia, 1974), 10, 11.

⁵ Strickland to Cass, September 5, 1834, U.S. Congress,. House. 1835. Information in Relation to the Delaware Breakwater. 23d Cong. 2d sess. H. Doc. 145; Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 8, 10.

⁶ Snyder and Guss, ; Snyder and Guss, *History of the Philadelphia District*, 6, 10; Dennis F. Polis, ed., *History, Land Ownership, and Laws including a Survey of Maps Prior to 1840*, vol. 2 of *Delaware Bay Report Series* (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware, 1973), 225; U.S. Congress. House. 1835. Extract from a report of the Quartermaster General to the Secretary of War, dated October 25, 1834. 23d Cong. 2d sess. H. Doc 145.

⁷ U.S. Congress. House. 1835. Lewis Cass, War Department, October 25, 1834 to Major General Jesup, Lieutenant Colonel Thayer, and Colonel Totten; Thomas S. Jesup, Joseph F. Totten, and S. Thayer, Lewes, Del., to Hon. Lewis Cass; J.F. Lane, Washington City, January 26, 1835 to Major General T.S. Jesup; . 23d Cong. 2d sess. H. Doc 145.

⁸U.S. Congress. Senate. 1834. *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th of November , 1831, and the 27th December 1833*. 23d Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc. 512, 1:4, 384; U.S. Congress. Senate. 1835. *Report from the Secretary of the Senate, In Obedience to a resolution of the Senate relative to printing ordered at the last and present sessions*, 23d Cong., 2d sess. S. Doc 100.

⁹ Nicole Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Virgil W. Dean, ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33.

¹⁰ U.S. Congress. Senate. 1835. *Report from the Secretary of the Senate, in obedience to a resolution of the Senate relative to printing ordered at the last and present sessions*, 23d Cong., 2d sess. S. Doc 100; U.S. Congress. Senate. 1834. *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th of November , 1831, and the 27th December 1833*. 23d Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc. 512, 1:384, 1178.

¹¹ Ibid. Some confusion and delay apparently ensued when the War Department mistakenly sent the bulk of the Indian removal documents directly to the printing office instead of the Secretary of the Senate. As of February 4, 1835, that official reported to the President of the Senate that 3,518 pages had already been printed, and that the remaining five hundred pages of so “can be completed in a few days.”

¹² William T. Martin, *History of Franklin County: A Collection of Reminiscences of the Early Settlement of the County* (Columbus, Ohio: Follett, Foster & Co., 1858), 60, 64, 175, 283; Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 2: 865n42; Michael A. Broadstone, ed., *History of Green County, Ohio: Its People, Industries, and Institutions* (Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., 1918), 164, 165; “Ohio Printer Index, 1789-1850,” Morgan Library of Ohio Imprints, 1796-1850, Ohio Digital Research Commons, <http://www.ohiolink.edu>.

¹³ Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society), 540, 547, 548; Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:278n26; Paul Wallace Gates, Cornell University, “Introduction” in Ibid., 1:22, 32-34.

¹⁴ Mary St. Clair, Indianapolis, to Lieut. John F. Lane, December 21, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Gates, “Introduction,” in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:22; U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.12, 185,186; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 550.

¹⁵ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 542, 823n114; U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.12, 185-187; Gates, “Introduction,” in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:38.

¹⁶ “Delaware Breakwater,” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1, no. 32 (August 6, 1835): 249, 250.

¹⁷ Ibid.; James L. Morrison, Jr., *“The Best School in the World:” West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years, 1833-1866* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1986), 5, 8-9. Morrison explains why Lane’s posting to the breakwater construction site in the mid-1830s would not have been extraordinary: “The coastal defense mission, shared by the engineers and heavy artillery, embraced the construction, maintenance, and garrisoning of a string of fortifications stretching initially from Maine to Florida. . . . While serving on duty with the army engineers. . . graduates of the military academy built lighthouses, erected public buildings, dug canals, and removed hazards to navigation, as well as exploring, surveying, mapping, and building roads and railroads.

¹⁸ J.F. Lane to Major General T.S. Jesup, January 26, 1835 as quoted in “Delaware Breakwater,” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1, no. 32 (August 6, 1835): 249, 250.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.; U.S. Congress. House. 1835. *Letter from the Secretary of War Transmitting Information in relation to the Delaware Breakwater*. 23d Cong., 2d sess. H. Doc. 145.

²¹ John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, 'The Liberator of Kansas'* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, 1897), 137; William Elsey Connelley, ed., "The Lane Family," *Kansas Historical Collections* 16 (1923-1925):29; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 15; "Sacred to the Memory of Ann Buell," Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Frames 1291-1293, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-Military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1888, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., hereafter cited as Mary Lane's Diary, Buell-Brien Papers; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September 1930): 179, 180, 187, 193. James H. Lane and his older brother, John, were respectively aged eleven and thirteen when in August 1825 their father invoked the language of the dueling code during a bitter political campaign against Isaac Blackford. The latter, Lane averred at the time, would prefer "to lose fifty elections rather 'than call Amos Lane to the field of honor.'"

²² Nicole Etcheson, "Manliness and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1790-1856," *Journal of the Early Republic* 15 No. 1 (Spring 1995), 63.

²³ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 192, 193; U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.11, 172.

²⁴ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 193-195.

²⁵ Ibid.; U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.11, 172.

²⁶ U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.11, 143.

²⁷ J.F. Lane, Washington City to Messrs. Blair & Rives, March 1, 1835, as quoted in the *Washington Globe*, March 2, 1835. Lane explained the incident as follows: "Having accidentally met with Mr. Ewing, I took occasion, courteously, to request an explanation of a supposed injury....The injury of which I desired explanation was purely personal, having no relation in any way to politics, and referring to myself and other persons, unable to act for themselves."

²⁸ U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 1835. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol.2 no.11, 154.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 155

³¹ Ibid., 156.

³² Ibid., 155, 156; Gates, “Introduction,” in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:22; U.S. Congress. Senate. 1834. *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians, Between the 30th of November, 1831, and the 27th December 1833*. 23d Cong., 1st sess. S. Doc. 512, 1:4, 384, 1178. It is perhaps noteworthy that two sets of scholars, working independently and separated by roughly a generation in time, focused on the same piece of legislation. What most impressed one was the heated exchange between Amos Lane and two colleagues from Indiana; what most impressed the others was that the law’s author was “a Whig member of Congress from Indiana and a bitter political enemy of [Senator] Tipton.”

³³ Cong. Debates, 23d Cong., 2d sess., 1835, vol.11, 1565,1566.

³⁴ Benjamin Romans, ed., *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 10 (March 5, 1835): 76.

³⁵ Ibid.; House select committee, *Assault on Mr. Ewing*, 23d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rep. 135, 1.

³⁶ House select committee, *Assault on Mr. Ewing*, 23d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rep. 135, 1, 2.

³⁷ Benjamin Romans, ed., “Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry convened at Gadsby’s Hotel, in the City of Washington, on the 28th day of February, 1835, in obedience to the following order, vic: Headquarters of the Army, Adjutant General’s Office, Washington, 28th February 1835. Order No. 8,” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 16 (April 16, 1835): 122; Benjamin Romans, ed., “Lieut. Lane’s Case (Concluded),” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 17 (April 23, 1835): 129, 130. Besides Major General Winfield Scott, two other general officers served on Lieutenant Lane’s court of inquiry: Brigadier General Hugh Brady and Brigadier General John E. Wool. In a commentary that Lane provided the court, he observed, “that the investigation made by the Congressional Committee comprehended only a part of the evidence on your record.”

³⁸ Benjamin F. Romans, ed., *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 16 (April 16, 1835): 124.

³⁹ “Washington City, 1st March, 1835. Messrs. Blair & Rives,” *Washington Globe*, March 2, 1835; Cong. Debates, 23d Cong., 2d sess., 1835, vol.11, 1565,1566; Benjamin F. Romans, ed., “Assault on Mr. Ewing,” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 12 (March 19, 1835): 91.

⁴⁰ Benjamin Romans, ed., “Lieut. Lane’s Case (Concluded),” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 17 (April 23, 1835): 130.

⁴¹ Benjamin Romans, ed., ““Proceedings of a Court of Inquiry convened at Gadsby’s Hotel, in the City of Washington, on the 28th day of February, 1835, in obedience to the following order, vic: Headquarters of the Army, Adjutant General’s Office, Washington, 28th February 1835. Order No. 8,” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 16 (April 16, 1835):125.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Benjamin Romans, ed., “Lieut. Lane’s Case (Concluded),” *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 17 (April 23, 1835): 129, 130.

⁴⁴ Ibid.; “Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane,” *Niles’ Weekly Register* 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80.

⁴⁵ “Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane,” *Niles’ Weekly Register* 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Indianapolis, *Indiana Journal*, June 2-3, 1832 as quoted in Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:625n90

⁴⁸ *United States Telegraaph* as quoted in Marquis James, *The Raven: A Biography of Sam Houston* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929), 164, 165; *Niles Weekly Register*, Baltimore, 48 No.1225 (March 14, 1835): 17. Speaking of the Lane-Ewing incident in 1835, the editor of the *Register* averred that “members of Congress must not only be subject to a call to order, but *subject to a call out!*”

⁴⁹ James, *Biography of Sam Houston*, 167.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 170, 172.

⁵¹ *Niles Weekly Register*, Baltimore, 48 No.1225 (March 14, 1835): 17; “Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane,” in Ibid., 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80; House select committee, *Assault on Mr. Ewing*, 23d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rep. 135, 1, 2.

⁵² “Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane,” *Niles Weekly Register*, Baltimore, 48 No.1228 (April 4, 1835): 80.

⁵³ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

⁵⁴ Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 137; Romans, “Lieut. Lane’s Case (Concluded),” 129, 130.

⁵⁵ D.K. Minor, ed., “Headquarters of the Army,” *American Railroad Journal and Advocate of Internal Improvements* 4 No. 12 (March 28, 1835): 190.

⁵⁶ Captain J.F. Lane, Tallassee, Ala., to Major Washington Barrow, Tennessee Volunteers, August 26, 1836, in “Report on India Rubber Air Ponton [sic] Boats and Bridges, For the use of Armies and other purposes,” September 22, 1846, MS, Special Collections, John F. Lane, United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. (photocopy in possession of the author), hereafter cited as “Army Report on India Rubber Pontoon Boats and Bridges.”

⁵⁷ William D. Hoyt, Jr., “Zachary Taylor on Jackson and the Military Establishment, 1835,” *The American Historical Review* 51 No. 3 (April 1946), 481.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 481, 482.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 482.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 482, 484.

⁶¹ Jane Lane Huntington, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to E.M. Huntington, June 17, 1835, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶² E.M. Huntington, Washington, to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, June 18, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, Ind., to Mrs. Jane Huntington, July 31, 1834, in Ibid.

⁶³ E.M. Huntington, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, August 20, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁴ Jane Lane Huntington, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to E.M. Huntington, June 17, 1835, Buell-Brien Papers; E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, August 2, 1835, in Ibid.

⁶⁵ Jane Lane Huntington, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to E.M. Huntington, June 17, 1835, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁶ E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, August 2, 1835, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 541; Robertson and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:757; Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 14; Dorothy Riker and Gayle Thornbrough, comps., *Indiana Election Returns, 1816-1851*, vol. 40 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1960), 227; Mary Lane's Diary, Frame 1223, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁶⁹ Alva L. Sawyer, *A History of the Northern Peninsula of Michigan and its People* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911), 3:1383-1384.

⁷⁰ Jane Lane Huntington, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to E.M. Huntington, June 17, 1835, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷¹ J.F. Lane, Boston, Mass., to George P. Buell, Esq., January 10, 1836, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ John K. Mahon, "Two Seminole Treaties: Payne's Landing, 1832, and Ft. Gibson, 1833," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 4 No. 1 (July 1962), 7,8.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 9, 15, 16; Albert Hubbard Roberts, "The Dade Massacre," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 5 No.3 (January 1927), 124-126; "A Battle of the Seminole Wars," Dade Battlefield Historic State Park, Bushnell, Florida, <http://www.exploresouthernhistory.com/dade.html> (accessed November 10, 2010).

⁷⁶ John K. Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War* (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1967, Revised Edition, 1991), 172, 173; "United States Dragoons," *Niles' Weekly Register* 50 No. 1293 (July 2, 1836), 311; Melburn D. Thurman, "Seminole, Creeks, Delawares, and Shawnees: Indian Auxiliaries in the Second Seminole War," *The Florida Anthropologist* 30 No. 4 (December 1977), 147; James F. Sunderman, ed., *Journey Into Wilderness: An Army Surgeon's Account of Life in Camp and Field during the Creek and Seminole Wars 1836-1838 by Jacob Rhett Motte* (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1953), 22, 32.

⁷⁷ "United States Dragoons," *Niles' Weekly Register* 50 No. 1293 (July 2, 1836), 311; George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., From Its Establishment, in 1802, to 1890* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Third Edition, 1891), 1: 409, 410.

⁷⁸ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for January 23, 1838, Frame 1223, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁷⁹ Entries for January 23, 1838 and January 24, 1838, Frames 1223 and 1224, in Ibid.; E.M. Huntington, Washington, March 13, 1836, to Mrs. Jane Huntington, Buell-Brien Papers; Jane Huntington, Lawrenceburg, Ind., April 10, 1836, to E.M. Huntington, Esq., in Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Mary Lane's Diary, entry for January 24, 1838, Frame 1223, Buell-Brien Papers; Mahon, *Second Seminole War*, 173; "United States Dragoons," *Niles' Weekly Register* 50 No. 1293 (July 2, 1836), 311; Cullum, *Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, 409-410; Sunderman, *Journey Into Wilderness*, 31, 32.

⁸² Cullum, *Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, 409-410; "Army Report on India Rubber Pontoon Boats and Bridges," 2- 4, 5-6; Sunderman, *Journey Into Wilderness*, 31, 32; "New Books and Publications," *Scientific American* 9 No.9 (August 29, 1863): 133. The last-cited *Scientific American* source is a review of (then) Brigadier General George W. Cullum's *Systems of Military Bridges*, published in 1863. It reads in part, "The first India-rubber pontoon bridge experimented with was in 1836, by Captain John F. Lane, U.S. Army; it is 350 feet in length, and was thrown over the Tallapoosa River, in Alabama. Such bridges were afterward practically used in the Mexican War, under the charge of General Cullum."

⁸³ "Army Report on India Rubber Pontoon Boats and Bridges," 6, 7.

⁸⁴ J.F. Lane, Tallassee, Ala., to Major Washington Barrow, August 26, 1836, in Ibid., 4,5.

⁸⁵ “Melancholy Death of Lieut. Col. Lane, at Fort Drane, Florida,” unattributed newspaper article in MS, Hannibal Day Scrapbook, , Special Collections, John F. Lane, United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. (photocopy in possession of the author). This article contained an abstract purportedly taken from the October 26, 1836 issue of the *Charleston Courier*.

⁸⁶ Mary Lane’s Diary, entry for January 24, 1838, Frames 1223, 1224, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁸⁷ Ibid.; “War in Florida: From the *Florida Herald*—Extra, Oct 21. From the Same,” *Niles’ Weekly Register* 1 No.10 (November 5, 1836): 148; Major Eben Swift, *Services of Graduates of West Point in Indian Wars* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), 543; “Army Report on India Rubber Pontoon Boats and Bridges,” 8. According to the army report, “No cause can be assigned for the act, other than a supposition that the responsibilities of his station, and the fatigues of the march, had produced an inflammation of the brain.”

⁸⁸ Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, Mo. And London, England: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 263.

⁸⁹ Mary Lane’s Diary, entry for January 24, 1838, Frames 1223, 1224, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁹⁰ “War in Florida: From the *Florida Herald*—Extra, Oct 21. From the Same,” *Niles’ Weekly Register* 1 No.10 (November 5, 1836): 148.

⁹¹ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; “General James H. Lane. His Last Days in St. Louis. His Journey to Leavenworth. His Illness, Dejection, Anxiety, Etc. An Authentic Statement,” from the *St. Louis Democrat*, ca. 1866, MS, vol. 98, Kansas Scrapbooks, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kans., 7-10. A portion of this extract reads, “On one occasion Lane very minutely detailed the circumstances of the suicide of his brother in Florida, a United States army officer there, many years ago, and at the same time expresses much astonishment that his brother could have done such an act.”

Chapter Eleven

¹ Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frame 1224), Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1883-1888, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., hereafter cited as Mary Lane’s Diary, Buell-Brien Papers.

²James F. Sunderman, ed., *Journey Into Wilderness: An Army Surgeon’s Account of Life in Camp and Field During the Creek and Seminole Wars, 1836-1838 by Jacob Rhett Motte* (Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1953), 259n5.

³“From Tampa Bay,” in Benjamin Romans, ed., *Army and Navy Chronicle* 3 No. 17 (October 27, 1836): 269; “On the Death of John F. Lane, by his Mother, Mary Lane,” printed alongside “George W. Lane, Denver, Col., May, 1869 to Professor Charles Davies” in unattributed MS,

Hannibal Day Scrapbook, Special Collections, John F. Lane, United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. (photocopy in possession of the author).

⁴ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for December 21, 1841 (Frame 1225), Buell-Brien Papers; Stephen D. Engle, *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All* (Chapel Hill, N.C. and London, England: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 7, 8; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 16. Don Carlos Buell's sister, Sallie, in March 1840 married George Lane.

⁵ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 16; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana from their Earliest Settlement* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co., 1885), 806-808; E.M. Huntington, Washington, to Mrs. Jane Huntington, March 13, 1836, Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, hereafter cited as Buell-Brien Papers. Don Carlos Buell's uncle, George P. Buell, Sr., was a brother-in-law of both Jim and George Lane, and their deceased brother, Lieutenant John Foote Lane.

⁶Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 7, 8; Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frame 1224), and Entry for September 6, 1842 (Frame 1240), Buell-Brien Papers. Don Carlos' stepmother, Ann Lane Buell, was born in March, 1809, and married his Uncle George on June 20, 1824. Don Carlos Buell was born on March 23, 1818.

⁷ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 7, 8.

⁸ "Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane," *Niles' Weekly Register* 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80; Melburn D. Thurman, "Seminole, Creeks, Delawares, and Shawnees: Indian Auxilliaries in the Second Seminole War," *The Florida Anthropologist* 30 No. 4 (December 1977): 147; "Ponton Equipage," in Benjamin Romans, ed., *Army and Navy Chronicle* 3 No. 17 (October 27, 1836):264; Charles Davies, West Point, N.Y., to Lt. John F. Lane, June 4, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers. Between 1836 and 1839, journalistic spelling conventions apparently underwent a change. In 1836 the small inflatable boats made of India rubber were called *pontons*; by 1839 the more modern spelling of *pontoon* came into vogue.

⁹ Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir. A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendents of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately Printed, 1895), 68, 69.

¹⁰ V. Frederick Rickey and Amy Shell-Gellasch, "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point," in Lance Betros, ed., *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond* (Abilene, Tex.: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004), 593.

¹¹ "Court of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane," *Niles' Weekly Register* 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80; E.M. Huntington, Washington, to Mrs. Jane Huntington, March 13, 1836, Buell-Brien Papers; "War in Florida: From the *Florida Herald* – Extra, Oct. 21, From the Same," *Niles' Weekly Register* 1 No. 10 (November 10, 1836): 148; Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 8. For as long as

Davies headed West Point's math department, he retained his position on the academic board which determined whether or not a prospective cadet would be admitted to the U.S. Military Academy. By remaining at West Point until after the annual academic examinations concluded in June, 1837, Davies incidentally insured that he would be present when Don Carlos Buell's application came before the board for consideration. If this did not happen intentionally, it makes for quite an interesting historical coincidence.

¹² Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for October 19, 1848 (Frame 1266), Buell-Brien Papers; "Washington City" and "Ponton Equipage," in Romans, *Army and Navy Chronicle* 3 No. 18 (November 3, 1836): 281; *Reports on India Rubber Pontoons, and Bridges, From the United States Quartermasters and Ordnance Departments* (New York: Daniel Fanshaw, 1849), 3, 4, 15-23; "New Books and Publications," review of Brigadier General George W. Cullum, *Systems of Military Bridges* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1863) in *Scientific American* 9 No. 9 (August 29, 1863), 133, 134; Obituary of General George W. Cullum, *New York Times*, February 29, 1892; Captain Leo McGonagle, "The Demise of USMAs Engineer Detachment as Trainers of the Corps: A Result of a Victory of Athens over Sparta at the United States Military Academy," MS, n.d., Special Collections, U.S. Military Academy Library, West Point, New York (hereafter cited as the McGonagle MS), 2,3,5,6.

¹³ "Dragoon Expedition," in Romans, *Army and Navy Chronicle* 9 No. 18 (October 31, 1839): 285.

¹⁴ "Pontoon Equipage," in Romans, *Army and Navy Chronicle* 9 No. 4 (July 25, 1839): 55.

¹⁵ Engle, *Don Carlos Buell*, 9, 368n28, 371n1; *Register of All Officers and Agents, Civil, Military, and Naval, in the Service of the United States on the Thirtieth September, 1839* (Washington: A.D. Clanton & Co., 1839), 250.

¹⁶ Donad F. Carmony, *Indiana, 1816- 1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 1 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 548-551; "1836 Presidential General Election Results—Indiana," <http://www.uselections.org/RESULTS/state.php?.year=1836> (accessed September 5, 2011); George W. Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to John F. Lane, December 25, 1831, Buell-Brien Papers; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No.3 (September 1930): 207.

¹⁷ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 207, 208.

¹⁸ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 195, 196, 201. In this instance, the term *Rubicon* refers to a former dependence on *laissez-faire* business practices, which in Indiana by the mid-1830s had been abandoned in favor of aggressive government involvement in state and local economic development.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 221, 552; Rebecca A. Shepherd, *et al.*, comps. & eds., *A Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly* vol. 1, 1816-1899 (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Select Committee on

the Centennial History of the Indiana General Assembly in cooperation with the Indiana Historical Bureau, 1980), 228; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 209, 210; Mary Lane’s Diary, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frames 1223, 1224), Buell-Brien Papers.

²⁰ Mary Lane’s Diary, Entry for June 25, 1842 (Frame 1225), Buell-Brien Papers; Alexander F. Morrison, Indianapolis, to Hon. J. Tipton, January 12, 1838 in Nellie Armstrong Robinson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical bureau, 1942), 3:501.

²¹ Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 1:343; Mary Lane’s Diary, Entry for June 25, 1842 (Frame 1225), Buell-Brien Papers; Death Notice of Jane Lane Huntington, Aurora, Ind. *Dearborn County Democrat* 11 No. 56 (January 23, 1840); Obituary of Arthur St. Clair, Lawrenceburg, Ind. *Western Argus* 1 No. 17 (August 28, 1841): 3; Field notes taken by the author of “Little Jane” Lane Huntington’s and Arthur St. Clair’s headstone inscriptions, Lawrenceburg, Ind., August 2007; William Marshall, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, May 9, 1829, in Armstrong and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 2:163, 164; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, December 10, 1829, in *Ibid.*, 2: 229; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, May 28, 1830, in *Ibid.*, 2:277; Alexander F. Morrison, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, August 20, 1830, in *Ibid.*, 2: 325; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John F. Lane, November 13, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers; John F. Lane, Washington, to George P. Buell, December 14, 1833, in *Ibid.* Arthur St. Clair’s importance as an opinion leader and role model within the extended Lane family kinship network can hardly be overstated. As an early disciple of Andrew Jackson in Indiana, St. Clair, though previously overlooked by historians, was probably instrumental in convincing Amos Lane during the late 1820s to switch political allegiances away from John Quincy Adams and towards the Hero of New Orleans. This occurred in the time-frame that immediately followed St. Clair’s 1825 marriage to Amos Lane’s daughter. St. Clair’s appointment as registrar of the Indianapolis land office predated John Tipton’s 1832 election to the U.S. Senate. It was St. Clair who hosted the first organizational meeting of the pro-Jackson *Indiana Democrat* in the registrar’s office. For a time he was also part-owner of the paper. Upon Amos Lane’s election to Congress in 1833, St. Clair used his influence to bring Isaac Verplanck Van Antwerp on board as editor. At the time of his death, he was one of the new generation of leaders within Indiana’s Democratic Party.

²² Paul Wallace Gates, “Introduction,” in Armstrong and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:51.

²³ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 208, 210; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James Henry Lane*, 18, 20, 21; Carmony, *Indiana-1850*, 552; Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 1:476.

²⁴ Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 1:44; George P. Buell, Lawrenceburg, to Dear John, July 19, 1834, Buell-Brien Papers; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 648.

²⁵ Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 1:228; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 208, 210, 211-213, 214; Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for January 24, 1842 (Frame 1228), Buell-Brien Papers; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 494.

²⁶ Ibid.; Amos Lane, Representatives' Hall [Indianapolis], to Dear Sir, December 12, 1839, James H. Lane Papers, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

²⁷ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for January 16, 1842 (Frame 1226), Buell-Brien Papers; Entry for December 21, 1841 (Frames 1225, 1226), in Ibid; Engle, *Don Carlos Buell, 2, 3; History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 808; Obituary of Sallie Maria Buell, Aurora, Ind. *Dearborn County Independent* 24 No. 26 (December 24, 1891).

²⁸ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for December 21, 1841 (Frames 1225, 1227), Buell-Brien Papers; Entry for July 2, 1843 (Frame 1245), in Ibid; Mary E. Baldrige, Youngstown, PA., to J.H. Lane, August 11, 1841, James Henry Lane Papers, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence; Albert Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 19, 20. According to Castel, once Lane arrived in Kansas "he was utterly irreligious except at election time. Then, with much fanfare and a great showing of repentance, he would join the politically influential Methodist Church, only to lapse into his old ways once the votes were tallied. Reproached once too often by a Methodist preacher for backsliding, he exploded: 'The Methodist Church may go to hell!'"

²⁹ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for June 25, 1842 (Frame 1225), Buell-Brien Papers; Entry for March 6, 1842 (Frame 1230) in Ibid.

³⁰ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for September 6, 1842 (Frame 1240), Buell-Brien papers; Entry for July 4, 1843 (Frame 1246), in Ibid.; Entry for August 29, 1843 (Frame 1248), in Ibid.; Albert Welles, Comp., *History of the Buell Family in England...and in America* (New York: American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History and Heraldry, Society Library, 1881), 258.

³¹ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 290, 291, 730n7, 731.

³² Ibid., 594; O.F. Roberts, "The Lane Family," *Kansas Historical Collections* 16 (1923-1925):29, as quoted in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 14; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 177, 208, 209.

³³ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for August 29, 1843 (Frame 1248), Buell-Brien Papers; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 648; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 322, 747n146; Gates, "Introduction," in Armstrong and Riker, *The John Tipton Papers*, 1:53.

³⁴ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 594.

³⁵ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for August 29, 1843 (Frame 1248); "Question of County Division," in Archibald Shaw, Ed., *History of Dearborn County, Indiana Her People, Industries and Institutions* (Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., Inc., 1915), 133-138.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ James H. Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., to George P. Buell, December 15, 1843, as quoted in Ibid.

³⁸ Shaw, *History of Dearborn County*, 136-138.

³⁹ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for October 27, 1844 (Frame 1252), Buell-Brien papers; "Sacred to the Memory of Ann Buell," Frames 1291, 1292, in Ibid.; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 648; Field notes taken by the author from Ann Lane Buell's headstone inscription, Lawrenceburg, Ind., August 2007. Widower George Pearson Buell's loneliness did not last very long. After the turn of roughly a year, in the latter part of 1845 he married his deceased wife's widowed (and childless) sister, Mary Lane St. Clair, who raised his children as her own.

⁴⁰ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for January 24, 1838 (Frames 1223, 1224), Buell-Brien Papers; Death notice for Jane Lane Huntington, Aurora, Ind. *Dearborn County Democrat* 11 No. 6 (January 23, 1840); Obituary of Arthur St. Clair, Lawrenceburg, Ind. *Western Argus* 1 No. 17 (August 28, 1841): 3; Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 1: 343; Field notes taken by the author from Jane Lane Huntington's, "Little Jane" Lane Huntington's, Arthur St. Clair's, and Ann Lane Buell's headstone inscriptions, Lawrenceburg, Ind., August 2007.

⁴¹ Mary Lane's Diary, "Sacred to the Memory of Ann Buell," Frames 1291, 1292, Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴² Ibid.; J.F. Lane, West Point, N.Y. to Mrs. A. Buell, September 13, 1825, Buell-Brien Papers; J.F. Lane, West Point, N.Y. to Dear Sister, January 13, 1827, in Ibid; J.H. Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind. to Dear Brother, December 25, 1831, in Ibid.; Leverett Spring, "The Career of a Kansas Politician," *American Historical Review* 4 (October 1898): 88. Mary Lane's observations on her children's scholastic aptitudes, taken together with John Lane's promise to teach his younger brother the same mathematics course used at West Point, and Jim Lane's stated wish (at age seventeen) to subscribe to "one of the best Philadelphia newspapers," seem to refute comments criticizing Lane that Leverett Spring made late in the nineteenth century. They concerned a purported aversion to literature. According to Spring, Jim Lane "missed everything that books can give a man. He did not care for them—had none of the finer mental aptitudes....His education, such as it was, came from the public street and corner grocery, from the bar-rooms of the country taverns and political convention."

⁴³ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for October 27, 1844 (Frame 1252), Buell-Brien Papers; Entry for September 24, 1848 (Frames 1263, 1264), in Ibid.; "Meeting of the Four Sisters—December 1848," Frames 1312, 1313, in Ibid; Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir*, 68, 69; John Speer,

Life of General James H. Lane, 'The Liberator of Kansas' (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer Press, 1897), 10, 11. The 1844 visit from Mrs. Davies confirms that over the years branches of the Lane extended family, both east and west of the Adirondacks, maintained close ties, in spite of personal calamity and geographical separation. This intra-family connectivity still persisted at the time John Speer published his hagiography of James H. Lane late in the nineteenth century. The Mrs. Davies mentioned in Mary Lane's chronicle was, of course, the wife of Professor Charles Davies of West Point. She was the former Mary Anne Mansfield, daughter of Jared Mansfield, a lieutenant colonel of engineers, professor at the U.S. Military Academy, and former Surveyor-General of the United States. Charles Davies, after spending a year in Europe to restore his health following John Lane's death, returned to Connecticut where he taught Mathematics at Trinity College for four years. A few years before Ann Lane Buell died, he returned with his family to West Point and served in the capacity of paymaster until after the outbreak of the Mexican War.

⁴⁴ Mary Lane's Diary, Entry for November 1, 1844 (Frame 1252), Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴⁵ Entries for November 2, 1844 through November 5, 1844 (Frames 1252, 1253) in *Ibid.*; "1844 Presidential General Election Results for Ohio," <http://uselectionatlas.org> (accessed September 5, 2011).

⁴⁶ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 215; Mary Lane's Diary, Entries for November 24, 1844 (Frames 1253, 1254), and March 2, 1845 (Frame 1257), Buell-Brien Papers.

⁴⁷ Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 207, 208, 214, 215; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 28; Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paulo, Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 202, 204, 205, 207.

⁴⁸ Eyal, *The Young America Movement*, 205.

⁴⁹ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1995), 152; Elizabeth Baxter and Persis Yates Boyesen, *Historic Ogdensburg* (Ogdensburg, N.Y.: Ryan Press, Inc., 1995), 25. Preston King and James H. Lane respectively served as postmasters of Ogdensburg, N.Y. and Lawrenceburg, Ind. during Martin Van Buren's tenure as U.S. president. The outbreak of the Civil War found both of them in the U.S. Senate, where they worked closely together throughout the conflict. Both also committed suicide within a year of each other, during the administration of President Andrew Johnson.

⁵⁰ Eyal, *The Young America Movement*, ix, 2, 204.

⁵¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 28, 30n20.

⁵² Ibid.; Eyal, *The Young America Movement*, 206.

⁵³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 20, 28; Shepherd, *et al.*, *Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*, 105, 106, 228.

⁵⁴ Captain Leo McGonagle, “The Demise of the USMAs Engineer Detachment as Trainers of the Corps: A Result of the Victory of Athens over Sparta at the United States Military Academy,” n.d., unpublished MS, 2, 3, 5; George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.*, 3d Edition (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1893), 1:448; Harrison Ellery, Ed., *The Memoirs of Gen. Joseph Gardner Swift, L.L.D., U.S.A., First Graduate of the Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer U.S.A. from 1812 to 1818: to Which is Added a Genealogy of the Family of Thomas Swift of Dorchester, Mass., 1634* (Worcester, Mass.: F.S. Blanchard & Co., 1890), 122, 123, 194. Disseminating knowledge of John Lane’s invention, which occurred in the early and mid-1840s through the agency of Alexander Swift, symbolically completed a series of episodic benevolent gestures exchanged among the Swifts, Davies, and Lanes that dated to the War of 1812, when Joseph Gardner Swift nominated Charles Davies to attend West Point.

⁵⁵ Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy*, 1:448; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 23, 24; U.S. Quartermaster’s and Ordnance Departments, *Reports on India Rubber Air Pontoons and Bridges*, 3-5.

⁵⁶ Ibid. An earlier chapter explained the importance of John Lane as a role model in Jim Lane’s life. For a brief summary of how Arthur St. Clair’s affected Lane, see note 21 above.

Chapter Twelve

¹ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 19.

² Ibid.

³ “Dearborn Volunteers” in Oran Perry, Comp., *Indiana in the Mexican War* (Indianapolis: William B. Buford, 1908), 112; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana from their Earliest Settlement* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co., 1885), 202.

⁴ “Lawrenceburg Bank Aids Home Company” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 34, 35; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 19, 20.

⁵ Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 59; R.C. Buley, “Indiana in the Mexican War,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 15 No. 4 (September – December, 1919): 269, 270.

⁶ Ibid.; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 20, 21.

⁷ A. Merriam-Webster, *Webster’s American Military Biographies* (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1978), 431, 432; William D. Hoyt, Jr., “Zachary Taylor on Jackson and the Military Establishment, 1835,” *American Historical Review* 51 No. 3 (April, 1946): 480; Holton

Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor, Soldier of the Republic* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1941), 112; Willard Carl Klunder, *Lewis Cass and the Politics of Moderation* (Kent, Oh. and London, England: Kent State University Press, 1996), 70. The ill feeling between Zachary Taylor and Lewis Cass began during the latter's tenure as President Andrew Jackson's secretary of state during the Black Hawk War. An occasion arose when Cass failed to provide Taylor the backing he thought he deserved in zealously evicting prospective white settlers from lucrative mining land which the U.S. government officially recognized as territory that belonged to native peoples.

⁸ Hoyt, "Zachary Taylor on Jackson," 482; Stephenson, *Political Career of James H. Lane*, 13n11, 14, 29; "Court Of Inquiry on Lieutenant Lane," *Niles' Weekly Register* 48 No. 1228 (April 4, 1835): 80.

⁹ O.F. Roberts, "The Lane Family," *Kansas Historical Collections* 16 (1923-1925): 30; Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 1 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 137-139; Albert Welles, Comp., *History of the Buell Family in England...and in America* (New York: American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History and Heraldry, Society Library, 1881), 257, 258.

¹⁰ R.C. Buley, "Indiana in the Mexican War: The Indiana Volunteers," *Indiana Magazine of History* 15 No. 4 (September-December 1919): 269-271; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 20, 21; David Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista: The American Campaign in Northeastern Mexico, 1846-47* (Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1966), 168, 169; "Contested Election in Second Regiment," in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 54, 55; "Captain Bowles Elected Colonel of the Second," in *Ibid.*, 85; R.C. Buley, "Indiana in the Mexican War: The Buena Vista Controversy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 16 No.1 (January-March 1920): 53-55.

¹¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 21; Buley, "The Indiana Volunteers," 273, 274, 275n33.

¹² Buley, "The Indiana Volunteers," 274.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 275, 277, 278; "The Mexican War and After," in Maurice Matloff, Ed., *American Military History*, Revised Ed., (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, United States Army, 1973), 168.

¹⁴ Buley, "The Indiana Volunteers," 278-280.

¹⁵ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 21; "List of Deaths," *Indiana Sentinel*, December 22, 1846," as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 120, 121; MS, J.H. Lane, "Declarative," n.d., Dearborn County, Ind., transcript, in James H. Lane Papers, RH MS Coll 28:1, Folder 28, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, Kansas University, Lawrence. Although this typed transcription is undated, Lane apparently made his deposition sometime in the early 1850s, since it states that "for three years past his friends have been urging

him to apply” for government aid to compensate for a disability he incurred in the line of duty while in Mexico.”

¹⁶ “Letter from Third Regiment,” *Indiana Sentinel*, December 24, 1846, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 122.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ “Departure of General Scott for the Seat of War,” *New Orleans Picayune*, December 24, 1846, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 122; Matloff, *American Military History*, 170. Saltillo was situated at the only road junction along the North-South line of march to Mexico City that could reasonably accommodate wagons and artillery. It crossed the East-West road to Tampico on the Gulf coast, which the U.S. Navy captured in November. Monterrey lay between the American cantonment at Point Isabel and Saltillo. President Polk regarded the Monterrey armistice too generous to the Mexicans, and subsequently rejected it.

¹⁹ Matloff, *American Military History*, 170.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 170, 171.

²¹ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 166, 167; Matloff, *American Military History*, 170.

²² Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 168, 169; K. Jack Bauer, *The Mexican War, 1846-1848* (Lincoln, Neb. And London, England: University of Nebraska Press, 1974), 208, 209; Edward T. Dickey, Co. G, Third Indiana, “Bad Blood Between Two Good Men,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 133, 134.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 176.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 169; Bauer, *The Mexican War*, 208, 209, 227n23.

²⁷ Bryce D. Benedict, *Jayhawkers: The Civil War Brigade of James Henry Lane* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009), 5-7, 72; Richard J. Hinton, *Rebel Invasion of Missouri and Kansas and the Campaign of The Army of the Border Against General Sterling Price in October and November 1864* (Chicago: Church & Goodman, 1865; repr., Ottawa, Kans.: Kansas Heritage Press, 1994), 39, 40; Jeannie M. Whayne et al., *Arkansas: A Narrative History* (Fayetteville: University Press of Arkansas, 169-173; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 171.

²⁸ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 177, 178.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 180, 184.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 174, 178, 182.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 179; Matloff, *American Military History*, 171.

- ³² Buley, “The Buena Vista Controversy,” 46; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 55-57.
- ³³ Buley, “The Buena Vista Controversy,” 48, 54; Matloff, *American Military History*, 170.
- ³⁴ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 189.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 179, 180, 182.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 182, 188-190; K. Jack Bauer, *Zachary Taylor: Soldier, Planter, Statesman of the Old Southwest* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 201, 202; Buley, “The Buena Vista Controversy,” 54.
- ³⁷ “Contested Election in Second Regiment,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 54, 55; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 186, 187; Buley, “The Buena Vista Controversy,” 53, 54.
- ³⁸ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 187, 188.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 189-192.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*; “Extract of General Lane’s Report,” as quoted in “The Facts About Buena Vista,” *New Albany Democrat*, August 24, 1848, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 301.
- ⁴¹ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 191, 192.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 192, 193.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 199.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 167, 168; Buley, “The Buena Vista Controversy,” 60; “Class of 1828,” in *The Register of Graduates and Former Cadets of the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, 2005* (West Point, N.Y.: Association of Graduates, USMA, 2005), 552.
- ⁴⁵ James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 170-172; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 199-203.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*; K. Jack Bauer, *Zachary Taylor: Soldier, Planter, Statesman of the Old Southwest* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 201, 202.
- ⁴⁷ James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 170-172; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 202, 203. Lane inferred, in so many words, that the American formation presented an outward-facing “V.” Lavender indicates that Davis viewed it as “a broad, shallow V, the open middle facing the enemy.” Either way the Mexican attack broke against the junction of the combined regiments. Still, the direction in which the V pointed would have a bearing on which interpretation—Lane’s or Davis’—came closest to being correct. Since Lane crafted no report on the battle until some weeks later (because his brigade commander never requested one), the accuracy of the report submitted by Jefferson Davis was apparently accepted at face value by his former father-in-law, Zachary Taylor.

⁴⁸ James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 171; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 207, 208.

⁴⁹ W.H.L. Wallace as quoted in Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 208.

⁵⁰ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 209.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 211

⁵³ James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 171.

⁵⁴ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 211, 212.

⁵⁵ "Presentation of the Flags of the Second and Third Regiments," *Indiana Journal*, February 18, 1848, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 267; Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 46; Matloff, *American Military History*, 171, 174; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 210.

⁵⁶ "Presentation of the Flags of the Second and Third Regiments," 268; "A Soldier's Account of the Battle of Buena Vista," *Madison Courier*, April 10, 1847, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 150.

⁵⁷ Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 46, 50, 65; Buley, "The Indiana Volunteers," 267, 270, 271; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 203; Dickey, "Bad Blood Between Two Good Men," 133, 134; "Presentation of the Flags of the Second and Third Regiments," 267; James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 171; "The Facts About Buena Vista (A Review of the Whole Controversy)," *New Albany Democrat*, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 300, 308.

⁵⁸ W.A. Bowles, Buena Vista, Mexico, March 27, 1847, to General Wool, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 309, 310; R.C. Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 54. The unintended consequences of the battle placed Brigadier General Joseph Lane in a peculiar situation. R.C. Buley contended that before the engagement, "the relation between [General Lane and the Second Indiana] was very similar to that existing between General Taylor and [Jefferson Davis'] First Mississippi." The Second Indiana was, in other words, Jo Lane's favorite. Yet the outcome of the battle left the brigade commander little choice but to extol the "Steadfast Third" and its commander, and bring charges against Colonel Bowles of the Second Indiana, whose company he formerly much preferred to that of Jim Lane, his pre-battle nemesis.

⁵⁹ W.S. Bliss, Camp near Monterrey, March 23, 1847 to Brigadier General Wool, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 307.

- ⁶⁰ Ibid.; Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 59, 60; "Facts and Opinions of the Court of Inquiry Convened to Investigate the Conduct of Colonel W.A. Bowles," in Ibid., 309, 310.
- ⁶¹ Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 63, 66; Z. Taylor, Baton Rouge, La., March 24, 1848, to Hon. George G. Dunn, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 315.
- ⁶² W.S. Bliss, Camp near Monterrey, March 23, 1847 to Brigadier General Wool, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 307 "Facts and Opinions of the Court of Inquiry Convened to Examine Into the Conduct of General Lane," as quoted in Ibid., 308; "Facts and Opinions of the Court of Inquiry Convened to Investigate the Conduct of Colonel W.A. Bowles," as quoted in Ibid., 309-311.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Entry for April 7, 1847 (Frame 1262), Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1883-1888, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.; "A Soldier's Account of the Battle of Buena Vista," *Madison Courier*, April 10, 1847, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 150; "List of names of the killed and wounded and missing of the Army of Occupation in the Battle of Buena Vista, February 23, 1847," as quoted in Ibid., 146, 147; Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 211.
- ⁶⁶ James H. Lane, Buena Vista, Mexico, April 19, 1847 to Editor, *New Orleans Delta*, as quoted in *Madison Courier*, May 29, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 170-172.
- ⁶⁷ Lavender, *Climax at Buena Vista*, 203; Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 46; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, Mo. and London, England: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 20; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 24-26.
- ⁶⁸ Zachary Taylor as quoted in Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 46.
- ⁶⁹ Zachary Taylor as quoted in Ibid., 65.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid.; "A Soldier's Account of the Battle of Buena Vista," *Madison Courier*, April 10, 1847, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 150.
- ⁷¹ Buley, "The Buena Vista Controversy," 64.
- ⁷² "Lieut. Kingsbury Makes a Correction," *Indiana Sentinel*, August 23, 1848, as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 298, 299.
- ⁷³ "Headquarters, First Indiana Volunteers, New Orleans, June 14, 1847," as quoted in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 180, 181; "Colonel Lane Authorized to Raise Another Regiment," in Ibid., 216, 217; "Colonel Lane Presented With Cane," *Madison Courier*, October 9, 1847, as quoted in Ibid., 230.

Chapter Thirteen

¹ Richmond, Indiana *Palladium*, as quoted in Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 1 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 623, 624; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 20; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930): 214, 215.

² Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 216.

³ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 626, 627.

⁴ Richmond, Indiana *Palladium*, April 27, June 1, 1847 as quoted in *Ibid.*, 629, 859n170.

⁵ Rebecca A. Shepherd, *et al.*, comps. & eds., *A Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly* vol. 1, 1816-1899 (Indianapolis: Indianapolis Select Committee on the Centennial History of the Indiana General Assembly in cooperation with the Indiana Historical Bureau, 1980), 228; ; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana from their Earliest Settlement* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co., 1885), 202.

⁶ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 215, 216. Stephenson indicated that Lane’s intent was to secure a government contract for delivering hay to New Orleans, and also “to see that justice was done to...his [son’s] ‘Steadfast Third,’ but made no connection between his trips to Washington and Jim Lane’s efforts to raise a new regiment of veterans.

⁷ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 630.

⁸ John Y. Mason, Acting Secretary of War, August 26, 1847 to Colonel James H. Lane, as quoted in “Colonel Lane Authorized To Raise Another Regiment,” in Oran Perry, Comp., *Indiana in the Mexican War* (Indianapolis: William B. Buford, 1908), 216, 217.

⁹ *Ibid.*; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 215, 216.

¹⁰ “A Proclamation by the Governor of the State of Indiana,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 218-223; J.H. Lane, Indianapolis, August 31, 1847 to The Returned Volunteers and Citizens of Indiana, in *Ibid.*, 223.

¹¹ *Madison Courier*, August 28, 1847, as quoted in “Third Indiana Filled the Gap,” in *Ibid.*, 218.

¹² *Madison Courier*, October 2, 1847, as quoted in *Ibid.*, 228, 230.

¹³ *Greenfield Investigator*, October 11, 1847, as quoted in *Ibid.*, 230, 231.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 627.

¹⁶ Ibid., 628.

¹⁷ Ibid., 628, 631.

¹⁸ *Lecompton Union*, August 30, 1856; “The Fifth Regiment Ordered to Mexico,” *New Albany Democrat*, October 26, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 234. The Lanes’ first child, born July 17, 1844, was a girl named Mary Ellen; their first son, James Henry Lane, Junior, was born April 24, 1848, during his father’s second deployment to Mexico. All of the Lane children born prior to the family’s immigration to Kansas in 1855 are named in the *Lecompton Union* article.

¹⁹ “Departure of the Fifth Regiment,” *New Albany Democrat*, November 2, 1847, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 237; “The Fifth Regiment Arrives at Vera Cruz,” *Indiana Journal*, December 21, 1847, in Ibid., 255; “Letter from Captain McDougall,” *Indiana Sentinel*, December 25, 1847, in Ibid., 256; Ibid., 247; “Chronology: 1847,” *1841-1849: Manifest Destiny*, vol. 7 of *The Annals of America* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1968), xxxi. Captain J. McDougall commanded Company F, “The Center Guards” of Marion County, Indiana, in the regiment commanded by James H. Lane.

²⁰ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 26, 27.

²¹ James H. Lane, Encero, Mexico, June 28, 1848, to Dear Wife, James H. Lane Papers, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kans.; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 22.

²² Ibid.

²³ “Free Barbecue in Honor of the Indiana Volunteers,” *Indiana Sentinel*, October 7, 1848 and *New Albany Democrat*, October 12, 1848, in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 322; R.C. Buley, “Indiana in the Mexican War: The Buena Vista Controversy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 16 No.1 (January-March, 1920): 46; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 215, 216; Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 29; “1848 Presidential Election Results—Indiana,” *Dave Leip’s Atlas of U.S. presidential Elections*, <http://www.uselectionatlas.org> (accessed November 5, 2011); “Butler, William Orlando, (1791-1880,)” *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress, 1774-Present*, <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=B001197> (accessed November 25, 2011). Lewis Cass’ vice-presidential running-mate, William O. Butler of Kentucky, did hold the rank of major general during the Mexican War. Though recognized by Congress for gallantry at Monterey, his reputation as a war hero was eclipsed by that of the Whig presidential nominee, Zachary Taylor. Buley averred that “in 1848 the dispute [regarding Taylor and Buena Vista] was turned into campaign material and intimately concerned a doubtful state and the national election. It was in this rehashing of the whole affair that the controversy took on its most bitter aspects [in Indiana].”

²⁴ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 192; Jacob Stringfellow, “Jim Lane,” *Lippincott’s Magazine of Literature, Science, and Education* 5 (March, 1870): 266. The younger Lane apparently inherited his father’s elocutionary skills. In December 1836, a

Tennessee observer noted that Amos Lane was “the most thorough and regular-bred *tongue lasher* in Congress... while [Daniel] Webster was speaking in the Senate today... Lane kept a crowded audience in the House and its galleries!” In 1870, Stringfellow, a contemporary of James Henry Lane, recalled that “he sent a shiver down the backs of his auditors like a charge of electricity down a lightning rod, and raised the goose-flesh on their skins as though a regiment were marching over their collected graves.”

²⁵ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 25n55, 28, 29; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 215, 216.

²⁶ “Chronology: 1848,” *1841-1849: Manifest Destiny*, 7: xxxii, xxxiii; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 25n55.

²⁷ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 632; “Sketches of Prominent Men in the War,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 328.

²⁸ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 26, 29; “Sword Presentation,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 326.

²⁹ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 503; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 26, 27, 29; “Sword Presentation,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 326.

³⁰ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 152-154; Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paulo, Delhi: 2007), 207; “Chronology: 1848,” *1841-1849: Manifest Destiny*, 7: xxxii, xxxiii.

³¹ James H. Lane, Washington City, January 7, 1853, to Tammany Society, James H. Lane Papers, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kans.; Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 152. Although Lane decried the disaffections within the Democratic Party, whether in New York, Indiana, or elsewhere, his position aligned closely with the views of David Wilmot, who according to Foner complained, “It is the South, that has attempted to make this question of the extension of slavery into free territory, a party test.”

³² Eyal, *The Young America Movement*, 215; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 29, 37; Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 152; Nicole Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33; Jacob Stringfellow, “Jim Lane,” *Lippincott’s Magazine of Literature, Science and Education* 5 (March, 1870), 267. Stringfellow, a contemporary of Lane’s, was perhaps the first journalist to suggest that he possessed chameleon-like qualities. Commenting on Lane’s remarkable aptitude for adaptability, Stringfellow averred that Lane was “like that versatile Chelonian, the mud-turtle of . . . superstition, he contained within his shell the flavor of every creature dear to the palate of man—fish, flesh, or fowl.” Over time the preferred convention for describing Lane apparently evolved from chelonian to chameleon.

³³ “Indiana,” *Niles’ National Register*, September 14, 1849.

³⁴ “Indiana,” *National Era*, August 23, 1849.

³⁵ Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 177, 216; Joan D. Hedrick, Department of History, Trinity College, “Stowe’s Life and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*,” <http://utc.iath.virginia.edu> (accessed November 5, 2011); “Mr. Lane’s Sickness and Death,” Mary Foote Howse Lane Diary, 1829-1852, Frames 1317, 1318, Folder 1, Box 28 (Diaries, Non-military), The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1883-1888, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., cited hereafter as Mary Lane’s Diary; “U.S. Federal Census Mortality Schedules Index Record about Hon. Amos Lane,” *Ancestry.com-U.S. Federal Census Mortality Schedules Index*, ID# MRT197_186628, <http://search.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/sse.dll?> (Accessed November 12, 2005). In the back of her diary Mary Lane left an affectionate and detailed account of her husband’s final illness and death. When the end came, she and the couple’s surviving children were present at his bedside.

³⁶ Mary Lane’s Diary, entries for September 24, 1848 thru April 8, 1849 (Frames 1264-1270), Buell-Brien Papers.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ “Chronology: 1848,” *1841-1849: Manifest Destiny*, 7: xxxiii.

³⁹ Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 403; “Democratic Platform of January 8, 1849,” in Charles Kettleborough, *Constitution Making in Indiana: A Source Book of Constitutional Documents with Historical Introduction and Critical Notes* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1916), 194; “Sword Presentation,” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 326; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 31.

⁴⁰ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 30n22, 31n24; *Niles’ National Register*, September 14, 1849, 76 No. 11, 10; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 406, 407, 423; Arthur St. Clair, Indianapolis, to John Tipton, May 18, 1830, in Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, Eds., *The John Tipton Papers, Volume 2, 1828-1833*, vol. 24 of *Indiana Historical Collections* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 277-278; Alexander F. Morrison, Greenfield, Ind., to John Tipton, December 12, 1832, in *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Thomas James De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 23 No. 2 (June, 1927): 117n7, 120, 121; “Colonel James P. Drake” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 331, 332.

⁴² “Colonel James P. Drake” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 331. The family’s first contact with Owen’s New Harmony communities may have occurred as early as the 1820s, when Drake served as clerk and auditor of Posey County, Indiana while concurrently holding a brigadier general’s commission in the state militia. It was then, according to Oran Perry, that Drake got his opportunity to observe “these communities...each striving in its different way to benefit humanity, [which] undoubtedly had much to do with broadening his views....[Drake] himself said that it was here he first got his idea of woman’s perfect equality with man.”

⁴³ “Colonel James P. Drake” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 332; De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” 121. Following Ann Lane Buell’s death in 1844, her sister, Mary Lane St. Clair, by then a widow, married Ann’s former husband, George Pearson Buell, Senior; hence Mary St. Clair Buell’s signature on an open letter extolling Robert Owen. Mary and Ann were both sisters of James H. Lane.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ “Hon. James H. Lane, United States Senator from Kansas,” in Richard J. Hinton, *Rebel Invasion of Missouri and Kansas and the Campaign of the Army of the Border Against Rebel General Sterling Price in October and November 1864* (1865; repr., Ottawa, Kans.: Kansas Heritage Press, 1994), 342; “Away From Home: The Working Girls of Lowell,” in William Bruce Wheeler and Susan D. Becker, *Discovering the American Past: A Look at the Evidence*, 4th ed. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1998), 1: 141.

⁴⁶ “Jim Lane,” in Hugh D. Fisher, *Gun and the Gospel: Early Kansas and Chaplain Fisher*, 2nd ed. (Chicago and New York: Medical Century Co., 1897), 29, 43, 44.

⁴⁷ . Mary Lane’s Diary, entries for December 21, 1841 (Frame 1225) and February 6, 1842 (Frame 1228), Buell-Brien Papers; De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” 117, 120, 121.

⁴⁸ Wheeler and Becker, “The Working Girls of Lowell,” 1:141; De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” 121; “Colonel James P. Drake” in Perry, *Indiana in the Mexican War*, 332. The appeal published in the *Cannelton Economist* began with a caveat. The ladies deprecated “the efforts of those of our sex who desire to enter the political arena, to contend with men at the ballot box, or sit in...public councils; and [demanded] only protection for the property that Providence may enable us to give our daughters, [and] protection for our sex against the improvidence or the vices of weak or bad men.”

⁴⁹ De La Hunt, “Judge Elisha Mills Huntington,” 117, 120, 121; Mary Lane’s Diary, entry for June 25, 1842 (Frame 1225); “Died,” Aurora, Indiana *Dearborn County Recorder*, January 23, 1840; “Will of Amos Lane,” May 10, 1847, *Will Record Book No.2*, Dearborn County Court House, Lawrenceburg, Indiana, 373, 374 (photocopy in possession of the author). At the time of her death in April, 1836, Jane Lane Huntington turned over the care of her newborn infant daughter, “Little Jane” Huntington, to her sister, Mary Lane St. Clair, “who loved her as her own,” until the child died in January, 1840 of scarlet fever. In November, 1841, Elisha Huntington remarried. When his “new” wife subsequently gave birth to a daughter in August, 1844, the couple named their child after Mary Lane St. Clair. This attests to the familial bond that persisted between Huntington and his former Lane in-laws in the years following the death of his first wife. With regard to the extended Lane family’s collective advocacy of the cause of women’s rights, it may be noteworthy that when Amos Lane made out his will, rather than designating either of his two sons as executors he instead appointed his daughter, Mary Lane St. Clair Buell as the sole executrix. By the time he created this document in May, 1847, she had since married George Pearson Buell, himself the widower of Mary’s other deceased sister, Ann. Thus Buell married two siblings of James Henry Lane.

⁵⁰ James C. Malin, "The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered: Origins," in *Territorial Kansas: Studies Commemorating the Centennial* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Publications, 1954), 36, 68n7. "Fearing additional charges of radicalism," explained Malin, "some members [of the Topeka constitutional convention] objected to the admission of Mrs. Chapman, but it carried by the casting vote of the president of the convention, James H. Lane."

⁵¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 42; William Elsey Connelley, *James Henry Lane: The "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas* (Topeka: Crane & Co., 1899), 46; Michael Fellman, *Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the Civil War* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 6. Fellman's observation on Missouri agriculture helps illuminate Lane's meaning: "Most...southern migrants who had slaves (a minority) settled along the Missouri River in the hemp growing areas of the west central part of the state and in the east central tobacco growing regions. Missouri was the second largest hemp producing state, next to Kentucky, and the sixth largest tobacco raiser. Both these crops were raised with back-breaking, labor-intensive work—work usually done by slaves." Connelley averred that Lane was hardly the first to use the "negro and the mule" turn of phrase. It was, said Connelley, "a favorite form of expressing assent to slavery; it has been attributed to other men, at other times and places...Lane afterwards admitted that when he came to Kansas he cared nothing about the great question of slavery."

⁵² Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 447; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 42; Connelley, *James Henry Lane*, 46.

⁵³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 30; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 449-451; Eugene H. Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy* (Urbana, Chicago, & London: University of Illinois Press, 1967), 55-57.

⁵⁴ "Action by the Legislature of Indiana," *The African Repository* 26 No. 4 (April, 1850): 112.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*; Berwanger, *Frontier Against Slavery*, 53, 56; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 447-451.

⁵⁶ Carmony, , *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 447, 449.

⁵⁷ Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery*, 98, 99, 111, 112; Bill Cecil-Fronsman, "Advocate the Freedom of the White Men As Well As That of Negroes: The Kansas Free State and Antislavery Westerners in Territorial Kansas," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 20 No. 2 (Summer, 1997): 114; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 45, 53, 58; John Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane, 'The Liberator of Kansas'* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, 1897), 42-44; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 53, 54.

⁵⁸ Cecil-Fronsman, "Advocate the Freedom of the White Men," 114; R. J. Brukinsly, Baltimore, to Lt. J.F. Lane, December 31, 1833, Correspondence, Family Letter Books, Non-military, Box 24, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1945, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., cited hereafter as Buell-Brien Papers; Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery*, 56, 57.

⁵⁹ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 238.

⁶⁰ Mary Lane's Diary, entries for September 5, 1842 (Frame 1240) and October 9, 1842 (Frame 1242), Buell-Brien Papers; Kenneth Stampf, *Indiana Politics During the Civil War* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949), 9,10.

⁶¹ John F. Kennedy, *A Nation of Immigrants* (New York: Harper & Row, [first published in 1964] 1986), 54, as quoted in Baron, "German Republicans and Radicals," 3; Carmony, , *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 278, 449; Stampf, *Indiana Politics During the Civil War*, 9.

⁶² Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 31; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 22.

⁶³ "Daniel Webster: America's Interest in Foreign Democratic Institutions," in *1850-1857: A House Dividing*, 8:113; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 36. Once the European revolutions of 1848 erupted, the American dialogue with the Austrians was ongoing. Upon President Franklin Pierce's election, he appointed William L. Marcy as Secretary of State in March 1853, during the same time-frame that coincided with Jim Lane's watch as the lieutenant governor of Indiana. On January 7, 1854, in a letter to the Tammany Society of New York, Lane mentioned a letter from Secretary Marcy to the Austrian minister, written in a vein similar to that of Daniel Webster's earlier correspondence.

⁶⁴ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 31, 32; Eyal, *The Young America Movement*, 104.

⁶⁵ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 34, 35.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 32, 33; T.W. Gibson, Petersburg, to L.F. Mosher, March 14, 1851, James H. Lane papers (MS Collection No. 28, Folder 4), Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence; "1852 General Election, Democratic Party Ticket," *Electoral College Information*, Online Services, Indiana Election Division, <http://www.in.gov/sos/elections/2927.htm> (Accessed August 6, 2011).

⁶⁷ James C. Malin, *John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six* (Philadelphia: Lancaster Press, 1942), 371; Benjamin Romans, Ed., "Lieut. Lane's Case (Concluded)," *Army and Navy Chronicle* 1 No. 17 (April 23, 1835): 129, 130; Nicole Etcheson, "James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical," in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 187; Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery*, 52. In the mid-1820s when Jim Lane was still a pre-teen, his father called Isaac Blackford "a 'diminutive, weeze-faced sparrow,' who preferred to lose fifty elections rather 'than call Amos Lane to the *field of honor*, in order to test his firmness or his courage.'" Over twenty years later when Jim Lane was sworn in as Lieutenant Governor, Blackford had since become a judge on the Indiana supreme court. A modern-day reader can only speculate on the thoughts that passed through Blackford's mind on this occasion.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*; Nicole Etcheson, "Manliness and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1790-1856," *Journal of the Early Republic* 15 No. 1 (Spring, 1995): 61-63.

⁶⁹ Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., November 25, 1853, to Hon. James H. Lane, James H. Lane papers, Kansas Collection (MS Collection No. 28, Folder 5), Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

⁷⁰ Ibid.; Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., December 4, 1853, to Hon. J.H. Lane, in Ibid.; Stringfellow, "Jim Lane," *Lippincott's Magazine of Literature, Science and Education* 5 (March, 1871): 266. It may be that Mary's sense of relief ensued from learning that her daughter-in-law would accompany Jim Lane to Washington. Her son was apparently coming to be known around the capitol as a ladies' man. Jim Lane's sister, Mrs. Mary Buell, enclosed a note with her mother's letter, which advised her brother to "be very careful of the female company you're waiting on for a member's standing depends much on these matters." Jacob Stringfellow's Gilded Age article lampooning Jim Lane alleged that "his faults were Gallic," but presented no evidence to substantiate the claim. At any rate surviving documents suggest that Jim Lane's wife and children spent the winter of 1853-1854 with him in Washington and that Mary Baldrige Lane returned with their children to Lawrenceburg the following spring. Her husband followed in August after Congress adjourned.

⁷¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 36.

⁷² Nicole Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 12-14; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 36; Stephenson, "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," 200, 201; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 32, 33.

⁷³ E.M. Huntington, Terre Haute, Ind., August 2, 1835, to Mrs. E.M. Huntington, Buell-Brien Papers; James H. Lane, Encero, Mexico, June 28, 1848, to Dear Wife, James H. Lane Papers, Kansas Collection, Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence, Kans.

Chapter Fourteen

¹ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 31, 32, 35n13; U.S. Congress, House, 2005, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., House Document No. 108-222, 146; Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 230; Carl Fremont Brand, "The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History* 18 No. 1 (March, 1922): 48, 58, 59; Donald F. Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*, vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998), 605; Kenneth M. Stampp, *Indiana Politics During the Civil War* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949), 9, 10; Kenneth M. Stamp, *America in 1857: A Nation on the Brink* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 119.

² Brand, "History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 55; Michael F. Holt, "The Politics of Impatience: The Origins of Know Nothingism," *Journal of American History* 6 No. 2 (September, 1973): 323.

³ Brand, "History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 56.

⁴ . Ibid. 53; David J. Endres, "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio: Reassessing the Visit of Archbishop Bedini," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 21 No.4 (Fall, 2003), 6; James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1988), 133.

⁵ Endres, "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio," 6; Brand, "History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana, 53; ; Joseph A. Laker, "The Anti-Bedini Demonstration: Nativism at Work in Wheeling in 1854," *Cardinal Perspectives*, Wheeling Jesuit University, 2004, <http://www.wju> (Accessed December 7, 2011).

⁶ Rev. James F. Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America (June 1853-February 1854)* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Dell' Universita Gregoriana, 1960), 97; Endres, "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio," 3, 4; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 133; Steven Beller, *Francis Joseph* (London and New York: Longman, 1996), 33, 34, 45-49.

⁷ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 133; Endres, "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio," 6-8; Bryan Le Beau, "Saving the West from the Pope: Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Settlement of the Mississippi," *Mid America American Studies Association*, 1990 Presidential Address, 112; Joseph A. Laker, "The Anti-Bedini Demonstration: Nativism at Work in Wheeling in 1854," *Cardinal Perspectives*, Wheeling Jesuit University, 2004, <http://www.wju> (Accessed December 7, 2011).

⁸ "The Bedini Riots" in *History of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio; Their Past and Present, Including Early Settlement and Development; Antiquarian Researches; Their Aboriginal History; Pioneer History; Political Organization; Agricultural, Mining and Manufacturing Interests; A History of the City, Villages and Townships; Religious, Educational, Social, Military and Political History; Statistics; Biographies and Portraits of Pioneers and Representative Citizens, Etc.* (Cincinnati: S.B. Nelson & Co., 1894), 366, 367.

⁹ Ibid.; "Ultimate Sacrifice: Cincinnati Police Officers Killed in the Line of Duty," Police Department, City of Cincinnati, <http://cincinnati-oh.gov/police> (Accessed December 7, 2011).

¹⁰ Endres, "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio," 9, 10.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.; Nicole Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 14; Brand, "History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 76.

¹³ Stephen D. Engle, *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All* (Chapel Hill, N.C. and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 6; Albert Welles, Comp., *History of the Buell Family*

in England, *From the Remotest Times Ascertainable from our Ancient Histories, and in America, from Town, Parish, Church and Family Records* (New York: American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History and Heraldry, 1881), 256-258; Mary Foote Howse Lane, "Mary Lane, 1829-1852," Folder 1, Box 28, Diaries, Non-military (Microfilm Reel No. 9), *The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883, and John S. Brien, 1805-1943*, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., Entries for December 21, 1841 (Frame 1225) and November 24, 1844 (Frame 1254), Cited hereafter as *Mary Lane's Diary*. Numbers cited refer to frame numbers on the microfilm reel. Brand, "The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 52, 60, 61, 73, 81. In 1820, Ann Lane married George Pearson Buell, Sr. of Lawrenceburg, Indiana. Following Ann's death in 1844, her widowed sister, Mary Lane St. Clair, also married Ann's former husband. In 1840, Jim Lane's brother, George, married Sallie Marie Buell, the sister of Civil War general Don Carlos Buell. Buell family religious and political affiliations were common knowledge around Lawrenceburg, since George Buell ran a local pork-packing business and also served in the Indiana State Senate.

¹⁴ Brand, "The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 60, 61.

¹⁵ Engle, *Most Promising of All*, 5, 6; Welles, *History or the Buell Family*, 256-258; *Mary Lane's Diary*, Entries for December 21, 1841 (Frame 1225) and November 24, 1844 (Frame 1254); Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 38, 39; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, Mo., and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 32, 33; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 18-21, 27.

¹⁶ U.S. Congress, *Congressional Globe*, 1854, 33rd Cong., 1st sess., "Appeal of the Independent Democrats in Congress to the People of the United States," 281, 282; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 38; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 16, 17; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 34; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 119, 120. Neither did Lane voice any objection in the spring of 1854 when President Franklin Pierce dispatched U.S. troops to help local authorities in Boston enforce the fugitive slave law enacted as part of the 1850 compromise.

¹⁷ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 29; Willard Carl Klunder, *Lewis Cass and the Politics of Moderation* (Kent, Ohio and London, England: Kent State University Press, 1996), 266; Robert R. Russel, "The Issues in the Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 1854," *Journal of Southern History* 29 No. 2 (May, 1963): 199.

¹⁸ Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 18, 19; Russel, "Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill," 208; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 34.

¹⁹ Nicole Etcheson, "The Great Principle of Self-Government: Popular Sovereignty and Bleeding Kansas," in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *Territorial Kansas Reader* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas State Historical Society and the Kansas Territorial Sesquicentennial Commission, 2005), 55; Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 156, 158; Frank Towers, "Looking Past the Lower North: Republicans, Natural Rights, and the Election of 1860" (paper presented for the Historical Society, Baltimore, MD, June 5-8, 2008), 8, 10. Tower quotes Douglas as saying that "to

proscribe a man in this country on account of his birthplace or religious faith is subversive of all our ideas and principles of civil and religious freedom. It is revolting to our sense of Justice and right.” Yet Douglas apparently saw no contradiction in believing also “that the signers of the Declaration of Independence had no reference to negroes at all when they declared all men to be created equal....They were speaking of white men....They alluded to men of European birth and European descent—to white men, and to none others.” Jim Lane, Lewis Cass, and other purveyors of popular sovereignty in the mid-1850s held a double-minded view on this subject that differed little from Douglas.

²⁰ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 34; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 28, 29; Brand, “The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana,” 61; Nicole Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33; Stamp, *Indiana Politics During the Civil War*, 9; Russel, “Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill,” 198, 208. Jim Lane was no doubt much relieved when William A. Richardson, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, introduced the final version of the Douglas bill to the House *minus* the Clayton amendment, “and,” noted Russel, “no one tried to restore it.” Thus with one stroke Richardson removed the single greatest impediment to Lane casting his vote in favor of the act.

²¹ Russel, “Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill,” 187, 205; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 28, 29; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 23, 24, 32-34; Brand, “The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana,” 58, 59, 79. It is plausible that neither James Henry Lane nor his contemporaries in the Thirty-third Congress realized in the first quarter of 1854 that even as Clayton’s nativist amendment came under their scrutiny, the Delaware Senator was fast becoming a kingpin of the national Know-Nothing movement. Brand noted that in November, 1854, less than a year after the Bedini riot, “the second national convention of the ‘Order of the Star Spangled Banner’ met in secret session in Cincinnati.” One of the attending delegates was none other than Senator John M. Clayton of Delaware. Clayton ranked with former president Millard Fillmore and other prominent Know-Nothings as a possible nominee for the nation’s highest elective office. Months earlier in February, 1854, as Congress debated Douglas’ Kansas-Nebraska bill and Senator Clayton prepared to introduce his anti-immigrant amendment, Indiana’s first Know-Nothing lodge organized in Lane’s home town of Lawrenceburg.

²² *Ibid.*;

<http://uselectionatlas.org/RESULTS/state.php?fips=24&year=1856&f=0&off=0&elect=0> (Accessed January 31, 2012). Although Lane and Sollers were publicly sparring over the provision in the U.S. Constitution that allowed three bondsmen to count as one person for purposes of slave state representation in Congress, the root cause of their difficulty related to immigrant rights. As Russel observed, “the recorded debates in Congress are about the last place one should look to try to find out what the beliefs of individuals members were” on whether slavery should be allowed in newly organized territories. It is probably also significant that Maryland congressman Augustus Sollers represented the only state in which American party candidate Millard Fillmore later carried the 1856 presidential election.

²³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 28, 29; Russel, "Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill," 209.

²⁴ Brand, "History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana," 76.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 68, 71.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 68

²⁷ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 39; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 35, 36.

²⁸ *Ibid.*; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 121, 125; Holt, "The Origins of Know Nothingism," 313.

²⁹ *Ibid.*; Leverett W. Spring, *Kansas: The Prelude to the War for the Union* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1885), 63; Leverett W. Spring, "The Career of a Kansas Politician," *American Historical Review* 4 (October, 1898): 81; Albert E. Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 1997. Originally published in 1958 by Cornell University Press as *A Frontier State at War: Kansas, 1861-1865*), 20.

³⁰ Bill Cecil-Fronsman, "Advocate the Freedom of the White Men, As Well As That of Negroes," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Southern Plains* 20 No.2 (Summer, 1997): 109, 110; R. G. Elliott, "The Grasshopper Falls Convention and the Legislature of 1857," *Kansas Historical Collections* 10 (1907-1908): 185; Eugene H. Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy* (Urbana, Chicago, and London: University of Illinois Press, 1967), 103; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 29. Berwanger averred that Lane's "wavering and irrational attitude toward the Kansas-Nebraska Act and other measures favored by the Democratic party caused him fall into disfavor." However, as Spurgeon observed, "when Douglas first proposed to repeal the Missouri Compromise, only one of ten Indiana Democratic congressmen favored the plan." Since Lane later joined the majority of his Indiana colleagues in aligning in support of the bill, it is doubtful that his measure of "disfavor" exceeded that of his fellow congressmen who originally voiced similar misgivings.

³¹ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 39; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 35. Conceding the plausibility of Stephenson's opinion, it is nonetheless true, as Ian Spurgeon points out, that the two Indiana Democratic congressmen who were reelected despite the fact that they had voted in favor of the Nebraska bill hailed from "southern districts near Lane's." This suggests that in mid-June, 1854, the election outcome in Lane's Fourth Congressional District the following October would have been anything but a foregone conclusion. Thus his "aye" vote may not have equated to political suicide.

³² Spring, *Prelude to the War for the Union*, 63; Spring, "Career of a Kansas Politician," 81.

³³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 39n34.

³⁴ “Mr. Lane’s Sickness & Death,” *Mary Lane’s Diary*, Frames 1317, 1318; “Death of Hon. Amos Lane,” Aurora, *Indiana Western Commercial*, September 8, 1849; “Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Democratic Register*, December 29, 1854; “From the Western Christian Advocate. Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855; *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana from their Earliest Settlement Containing a History of the Counties; Their Cities, Townships, Towns, Villages, Schools, and Churches; Reminiscences, Extracts, Etc.; Local Statistics; Portraits of Early Settlers and Prominent Men; Biographies; Preliminary Chapters on the History of the Northwest Territory, the State of Indiana and the Indians* (Chicago: F.E. Weakley & Co. Publishers, 1885), 150, 151; Tombstone transcriptions, Amos Lane and Mary Lane, field-notes taken by the author on August 6, 2007, Lawrenceburg, Indiana; Brand, “The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana,” 76.

³⁵ *Ibid.*; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 39; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 35, 36; “Thirty Third Congress,” in U.S. Congress, House, 2005, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., House Document No. 108-222, 146; “James H. Lane Attorney at Law,” Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Democratic Register*, February 16, 1855.

³⁶ “Thirty Third Congress,” in U.S. Congress, House, 2005, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., House Document No. 108-222, 146; “Chronology: 1854,” *1850-1857: A House Dividing*, vol. 8 of *The Annals of America* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1968), xxvii; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 498; Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, and Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 150. A true homestead bill that granted land titles in return for occupancy differed from a graduation bill in that the latter decreased the price of public lands in proportion to the length of time they had been on the market. Lane preferred homestead legislation, but would have favored a graduation act also. “Forgotten during the Civil War,” averred Yonatan Eyal, “was that only recently had [land] reform turned Republican. Its origins lay in the New Democracy, where figures such as Douglas...introduced it as a way to make good on their Democratic pedigree.”

³⁷ *Ibid.*; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 38; ; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 33; Carmony, *Indiana, 1816-1850*, 498; John D. Morton, “This Magnificent New World: Thomas Hart Benton’s Westward Vision Reconsidered,” *Missouri Historical Review* 9 (April, 1996): 301, 308; Michael Welsh, “Legislating a Homestead Bill: Thomas Hart Benton and the Second Seminole War,” *Florida Historical Quarterly* 57 No. 2 (October, 1978): 157.

³⁸ Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930):190, 192, 200, 202; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 36; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 22, 23.

³⁹ “Thirty Third Congress,” in U.S. Congress, House, 2005, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., House Document No. 108-222, 146; *Kansas Free State*, April 22, 1855, as quoted in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 41; “Death of Hon. Amos Lane,” Aurora, *Indiana Western Commercial*, September 8, 1849; “Mrs. Mary Lane,” Lawrenceburg, *Indiana Democratic Register*, December 29, 1854; Brand, “The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana,” 76; Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., December 4, 1853, to Hon. J.H. Lane, James H. Lane Papers, Kansas Collection (MS Collection No. 28, Folder 5), Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence; “Autobiography of General James H. Lane, *from the Crusader of Freedom*,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 201.

⁴² Ibid., 197, 198; Brand, “History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana,” 62, 63, 78; Holt, “Origins of Know Nothingism,” 313.

⁴³ Spring, “Career of a Kansas Politician,” 80.

⁴⁴ Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 26. The willingness of Northern Democrats in Congress to make the 36° 30’ Missouri Compromise line inoperative pleasantly surprised their pro-slavery colleagues in Missouri. To many, the expectation that Kansas territory might one day become a slave state seemed like a windfall comparable to receiving a Christmas goose. Thus for pro-slavery Missourians, anyone who agreed with their views on slavery in the territories was said to be “sound on the goose” question.

⁴⁵ Aron, *American Confluence*, 240-242; Merkel, “Political Decline of Thomas Hart Benton,” 402-405.

⁴⁶ Russel, “Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill,” 208.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 188, 189; Willard Carl Klunder, *Lewis Cass and the Politics of Moderation* (Kent, Ohio and London, England: Kent State University Press, 1996), 169; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 7, 38. For abolitionists like Robinson, the idea of popular sovereignty equated to moral temporizing because it accepted black bondage as the price to be paid to prevent sectional discord. Because Jim Lane’s background in Congress made him perhaps the most prominent purveyor of popular sovereignty in the territory, many New England settlers were wary of his entry into Kansas’ political arena.

⁴⁸ Charles Robinson, *The Kansas Conflict* (Lawrence, Kans.: Journal Publishing Co., 1898), 141-143; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 44. Robinson uses a good deal of compression here, in not mentioning when Lane’s divorce occurred. Etcheson clearly took Robinson’s meaning to be that Lane left his family behind in Indiana. In fact, they accompanied him to Kansas. It was not until

1856 that Jim and Mary Baldrige Lane actually divorced, subsequent to her return to Indiana. The couple later remarried.

⁴⁹ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; *Kansas Free State*, April 30, 1855, as quoted in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 41.

⁵⁰ “COL. James H. Lane,” in *History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana*, 806; “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; *Kansas Free State*, July 2, 1855, as indicated in Alberta Pantle, Comp., “Death Notices From Kansas Territorial Newspapers, 1854-1861,” *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 21 (Summer, 1955): 322; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 152; John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, “The Liberator of Kansas”* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 214. It is only fair to state that both Speer, and more recently Spurgeon, do mention Annie’s death, albeit in a different context; namely, Lane’s land dispute with Gaius Jenkins, which ended violently with Jenkins’ death. According to Spurgeon, “When Lane returned to Lawrence in 1857, he found that Jenkins had plowed over the grave of one of Lane’s children, near the house. The small fence that had surrounded it was gone, leaving no trace of the grave.” These had to be Annie’s remains, interred after the 1855 tragedy.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² *Lecompton Union*, August 30, 1856; “Mary E. Lane vs. James H. Lane, Complaint for Divorce No. 178,” *Order Book No. 27, Dearborn County, Indiana Circuit Court, May 1856-May 1858*, 93, 94.

⁵³ Charles Robinson, “Ad Astra Per Aspera,” *The Kansas Magazine* 3 No. 5 (May, 1873): 399.

⁵⁴ R. G. Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” *Kansas Historical Collections* 8 (1903-1904): 362, 363; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 59.

⁵⁵ Elliott, “Big Springs Convention,” 363; Leverett Spring, *Kansas: Prelude to the War for the Union* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1885), 31, 32; Charles Robinson, *The Kansas Conflict* (Lawrence, Kans.: Journal Publishing Co., 1898), 140, 141; Oswald Garrison Villard, *John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography Fifty Years After* (London, Boston, and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910), 101, 102.

⁵⁶ Robinson, *Kansas Conflict*, 123, 124; Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 365; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 38.

⁵⁷ Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 363, 365; Robinson, *Kansas Conflict*, 128; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 50.

⁵⁸ *Lecompton Union*, August 30, 1856; *Kansas Free State*, April 30, 1855, as quoted in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 41.

⁵⁹ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 32; Pantle, “Death Notices From Kansas Territorial Newspapers,” 322; *Lecompton Union*, August 30, 1856; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 43; Rita G. Napier, “The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas: Leavenworth and the Formation of the Free-State Movement,” in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *Territorial Kansas Reader* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas State Historical Society, 2005), 199, 401n9.

⁶⁰ Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 1, 65, 66; Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 365, 367.

⁶¹ Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 101, 102; Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 363-365.

⁶² Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 367.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 368, 369.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 369; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 100; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 56, 67. Elliott’s comment that Lane had just returned from the “bogus legislature” is a clear indication that Lane stayed in contact with towns in eastern Kansas. During the first week in July, 1855, the territorial legislature had met at Pawnee, on the military reservation at Fort Riley, about 120 miles east of the Kansas-Missouri border. On the sixteenth it reconvened at Shawnee Mission, on the Missouri River. Lane apparently kept himself well-informed of what was going on in both locations.

⁶⁵ Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 369, 370.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 370; Spring, “Career of a Kansas Politician,” 82, 83; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 44, 45; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 46, 47; Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane*, 37; Robinson, *Kansas Conflict*, 170; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 69, 70; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 103.

⁶⁷ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 45.

⁶⁸ Elliott, “The Big Springs Convention,” 369; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 67; Napier, “The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas,” 210.

⁶⁹ Napier, “The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas,” 199, 200, 401n9.

⁷⁰ Bill Cecil-Fronsman, “Advocate the Freedom of White Men, As Well As That of Negroes: The *Kansas Free State* and Antislavery Westerners in Territorial Kansas,” *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 20 No. 2 (Summer, 1997): 112; “Prospectus of the Kansas Territorial Register,” *Leavenworth Kansas Territorial Register*, July 21, 1855.

⁷¹ James A. McGonigle, “Right Reverend John B. Miege, S.J. First Catholic Bishop of Kansas,” *Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society* 9 (1905-1906): 155, 158; Jesse A. Hall and

Leroy T. Hand, *History of Leavenworth County, Kansas* (Topeka: Historical Publishing Co., 1921), 131, 135, 141; Kirk H. Porter, *National Party Platforms, 1840-1960* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1961), 17;

⁷² Napier, "The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas," 210.

⁷³ Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," 372.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 373; Spring, *Kansas: Prelude to the War for the Union*, 64.

⁷⁵ Spring, "Career of a Kansas Politician," 83.

⁷⁶ Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," 373.

⁷⁷ Proceedings of the Big Springs Convention as quoted in Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," 374-376; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 67.

⁷⁸ Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," 375; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 63, 67, 68, 71.

⁷⁹ Napier, "The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas," 213; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 73, 74; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 106, 107. "From the double election for delegates in October, 1855, " observed Villard, " dates that duality in the political life of the... Territory which lasted for two years thereafter... It is not only that there were henceforth two governments, but that they were supported by factions bitterly hostile even to the extent of bloodshed."

⁸⁰ Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 106-108, especially 107.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 106, 108.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 79-81; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 54-58, 81; Stephen B. Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood: A Biography of John Brown*, 2nd ed. (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), 106, 107; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 54-58; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 113-117, 123, 124; James C. Malin, *John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six*, vol. 17 of *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia: Lancaster Press, 1942), 17.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* Ian Spurgeon rightly complains of "an overemphasis on [Lane's] personality and a lack of attention to the context of his actions." His behavior before, during, and after the Wakarusa War provides a case-in-point. Jim Lane could seem like two different personalities inside the same body, depending on whether he operated in a military or a political venue. While waging

irregular war, he was a person far unlike the laid-back conservative image he sometimes projected while functioning in a peacetime political environment.

⁸⁶ Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 75, 76; . Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 110-112; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 124, 127; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 57-59; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 61, 62.

⁸⁷ Napier, "The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas," 212; Carol Dark Ayers, *Lincoln and Kansas: Partnership for Freedom* (Manhattan, Kans.: Sunflower University Press, 2001), 140, 141; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 60; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 63, 65; Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 129, 132; Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 116.

Conclusion

¹ Resolutions of the Big Springs Convention, as quoted in R. G. Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," *Kansas Historical Collections* 8 (1903-1904): 375; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, *The Political Career of General James H. Lane* (Topeka, Kans.: B.P. Walker, State Printer, 1930), 42, 43; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, "The Transitional Period in the Career of James H. Lane," *Indiana Magazine of History* 25 No. 2 (June, 1929), 81; Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 10.

² "Address of Hon. T. Dwight Thatcher" in "Proceedings of the Celebration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Admission of Kansas into the Union, Held at Topeka, January 29, 1886," *Kansas Historical Collections* 3 (1886): 437.

³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 45, 46; Stephenson, "Transitional Period in the Career of James H. Lane," 81n33.

⁴ Stephenson, "Transitional Period in the Career of James H. Lane," 81n33.

⁵ James C. Malin, "The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered: Origins," in *Territorial Kansas: Studies Commemorating the Centennial* (Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Publications, 1954), 64.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 54-56, 60, 61; Rita G. Napier, "The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas: Leavenworth and the Formation of the Free-State Movement," in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *Territorial Kansas Reader* (Topeka, Kans.: Kansas State Historical Society, 2005), 199; Elliott, "The Big Springs Convention," 367.

⁷ Malin, "The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered," 59, 60.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Napier, “The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas,” 213; Carol Dark Ayres, *Lincoln and Kansas: Partnership for Freedom* (Manhattan, Kans.: Sunflower University Press, 2001), 140-142; Ian Michael Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane* (Columbia, Mo., and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 168.

¹⁰ Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 78, 83; Thatcher, “Address of Hon. T. Dwight Thatcher,” 439; “Grow, Galusha Aron,” in U.S. Congress, House, 2005, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005*, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., House Document No. 108-222, 1163; Senator Charles Sumner to Seth Webb, Junior, March 24, 1856, Mark W. Delahay Collection, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kans. Galusha Grow, a Pennsylvania Democrat, was chairman of the House Committee on Territories during the Thirty-fourth Congress when Lane presented the Kansas Memorial.

¹¹ Thatcher, “Address of Hon. T. Dwight Thatcher,” 439; *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*, 1163.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Malin, “The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered,” 65.

¹⁴ Ayres, *Lincoln and Kansas*, 140, 141.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*; Stephen B. Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 2nd ed. (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), 113; M.W. Delahay to Genl. C. Robinson, Col. J.H. Lane & Others, February 16, 1856, Mark W. Delahay Collection, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kans.

¹⁶ William E. Connelley, Ed., *A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans* (Chicago and New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1918), 1:468-470; Ayres, *Lincoln and Kansas*, 140; Napier, “The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas,” 194; D.W. Wilder, “The Newspapers of Kansas,” in “Proceedings of the Celebration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Admission of Kansas into the Union, Held at Topeka, January 29, 1886,” *Kansas Historical Collections* 3 (1886):406.

¹⁷ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 58-60; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 61. Stephenson avers that “Lane had intended to leave Kansas for the East much earlier than he did, but was prevented by a renewal of hostilities in the territory.” By mid-December, violent outbreaks marred the short-lived peace in Leavenworth.

¹⁸ John Brown as quoted in Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 111.

¹⁹ Oswald Garrison Villard, *John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography Fifty Years After* (London, Boston, and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910), 128; Nicole Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 90; Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 60n3. At the beginning of his chapter on the Kansas Memorial, Stephenson briefly states in a footnote that “Lane had intended to leave

Kansas for the East much earlier than he did, but was prevented by a renewal of hostilities in the territory.” However, Stephenson neither elaborates nor suggests the possibility that events roiling the political atmosphere in Leavenworth and throughout the territory at large in early 1856 might have had tended to radicalize Jim Lane.

²⁰ Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 128, 129; Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 114; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 89-91.

²¹ Villard, *A Biography Fifty Years After*, 128; Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 108, 109, 114, 115.

²² Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 61; Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood*, 114, 115; Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas*, 91, 92; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 64, 65.

²³ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 58, 59, 61-66; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 72-75, 77; Wendell Holmes Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 26 No. 3 (September, 1930): 177, 178.

²⁴ Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 177.

²⁵ Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 85; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 32, 104, 112, 113; Noble L. Prentis, *Kansas Miscellanies* (Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1889), 104; Mary Lane, Lawrenceburg, Ind., November 25, 1853, to Hon. James H. Lane, James H. Lane papers, Kansas Collection (MS Collection No. 28, Folder 5), Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence; Malin, “The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered,” 46. Lane’s admirers, like his detractors, at times made him seem bigger than life. Spurgeon noted a failure of writers “to compare [Lane’s] actions to those of others in his political environment. Ironically these historians project greater power and authority onto Lane than he actually had.” Spurgeon’s observation brings to mind James Malin’s earlier comment about Jim Lane’s effect on the Big Springs Convention: “the Lane-haters magnified his role as diabolical...[while] the hero-cult...[represented him] as winning the victory for compromise almost single handed.” Malin thought both perspectives were skewed, since the platform ultimately adopted “reflected dominant western sentiment and...whatever influence Lane exerted as a western man conformed to that pattern.”

²⁶ “Autobiography of General James H. Lane,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858; *Kansas Free State*, July 2, 1855, as indicated in Alberta Pantle, Comp., “Death Notices From Kansas Territorial Newspapers, 1854-1861,” *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 21 (Summer, 1955): 322; Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 152; John Speer, *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, “The Liberator of Kansas”* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, Printer, 1897), 214.

²⁷ William E. Connelley, “Introduction,” in Stephenson, *Political Career of General James H. Lane*, 5,6.

²⁸ Ibid. Between 1836 and 1844—prior to the deaths of either of his parents—Jim Lane suffered the loss of five close family members, including three siblings, a brother-in-law, and a niece. These tragedies are covered in some detail in chapters eleven and twelve of this study.

²⁹ Morris Massey, *The People Puzzle: Understanding Yourself and Others* (Reston, Va.: Prentice Hall, 1979), ix-xi, 14, 15. Professor Massey produced a series of videotaped lectures collectively titled “What You Are Is Where You Were When.” Commonly known as “The Massey Tapes,” these lectures were grounded in Dr. Massey’s experience teaching applied social sciences at the University of Colorado. Designed to improve human interaction within organizations, the Massey Tapes gained a wide audience during the 1970s among private, civic, governmental, and military agencies, and became the basis for the published work cited in this study.

³⁰ Ibid., 18. See also note 28 above.

³¹ Ibid. Exacerbating the grief attending John Lane’s loss was the knowledge that he died by his own hand. This study has also shown that between September, 1849 and December, 1854, Jim Lane also lost both of his parents.

³² Spurgeon, *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln*, 2.

³³ Nicole Etcheson, “James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical,” in Virgil W. Dean, Ed., *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History* (Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 33.

³⁴ William Faulkner, as quoted in Scott Horton, “The Past Is Not Past. Or Is It?,” *Harper’s Magazine*, March 24, 2008, <http://www.harpers.org/archive/2008/03/hbc-90002725> (Accessed February 20, 2012); John Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane, ‘The Liberator of Kansas,’* (Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, 1897), 90.

³⁵ Diary of Mary Lane, 1829-1852, Diaries, Non-Military, Box 28, The Papers of George Pearson Buell, 1833-1883 and John S. Brien, 1805-1943, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tenn., entries for August 2, 1829 (Frame 1200), September 20, 1829 (Frame 1202), and October 27, 1844 (Frame 1252), cited hereafter as Mary Lane’s Diary, Buell-Brien Papers; “Record of Mary Lane’s Family” in Ibid., Frame 1272; Nathaniel Goodwin, *The Foote Family: or the Descendants of Nathaniel Foote, One of the First Settlers of Wethersfield, Conn., with Genealogical Notes of Pasco Foote, Who Settled in Salem, Mass., and John Foote and Others of the Name, Who Settled More Recently in New York* (Hartford, Conn.: Case, Tiffany and Co., 1849), 207; Henry Eugene Davies, *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield, Connecticut* (New York: Privately printed, 1895), 50; Stephenson, “Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy,” 177, 178; “Officers of the City of Leavenworth County, Kansas, Since Its Organization,” in Jesse A. Hall and Leroy T. Hand, *History of Leavenworth County, Kansas* (Topeka, Kans.: Historical Publishing Co., 1921), 201; Charles Robinson, “Ad Astra Per Aspera,” *Kansas Magazine* 3 No. 5 (May, 1873): 398; Albert Welles, Comp., *History of the Buell Family in England, From the*

Remotest Times Ascertainable from our Ancient Histories, and in America, From Town, Parish, Church, and Family Records (New York: American College for Genealogical Registry, Family History and Heraldry, 1881), 257; John Lane to George P. Buell, January or February 24, 1833, Buell-Brien Papers; Field notes taken by the author in Ogdensburg, New York on or about March 8, 2007, and in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, on or about August 11, 2007.

³⁶ Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane*, 313-315; H.D. Fisher, *The Gun and the Gospel: Early Kansas and Chaplain Fisher*, 2nd ed. (Chicago and New York: Medical Century Co., 1897), 42-44.

³⁷ Albert Castel, *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1997), 19, 20; Speer, *Life of General James H. Lane*, 315; Mary Lane's Diary, entry for July 14, 1831 (Frame 1214), Buell-Brien Papers; Eccles.12: 5-7. Verses 6 and 7 read, "Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the pitcher broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto the God who gave it."

³⁸ Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, and Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 200, 201.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections

- Buell, George P. and John S. Brien Papers, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville.
- Cadet Application Papers, 1805-1866. Special Collections, U.S. Military Academy Library, West Point, N.Y.
- Hannibal Day Scrapbook. Special Collections, U.S. Military Academy Library, West Point, N.Y.
- Clarke, Sydney. Collection. Carl Albert Congressional and Studies Center Congressional Archives, University of Oklahoma, Norman
- Curtis, Samuel Ryan. Papers. Iowa State Historical Department, Division of Historical Museum and Archives, Des Moines.
- Ingalls, John J. Collection. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Jesup, Thomas Sidney. Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Kansas Scrapbooks. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Lane, James H. Collection. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Lane, James H. Papers. Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Public Documents

- Annual Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy Made to Congress and the Secretary of War for the Year 1821.* West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy. Official Reprint, 1884.
- East Mississippi Foothills Land Trust. "Chunky River," *East Mississippi Foothills Land Trust*. <http://www.emflt.org/chunky.html> (accessed February 17, 2011).
- "Electoral College Information." Online Services, Indiana Election Division. <http://www.in.gov/sos/elections/2979.htm> (accessed August 13, 2011).
- "Mary E. Lane vs. James H. Lane, Complaint for Divorce No. 178." *Order Book No. 27, Dearborn County, Indiana Circuit Court*. May 1856-May 1858.
- "1836 Presidential Election Results—Indiana." <http://www.uselections.org/RESULTS/state.php?.year=1836> (accessed September 5, 2011).

- “1852 General Election, Democratic Party Ticket.” *Electoral College Information*, Online Services, Indiana Election Division. <http://www.in.gov/sos/elections/2927.htm> (accessed August 6, 2011).
- National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C. Entry 201. Letters Received by the office of the Commissary General of Subsistence from Army Officers, Disbursing Officers, Indian Agents, The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Individual Indians. 1832 Ohio Emigration. Records Group 75.
- Register of All Officers and Agents, Civil, Military, and Naval, in the Service of the United States on the Thirtieth September, 1839*. Washington, D.C.: A.D. Clanton & Co., 1839.
- Register of Graduates and Former Cadets of the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, 2005*. West Point, N.Y.: Association of Graduates, USMA, 2005.
- Register of the Officers and Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy, June 1825 and June 1826*. West Point, N.Y.: U.S. Military Academy. Official Reprint, 1884.
- “Ultimate Sacrifice: Cincinnati Police Officers Killed in the Line of Duty.” Police Department, City of Cincinnati. <http://cincinnati-oh.gov/police> (accessed December 7, 2011).
- U.S. Congress. *Congressional Debates*. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol 11.
- U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 23d Cong., 2d sess. Vol. 2.
- U.S. Congress. *Congressional Globe*. 33d Cong., 1st sess. “Appeal of the Independent Democrats in Congress to the People of the United States.”
- U.S. Congress. House. *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress 1774-2005*. 108th Cong., 2d sess., 2005. H. Doc. 108-222.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. *Resolutions of the Legislature of Ohio, Opposed to any further appropriation for the Military Academy at West Point*. 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834. S. Doc. 247.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. James B. Gardiner, Examiner, to Hon. Elijah Hayward, Commissioner of the General Land Office, August 17, 1833. Report of Examination of the United States Land Office at Indianapolis, Indiana. 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834. S. Doc. 439: 51-69.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of Indians Between the 30th November 1831, and 27th December 1833, With Abstracts of Expenditures by Disbursing Agents, in the Removal and Subsistence of Indians, Etc. Etc. Furnished in Answer to a Resolution of the Senate of the 27th December 1833 By the Commissary General of Subsistence*. 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834. S. Doc. 512. Cited as Senate Document 512.
- U.S. Congress. House. *Letter From the Secretary of War, Transmitting a Report of the Quartermaster General of the Army in relation to the Delaware Breakwater*. 23d Cong., 1st sess., 1834. H. Doc. 422.

- U.S. Congress. House. *Letter From the Secretary of War, Transmitting Information in relation to the Delaware Breakwater*. 23d Cong., 2d sess., 1835. H. Doc. 145.
- U.S. Congress. House. *Assault on Mr. Ewing*. 23d Cong., 2d sess., 1835. H. Rep. 135.
- U.S. State Department. *Register of all Officers and Agents, Civil, Military, and Naval, in The Service of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Blair and Rives, 1835-1839.
- U.S. Quarter-Master's and Ordnance Departments. *Reports on India Rubber Air Pontoons and Bridges*. New York: Daniel Fanshaw, 1849.
- U.S. War Department. *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 128 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1881-1901.
- “Will of Amos Lane.” May 10, 1847. *Will Record Book No. 2*. Dearborn County Court, Lawrenceburg, Indiana.

Newspapers

- Aurora, Indiana. *Dearborn County Democrat*
- Aurora, Indiana. *Dearborn Independent*
- Aurora, Indiana. *Western Commercial*
- Baltimore, Maryland. *Niles' Weekly Register*
- Boone County, Kentucky. *Recorder*
- Cannelton, Indiana. *Cannelton Economist*
- Indianapolis, Indiana *Democrat*
- Indianapolis, Indiana *Journal*
- Lawrence, Kansas. *Kansas Free State*
- Lawrence, Kansas. *The Journal*.
- Lawrence, Kansas. *Republican*.
- Lawrenceburg, Indiana. *Democratic Register*
- Lawrenceburg, Indiana. *Indiana Palladium*
- Lawrenceburg, Indiana. *Western Argus*

Leavenworth, Kansas. *The Leavenworth Conservative*.

Leavenworth, Kansas. *Territorial Register*

Lecompton, Kansas. *Lecompton Union*

New York, New York. *American Railroad Journal and Advocate of Internal Improvements*

New York. *The New York Times*

Richmond, Indiana. *Palladium*

Washington, D.C. *African Repository*

Washington, D.C. *Army and Navy Chronicle*

Washington, D.C. *Daily National Intelligencer*

Washington, D.C. *The Globe*

Washington, D.C. *United States' Telegraph*

Published Primary Sources

- Ballard, David E. "The First State Legislature." *Kansas Historical Collections* X (1907-1908): 232-237.
- Berneking, Carolyn, ed. "A Look at Early Lawrence: Letters From Robert Gaston Elliott." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 43 (Autumn 1977): 282-296.
- Botkin, Theodosius. "Among the Sovereign Squats." *Kansas Historical Collections* VII (1901-1902): 418-441.
- Clarke, Grace Julian. "George W. Julian's Journal." *Indiana Magazine of History* XI (December 1915): 324-37.
- Cobb, David Glenn, ed. "Letters of David R. Cobb, 1858-1864." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* XI, no. 1 (February 1942): 65-71.
- Connelley, William E., ed. "Some Ingalls Letters." *Kansas Historical Collections* XIV (1915-1918): 94-122.
- Crawford, Samuel D. *Kansas in the Sixties*. Chicago, IL: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1911.

- Cullum, George W. *Systems of Military Bridges in Use By the United States Army, Those Adopted by the Great European Powers, and Such As Are Employed in British India. With Directions for the Preservation, Destruction, and Re-Establishment of Bridges.* New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1863.
- _____. *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.* 3d ed. Vol. 1. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1891.
- “Daniel Webster: America’s Interest in Foreign Democratic Institutions.” In *1850-1857: A House Dividing*. Vol. 8 of *The Annals of America*, edited by Mortimer J. Adler, Charles Van Doren, George Ducas, Wayne Moquin, and Thomas Stouffer, 110-113. Chicago, London, Toronto, Geneva, Sydney, Tokyo, Manila: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1968.
- Davies, Henry Eugene. *Davies Memoir: A Genealogical and Biographical Monograph on the Family and Descendants of John Davies of Litchfield Connecticut.* Privately printed, 1895.
- Dickson, C.H. “The Boy’s Story: Reminiscences of 1855,” *Kansas Historical Collections* V (1896): 76-87.
- Eicher, John H. and David J. Eicher. Eds. *Civil War High Commands.* Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Ellery, Harrison. Ed. *The Memoirs of General Joseph Gardner Swift, L.L.D., U.S.A., First Graduate of the Military Academy, West Point, Chief Engineer U.S.A. From 1812 to 1818: to Which is Added a Genealogy of the Family of Thomas Swift of Dorchester. Mass., 1634.* Worcester, Mass.: F.S. Balanchard & Co., 1890.
- Elliott, R.G. “The Big Springs Convention.” *Kansas Historical Collections* 8 (1903-1904): 362-377.
- _____. “The Grasshopper Falls Convention and the Legislature of 1857.” *Kansas Historical Collections* 10 (1907-1908): 182-196.
- Fisher, Rev. H.D., D.D. *The Gun and the Gospel: Early Kansas and Chaplain Fisher.* Chicago & New York: Medical Century Co., 1897. Second Edition.
- Gardner, Mark L. Ed. *The Southwestern Journals of Zebulon Pike, 1806-1807, Stephan Harding Hart and Archer Butler Hurlbert, eds.* Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico Press, 2006.
- Gibbens, V.E., ed. “Letters on the War in Kansas in 1856.” *Kansas Historical Quarterly* X No. 4 (November 1941): 369-379.

- Gleed, Charles S. "The First Kansas Railway," *Kansas Historical Collections* VI (1897-1900): 357-359.
- Goodwin, Nathaniel. *The Foote Family: Or the Descendants of Nathaniel Foote, One of the First Settlers of Wethersfield, Conn., with Genealogical Notes of Pasco Foote, Who Settled in Salem, Mass., and John Foote And others Who Settled More Recently in New York.* Hartford, Conn.: Case, Tiffany & Co., 1849.
- Hannahs, Harrison. "General Thomas Ewing, Jr." *Kansas Historical Collections* XII (1905-1906): 276-282.
- Haskell, John G. "The Passing of Slavery in Western Missouri." *Kansas Historical Collections* VII (1901-1902): 28-39.
- Hinton, Richard J. *Rebel Invasion of Missouri and Kansas and the Campaign of the Army of the Border Against General Sterling Price in October and November 1864.* 1865. Reprint, Ottawa, Kans.: Kansas Heritage Press, 1994.
- History of Dearborn and Ohio Counties, Indiana: From Their Earliest Settlement, Containing a History of the Counties; Their Cities, Townships, Towns, Villages, Schools, and Churches . . . Biographies; Preliminary Chapters on the History of the Northwest Territory, the State of Indiana, and the Indians.* 1885. Evansville, Ind.: Whipporwill Publications Edition, 1986.
- Hopkins, James F. Ed. *Secretary of State, 1825.* Vol. 4 of *The Papers of Henry Clay.* Kent, Ohio: University Press of Kentucky, 1972.
- Hough, Franklin B. *History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties, New York, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* 1853. Reprint, Baltimore: Regional Publishing Co., 1970.
- Hoyt, William D., ed. "Zachary Taylor on Jackson and the Military Establishment, 1835," *The American Historical Review* 51 No.3. (April 1946): 480-484.
- Hull, Myra E., ed. "Letters of John and Sarah Everett, 1854-1864; Miami County Pioneers." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* VIII no.1 (February 1939): 3-34.
- "The Indian Removal Act (28 May 1830)" <http://www.humanitiesweb.org/human.php?> (accessed January 2, 22011).
- Kettleborough, Charles. *Constitution Making in Indiana: A Source Book of Constitutional Documents with Historical Introduction and Critical Notes.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1916.
- Leip, Dave. "1848 Presidential Election Results—Indiana." *Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections.* http://www.us_electionatlas.org (accessed November 5, 2011).

- Leonard, O.E. "Organization of the Republican Party." *Kansas Historical Collections* VI (1897-1900): 312-316.
- Lonn, Ella. "Ripples of the Black Hawk War in Northern Indiana." *Indiana Magazine of History* 20. (September 1924): 288-307.
- "New Books And Publications." *Scientific American*. New Series 9 no.9 (August 29, 1863): 129-144.
- "Ohio Printer Index, 1789-1850." *Morgan Library of Ohio Imprints, 1789-1850*. Ohio Digital Research Commons. <http://www.ohiolink.edu>.
- Pantle, Alberta, comp. "Death Notices From Kansas Territorial Newspapers, 1854-1861, Part One." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 21 (Summer 1955): 302-323.
- Perry, Oran. Comp. *Indiana in the Mexican War*. Indianapolis: William B. Burford, 1908.
- "1844 Presidential Election Results for Ohio." <http://uselectionatlas.org> (accessed September 5, 2011).
- Reeder, Andrew H. "Governor Reeder's Escape From Kansas." *Kansas Historical Collections* III (1886): 205-223.
- _____. "EXECUTIVE MINUTES: Minutes Recorded in the Governor's Office During the Administration of Governor Andrew H. Reeder." *Kansas Historical Collections* III (1886): 227-270.
- "Removal of Indians From Ohio: Dunihue Correspondence of 1832." *Indiana Magazine of History* 35. No. 4 (December 1939): 408-426.
- Richardson, James D. *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908*. vols. 5 & 6. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Literature & Art, 1909.
- Riker, Dorothy. Ed. *Executive Proceedings of the State of Indiana, 1816-1836*. Vol. 2 of *Indiana Historical Collections*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1947.
- Riker, Dorothy and Gayle Thornbrough. Eds. *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana, 1805-1815*. Vol. 32 of *Indiana Historical Collections*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950.
- _____. Comps. *Indiana Election Returns, 1816-1851*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1960.
- Roberts, O.F. "The Lane Family." *Kansas Historical Collections* 26 (1923-1925): 29-32.
- Robertson, Nellie A., and Dorothy Riker. Eds. *The John Tipton Papers*. 3 vols. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942.
- Robinson, Charles. *The Kansas Conflict*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1892. 463.

- _____. "Ad Astra Per Aspera." *The Kansas Magazine* 3, no. 5 (May 1873): 389-400.
- Shepherd, Rebecca A., Charles W. Calhoun, Elizabeth Shanahan-Shoemaker, and Alan F. January. Comps. and Eds. *A Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly*. Vol. 1, 1816-1899. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1980.
- Speer, John. *Life of Gen. James H. Lane, "The Liberator of Kansas" with Corroborative Incidents of Pioneer History*. Garden City, Kans.: John Speer, Printer, 1897.
- Stanton, Frederick P. "Address of Ex-Governor Frederick P. Stanton." *Kansas Historical Collections* III (1886): 338-358.
- Stern, Philip Van Doren. Ed. *The Life and Writings of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Random House, 1940. Modern Library Edition, 2000.
- Stringfellow, Jacob (Nicholas Verres Smith). "Jim Lane," *Lippincott's Magazine* V (March 1870): 266-278.
- Sunderman, James F. Ed. *Journey Into Wilderness: An Army Surgeon's Account of Life in Camp and Field during the Creek and Seminole Wars 1836-1838 By Jacob Rhett Motte*. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1953.
- Swift, Eben. *Services of Graduates of West Point in Indian Wars*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905.
- Thatcher, T. Dwight. "The Rejected Constitutions." *Kansas Historical Collections* 3 (1886): 436-448.
- "Thomas Hart Benton in Defense of Dueling." Worldwide Web. *Civil War St. Louis*. <http://www.civilwarstlouis.com/History/Benton.htm> (accessed October 19, 2009).
- "U.S. Federal Census Mortality Schedules Index Record About Hon. Amos Lane." *Ancestry.com-U.S. Federal Census Mortality Schedules Index*, ID# MRT197_186628. <http://search.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/sse.dll?> (accessed November 12, 2005).
- Van Antwerp, Ver Planck. "Reminiscences of Early Iowa." *Iowa Journal of History* 52 (1954): 343-364.
- Wilder, D.W. "The Newspapers of Kansas." *Kansas Historical Collections* 3 (1886): 404-409.
- Yale Law School. "South Carolina Ordinance of Nullification, November 24, 1832." *The Avalon Project*. <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/states/sc/ordnul.htm> (accessed December 5, 2007).

_____. "President Jackson's Proclamation Regarding Nullification, December 10, 1832." *The Avalon Project*. <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/proclamations> (accessed December 5, 2007).

Secondary Sources

Agnew, James B. *Eggnog Riot: The Christmas Mutiny at West Point*. San Rafael, Cal. and London, England: Presidio Press, 1979.

Andrews, Martin R. Ed. *History of Marietta and Washington County, Ohio and Representative Citizens*. Chicago: Biographical Publishing Co., 1902.

Ann Crooker St. Clair Chapter, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Effingham, Ill. "Ann Crooker St. Clair." <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~ildar> (accessed December 16, 2010).

Aron, Stephen. *How the West was Lost: The Transformation of Kentucky from Daniel Boone to Henry Clay*. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

_____. *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Ayres, Carol Dark. *Lincoln and Kansas: Partnership for Freedom*. Manhattan, Kans.: Sunflower University Press, 2001.

Bailes, Kendall. *Rider on the Wind: Jim Lane and Kansas*. Shawnee Mission, KS: Wagon Wheel Press, 1962.

Baron, Frank. "German Republicans and Radicals in the Struggle for a Slave-Free Kansas: Charles F. Kob and August Bondi." *Yearbook for German-American Studies* 40 (2005): 3-26.

Barry, Louise. "The Emigrant Aid Company Parties of 1854," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 12 (May 1943): 115-55.

_____. "The New England Emigrant Aid Company Parties of 1855," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 12 (August 1943): 227-68.

"The Battle of Horseshoe Bend: Collision of Cultures," *National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior*. <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/twhp/lessons/54> (accessed August 17, 2010).

"A Battle of the Seminole Wars." Dade Battlefield Historic Park, Bushnell, Florida. <http://www.exploresouthernhistory.com/dade.html> (accessed November 10, 2010).

- “The Battle of the Thames,” *Ohio History Central: An Online Encyclopedia of Ohio History*. Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio. <http://www.ohiohistorycentral.org/entry>. (accessed August 17, 2010).
- Bauer, K. Jack. *The Mexican War, 1846-1848*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.
- _____. *Zachary Taylor: Soldier, Planter, Statesman of the Old Southwest*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.
- Becker, Carl. “Everyman His Own Historian.” *American Historical Review* 37, no. 2 (January 1932): 221-236.
- Beller, Steven. *Francis Joseph*. London and New York: Longman Publishers, 1996.
- Benedict, Bryce D. *Jayhawkers: The Civil War Brigade of James Henry Lane*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.
- Berard, Augusta Blanche. *Reminiscences of West Point in the Olden Time. Derived from Various Sources and Register of Graduates of the United States Military Academy*. East Saginaw, Mich.: Evening News Printing and Binding House, 1886.
- Berwanger, Eugene H. *The Frontier Against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy*. Urbana, Chicago, and London: University of Illinois Press, 1967.
- _____. “Negrophobia in Northern Proslavery and Antislavery Thought.” *Phylon* 33, no. 3 (3rd Quarter, 1972): 266-275.
- Blackmar, Frank W. “The History of the Desert,” *Kansas Historical Collections* IX (1905-1906): 101-114.
- _____. Ed. *Kansas: A Cyclopedia of State History, Embracing Events, Institutions, Industries, Counties, Cities, Towns, Prominent Persons, Etc.* Chicago: Standard Publishing Co., 1912.
- Boone County, Kentucky Historic Preservation Review Board. “Tousey Cemetery,” *Family Cemetery Register*. April 9, 1988.
- “Boone County, Kentucky Slaves and Owners Enumerated in the 1810 U.S. Census.” <http://www.boonecounty.us/slave-schedules-1810.htm> (accessed April 22, 2010).
- Boyesen, Persis Yates and Elizabeth Baxter. *Historic Ogdensburg*. Ogdensburg, N.Y.: Ryan Press, Inc., 1995.
- Brand, Carl Fremont. “The History of the Know Nothing Party in Indiana.” *Indiana Magazine of History* 18, no.1 (March 1922): 47-81.

- Breyer, Stephen. "For Their Own Good: The Cherokees, The Supreme Court, and the Early History of American Conscience," *New Republic* 223 no.6 (August 7, 2000): 32-39.
- "A Brief History of Boone County (1847)." Boone County, Kentucky History and Genealogy website. <http://www.boonecountkyky.us/> (accessed April 14, 2010).
- Broadstone, Michael A. Ed. *History of Green County, Ohio: Its People, Industries, and Institutions*. Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., 1918.
- Buckner, Sister Mary. *History of the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth Kansas*. 1898. Reprint, Kansas City, MO: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing, 1985.
- Buley, R.C. "Indiana in the Mexican War: The Indiana Volunteers." *Indiana Magazine of History* 15, no.4 (September-December 1919): 260-292.
- _____. "Indiana in the Mexican War: The Buena Vista Controversy." *Indiana Magazine of History* 16, no.1 (January-March 1920): 46-68.
- Cady, Anne M. Photograph of Catherine Banks Hasbrouck's Headstone, Taken in 2005. <http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~stlawgen/CEMETERY/Ogdensburgh/D> (accessed April 2, 2010).
- Caldwell, Martha B. "The Stubbs." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* VI, no.2 (May 1937):124-131.
- _____. "When Horace Greeley Visited Kansas in 1859." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 9, no.2 (May, 1940): 115-140.
- Carman, Harry J. and Reinhard H. Luthin. *Lincoln and the Patronage*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Carmony, Donald F. *Indiana, 1816-1850: The Pioneer Era*. Vol. 2 of *The History of Indiana*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1998.
- Castel, Albert E. *Civil War Kansas: Reaping the Whirlwind*. Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 1997. Originally Published in 1958 by Cornell University Press As *A Frontier State at War: Kansas, 1861-1865*.
- _____. "Jim Lane of Kansas." *Civil War Times Illustrated* 12 (April 1973):22-29.
- Cecil-Fronsman, Bill. "'Advocate the Freedom of the White Men As Well As That of Negroes:' The *Kansas Free State* and Antislavery Westerners in Territorial Kansas." *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 20, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 102-115.
- "Charles Davies," <http://www.dean.usma.edu/math/people/rickey/dms/Deptheads/Davies.html> (accessed April 30, 2007).
- Cheek, H. Lee, Jr. *John C. Calhoun: Selected Writings and Speeches*. Lanham, Md.: National Book Network, 2003.

- Chrisman, Lonnie. "Individuals From Chrisman Pedigree, p. 11." Chrisman Families. <http://chrisman.org/pedigree/out11htm#RIN4001> (accessed April 3, 2010).
- Chronicles of Boone County*. "Piatt Family." Boone County, Kentucky Public Library. http://www.bcpl.org/1hg/cbc/doku.php/piatt_family (accessed April 14, 2010).
- "Chronology, 1841-1849." In *1841-1849: Manifest Destiny*. Vol. 7 of *The Annals of America*, edited by Mortimer J. Adler, Charles Van Doren, George Ducas, Wayne Moquin, and Thomas Stauffer, xxi-xxxv. Chicago, London, Toronto, Geneva, Sydney, Tokyo, Manila: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1968.
- Clugston, W.G. *Rascals in Democracy: A Case Study of Popular Government*. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1941.
- Collins, Robert. *Jim Lane: Scoundrel, Statesman, Kansan*. Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Co., 2007.
- Connelley, William Elsey. *James Henry Lane: The "Grim Chieftain" of Kansas*. Topeka: Crane & Co., 1899.
- _____, ed. *History of Kansas Newspapers: A History of the Newspapers and Magazines Published in Kansas From the Organization of Kansas Territory, 1854, to January 1, 1916*. Topeka: Kansas State Printing Plant, 1916.
- _____. *A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans*. 2 vols. Chicago & New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1918.
- _____. Introduction to *The Political Career of General James H. Lane*, by Wendell Holmes Stephenson. Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1930.
- Connelly, James F. *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America (June 1853-February 1854)*. Rome, Italy: Libreria Editrice Dell' Universita Gregoriana, 1960.
- Cornish, Dudley Taylor. "Carl Becker's Kansas: The Power of Endurance." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 1-13.
- Courtwright, Julie. "'A Goblin That Drives Her Insane': Sara Robinson and the History Wars of Kansas, 1894-1911." *Ozark Historical Review* XXX (Spring 2001): 25-43.
- Crackel, Theodore J. *West Point: A Bicentennial History*. Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Press, 2002.
- Curtis, Gates. *Our County and its People: A Memorial Record of St. Lawrence County New York*. Syracuse, N.Y.: D. Mason & Co., Publishers, 1894.
- Cyclopedia of American Biography. Being the History of the United States as Illustrated in the Lives of the Founders, Builders, and Defenders of the Republic, and of the Men and*

- Women Who Are Doing the Work and the Thought of the present Time*. New York: James T. White & Co., 1893.
- Dannenbaum, Jed. "Immigrants and Temperance: Ethnocultural Conflict in Cincinnati, 1845-1860." *Ohio History* 87 (1978): 125-139.
- Davis, William C. *Jefferson Davis: The Man and His Hour*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1991.
- Dean, Virgil W., ed. *Territorial Kansas Reader*. Topeka, KS: Kansas State Historical Society, 2005.
- _____. , ed. *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- De La Hunt, Thomas James. "Judge Elisha Mills Huntington." *Indiana Magazine of History* 23. No. 2 (June 1927): 115-129.
- DeRosier, Arthur H., Jr. *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970.
- "DeWitt Clinton." <http://www.eriecanal.org/UnionCollege/Clinton.html> (accessed September 24, 2010).
- Donald, David. *Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.
- Dunn, Jacob Piatt. Ed. *Indiana and Indianians: A History of Aboriginal and Territorial Indiana and the Century of Statehood*. Chicago and New York: American Historical Society, 1919.
- Durham Township Historical Society, Durham, Pa. "History of the Durham Boat." <http://durhamhistoricalsociety.org/history2.html> (accessed March 31, 2010).
- Edmunds, R. David. "The Prairie Potawatomi Removal of 1833," *Indiana Magazine of History* 68 no.3 (September 1972): 240-253.
- Egle, Henry William. Ed. *Notes and Queries Historical, Biographical, and Genealogical Relating Chiefly to Interior Pennsylvania*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Harrisburg publishing Co., 1898.
- Emerson, Edward C. *Our County and Its People: A Descriptive Work on Jefferson County, New York*. Boston: The Boston History Co., 1898.
- Endler, James R. *Other Leaders, Other Heroes: West Point's Legacy to America Beyond the Field of Battle*. Westport, Conn. and London: Praeger, 1998.
- Endres, David J. "Know-Nothings, Nationhood, and the Nuncio: Reassessing the Visit of Archbishop Bedini." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 21, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 1-16.

- Engle, Stephen D. *Don Carlos Buell: Most Promising of All*. Chapel Hill, N.C. and London, England: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Esarey, Logan. *A History of Indiana From Its Exploration to 1850*. Indianapolis: W.K. Stewart Co., 1915.
- Etcheson, Nicole. *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era*. Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- _____. "Manliness and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1790-1856," *Journal of the Early Republic* 15 no.1 (Spring 1995): 59-77.
- _____. "James H. Lane: Radical Conservative, Conservative Radical." In *John Brown to Bob Dole: Movers and Shakers in Kansas History*, edited by Virgil W. Dean, 33-45. Lawrence, Kans.: University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- Eyal, Yonatan. *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Fellman, Michael. *Inside War: The Guerrilla Conflict in Missouri During the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*. 1970. Reprint, Oxford, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1988.
- Foote, Abram W. *Foote Family, Comprising the Genealogy and History of Nathaniel Foote of Wethersfield, Conn. And His Descendants*. Rutland, Vt.: Marble City Press—The Tuttle Co., 1907.
- Foreman, Carolyn Thomas. "Report of Captain John Stewart on the Construction of the Road From Fort Smith to Horse Prairie on the Red River." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 5, no.3 (September 1927): 333-347.
- Frank, Thomas. *What's the Matter with Kansas?: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 2004.
- Freehling, William W. *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Friend, Llerena. *Sam Houston, the Great Designer*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1954.
- Garand, P.S. *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*. Syracuse and New York: Mason Printing Corp., 1927.
- Gates, Curtis, ed. *Our County and its People: A memorial Record of St. Lawrence County New York*. Syracuse, N.Y.: D. Mason & Co., 1894.

- Gates, Paul Wallace. "Introduction." In *The John Tipton Papers*, edited by Nellie A Robertson and Dorothy Riker, 1: 3-53. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942.
- Gilmore, Donald. *Civil War on the Missouri-Kansas Border*. Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Co., 2006.
- Goodrich, Thomas. *Bloody Dawn: The Story of the Lawrence Massacre*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1991.
- Grippaldi, Richard N. "The Politics of Appointment in the Jacksonian Army: The (Non)Transfer of Ethan Allen Hitchcock to the Regiment of Dragoons, 1833." *Army History* 70 (Winter 2009): 26-35.
- Hacker, Barton C. "Engineering a New Order: Military Institutions, Technical Education, and the Rise of the Industrial State," *Technology and Culture* 34 (1993): 1-27.
- Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.
- Hamilton, Holman. *Zachary Taylor: Soldier of the Republic*. Indianapolis & New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1941.
- _____. *Zachary Taylor: Soldier in the White House*. Indianapolis & New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1951.
- Hall, Jesse A. and Leroy T. Hand. *History of Leavenworth County, Kansas*. Topeka: Historical Publishing Co., 1921.
- Harrison, Lowell H. and James C. Clotter. *A New History of Kentucky*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1997.
- Hedrick, Joan D. Department of History, Trinity College. "Stowe's Life and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*." http://utc.iat_h.virginia.edu (accessed November 5, 2011).
- Henshaw, Leslie. "The Aaron Burr Conspiracy in the Ohio Valley." *Ohio Historical and Archeological Publications* 24 (1915): 126-129.
- History of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio; Their Past and Present, Including Early Settlement and Development; Antiquarian Researches; Aboriginal History; Pioneer History; Political Organization; Agricultural, Mining, and Manufacturing Interests; A History of the City, Villages and Townships; Religious, Educational, Social, Military and Political History; Statistics, Biographies and Portraits of Pioneers and Representative Citizens, Etc.* Cincinnati: S.B. Nelson & Co., 1894.
- Holt, Michael F. "The Politics of Impatience: The Origins of Know Nothingism." *Journal of American History* 60, no. 2 (September 1973): 309-331.
- Horseman, Reginald. "American Indian Policy and the Origins of Manifest Destiny," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 11 (1968): 128-140.

- Horton, Scott. "The Past is Not Past. Or Is It?" *Harper's Magazine*, March 24, 2008. <http://www.harpers.org/archive/2008/03/hbc-90002725> (accessed February 20, 2012).
- Hough, Franklin B. *History of St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties, New York, From the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. 1853. Reprint, Baltimore. Regional Publishing Co., 1970.
- Howe, Henry. *Historical Collections of Ohio in Two Volumes. An Encyclopedia of the State: History Both General and Local, Geography with Descriptions of its Counties, Cities, and Villages, its Agricultural, Manufacturing, Mining and Business Development, Sketches of Eminent and Interesting Characters, etc., with Notes of a Tour Over It in 1886*. 2nd ed., 1902. Cincinnati: C.J. Krehbiel & Co., 1888.
- Huggins, Benjamin Lee. "The Nationalist Moment: John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and the Mind of Republican Nationalism in the Monroe Years." Major Paper, George Mason University, 2003. [mason.gmu.edu/~bhuggins/Major Paper.pdf](http://mason.gmu.edu/~bhuggins/Major%20Paper.pdf) (accessed April 1, 2010).
- "Huntington, Elisha Mills." *Biographical Directory of Federal Judges*. Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C. http://www.fjc.gov/serv_let/nGetInfo?jid=1131 (accessed January 26, 2011).
- Hurt, R. Douglas. *The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- James, Marquis. *The Raven: A Biography of Sam Houston*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929.
- Jochims, Larry O. and Virgil W. Dean. "Pillars of Society: A Brief History of the Kansas State Historical Society," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 18, no. 3 (Autumn 1995): 142-163.
- Johnson, Walter. *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- "John Wesley: Letter to William Wilberforce." <http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/wesley/wilber.stm> (accessed March 6, 2008).
- Jordan, H. Glenn. "Choctaw Colonization in Oklahoma." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 54, no. 1 (Spring 1976): 16-33
- Joseph, Alvin M., Jr. *The Civil War in the American West*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.
- Klunder, Willard Karl. *Lewis Cass and the Politics of Moderation*. Kent, Ohio and London, England: Kent State University Press, 1996.
- Laker, Joseph A. "The Anti-Bedini Demonstration: Nativism at Work in Wheeling in 1854." *Cardinal Perspectives*. Wheeling Jesuit University, 2004. <http://www.wju> (accessed December 7, 2011).
- Lambert, Joseph I. "The Black Hawk War: A Military Analysis." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 32 (December 1939): 442-473.

- Lanham, Charles. *Biographical Annals of the Government of the United States*. Second Edition. New York: J.M. Morrison, 1887.
- Lavender, David. *Climax At Buena Vista: The American Campaigns in Northeastern Mexico, 1846-47*. Philadelphia & New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1966.
- Le Beau, Bryan L. "Saving the West from the Pope: Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Settlement of the Mississippi." *Mid America American Studies Association, Presidential Address* (1990): 101-114.
- Lefevre, Ralph. *History of new Paltz, New York and Its Old Families (from 1678 to 1820) Including the Huguenot Pioneers and Others Who Settled in New Paltz Previous to the Revolution*. Albany, N.Y.: Fort Orange Press, 1903.
- Leslie, William R. "The Constitutional Significance of Indiana's Statute of 1824 on Fugitives From Labor." *Journal of Southern History* 13, no. 3 (August 1947): 338-353.
- Little, Henry. "A History of the Black Hawk War." *Pioneer Society of Michigan* 5 (1882): 152-178.
- Lloyd, Mary Crooker. "Ann Crooker St. Clair: Her Ancestors and Descendants." *American Monthly Magazine* 27. No. 4 (October 1905): 685-696.
- Loftus, Carrie. *Indiana Militia in the Black Hawk War*. San Antonio, Tex.: Frances T. Ingmire, 1986?
- Long, E.B. with Barbara Long. *The Civil War Day By Day: An Almanac 1861-1865*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.
- Lurie, Nancy O. "In Search of Chaetar: New Findings on Black Hawk's Surrender." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 71 (1988): 163-183.
- Mahon, John K. "Two Seminole Treaties: Payne's Landing, 1832, and Ft. Gibson, 1833." *Florida Historical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (July 1962): 1-21.
- _____. *History of the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842*. Rev. ed. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida Press, 1991.
- Malin, James C. *John Brown and the Legend of Fifty-Six*. Vol. 17 of *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Lancaster Press, 1942.
- _____. "The Topeka Statehood Movement Reconsidered: Origins." In *Territorial Kansas: Studies Commemorating the Centennial*, 33-69. Lawrence, Kans.: University of Kansas Publications, 1954.
- _____. "Notes on the Writing of General Histories of Kansas: Part Five: The 'Vanity' Histories," *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 22 No. 4 (Winter 1955): 617-643.

- Martin, William T. *History of Franklin County: A Collection of Reminiscences of the Early Settlement of the County*. Columbus, Ohio: Follett, Foster & Co., 1858.
- Massey, Morris. *The People Puzzle: Understanding Yourself and Others*. Reston, Va.: Prentice Hall, 1979.
- Matloff, Maurice. Ed. *American Military History*. Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, U.S. Army, 1973.
- McGonagle, Leo. "The Demise of USMA's Engineer Detachment as Trainers of the Corps: A Result of a Victory of Athens over Sparta at the United States Military Academy. West Point." MS, Special Collections, U.S. Military Academy Library, West Point, New York. n.d.,
- McGonigle, James A. "Right Reverend John B. Meigs, S.J. First Catholic Bishop of Kansas." *Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society* 9 (1905-1906): 153-159.
- Mc Henry, Robert. Ed. *Webster's American Military Biographies*. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1978.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1988.
- _____. *Ordeal By Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1982. Second Edition, 1992.
- Merkel, Benjamin C. "The Slavery Issue and the Political Decline of Thomas Hart Benton." *Missouri Historical Review* 38, no.4 (July 1944): 388-407.
- Mildfelt, Todd. *The Secret Danites, Kansas' First Jayhawkers: The Secret Society*. Winfield, KS: Central Plains Book Manufacturing, 2003.
- Miller, L. Merrill. *Historical Discourse and Manual of the First Presbyterian Church of Ogdensburgh, N.Y.* Ogdensburgh, N.Y.: Republican and Journal Print, 1865.
- Miner, Craig. "Lane and Lincoln: A Mysterious Connection." *Kansas History* XXIV(Autumn 2000): 186-199.
- _____. "Historic Ground: The Ongoing Enterprise of Kansas Territorial History." In *Kansas Territorial Reader*, edited by Virgil W. Dean, 1-9. Topeka, Kans.: Kansas State Historical Society, 2005.
- Monaghan, Jay. *Civil War on the Western Border, 1854-1865*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1955.
- Monks, Leander J., Logan Esarey, and Ernest V. Shockley. Eds. *Courts and Lawyers of Indiana*. Indianapolis: Federal Publishing Co., Inc., 1916.
- Morrison, James L., Jr. "*The Best School in the World:*" *West Point, the Pre-Civil War Years, 1833-1836*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1986.

- Morton, John D. "This Magnificent New World: Thomas Hart Benton's Westward Vision Reconsidered." *Missouri Historical Review* 9, no. 3 (April 1996): 284-308.
- Napier, Rita. "The Hidden History of Bleeding Kansas: Leavenworth and the Formation of the Free-State Movement." In *Territorial Kansas Reader*, edited by Virgil W. Dean, 194-214. Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 2005.
- Niven, John. *Martin Van Buren: The Romantic Age of American Politics*. Oxford, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Nowland, John H.B. *Sketches of Prominent Citizens of 1876, With a Few of the Pioneers Who Have Passed Away*. Indianapolis: Tifford and Carlon Printers, 1877.
- Oates, Stephen B. *To Purge This Land With Blood: A Biography of John Brown*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- _____. *The Approaching Fury: Voices of the Storm, 1820-1861*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1997.
- Paludan, Phillip Shaw. "A People's Contest:" *The Union and Civil War, 1861-1865*. New York, Grand Rapids, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, London, Singapore, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Perry, Dan W. "Hon. Milton W. Reynolds (Kicking Bird)," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 15 no.1 (March 1935):46-62.
- Peterson, Charles J. *Military Heroes of the War of 1812: With a Narrative of the War*. 3d ed. Philadelphia: William A. Leary & Co., 1849.
- Polis, Dennis F. Ed. *History, Land ownership, and Laws Including a Survey of Maps Prior to 1840*. Vol. 2 of *Delaware Bay Report Series*. Newark, Del.: University of Delaware, 1973.
- Porter, Kirk H. *National Party Platforms, 1840-1960*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1961.
- Prentis, Noble L. *Kansas Miscellanies*. Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1899.
- Regan, Geoffry. *SNAFU: Great American Military Disasters*. New York, N.Y.: Avon Books (The Hearst Corporation), 1993.
- Remini, Robert V. *The Battle of New Orleans: Andrew Jackson and America's First Military Victory*. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc., 1999.
- Renehan, Edward J. Jr. *The Secret Six: The True Tale of the Men Who Conspired with John Brown*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1995.
- Richmond, Robert W. *Kansas: A Land of Contrasts*. 3d ed. Wheeling, IL: Forum Press, Inc., 1989.

- Rickey, V. Frederick and Amy Shell-Gellasch. "201 Years of Mathematics at West Point." In *West Point: Two Centuries and Beyond*, edited by Lance Betros, 586-612. Abilene, Tex.: McWhiney Foundation Press, 2004.
- _____. "Mathematics Education at West Point: The First Hundred Years." *Mathematics Association of America Mathematical Sciences Digital Library*. <http://mathdl.maa.org/mathDL/47/?pa=contents&sa=viewDocuments&nodeld=1796 &pf=1> (accessed June 18, 2010)..
- Roberts, Albert Hubbard. "The Dade Massacre." *Florida Historical Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (January 1927): 123-138.
- Russel, Robert R. "The Issues in the Congressional Struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 1854." *Journal of Southern History* 29, no. 2 (May 1963): 187-210.
- Sandburg, Carl. *The Prairie Years*. Vol. 1 of *Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.
- Sawyer, Alvah H. *A History of the Northern Peninsula of Michigan and Its People: Its Mining, Lumber, and Agricultural Industries*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1911.
- Scott, Joan Wallace. *Gender and the Politics of History*. Revised Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- SenGupta, Gunja. "Bleeding Kansas," *Kansas History: A Journal of the Central Plains* 24 no. 4 (Winter 2001/2002): 318-341.
- Shannon, Fred Albert. *The Organization and Administration of the Union Army, 1861-1865*. 2 vols. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1928.
- Shaw, Archibald. Ed. *History of Dearborn County, Indiana: Her People, Industries, and Institutions*. Indianapolis: B.F. Bowen & Co., Inc., 1915.
- Shell-Gellasch, Amy. Ed. *History of Undergraduate Mathematics in America, Proceedings of a Conference Held at the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, June 21-24 (2001)*. West Point, N.Y.: United States Military Academy, 2001.
- Shenk, Joshua Wolf. *Lincoln's Melancholy: How Depression Challenged a President and Fueled His Greatness*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2005.
- Shepherd, Elizabeth A., Charles W. Calhoun, Elizabeth Shanahan-Shoemaker, and Alan F. January. Eds. *A Biographical Directory of the Indiana General Assembly, Volume 1, 1816-1899*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1980.
- Smith, Ronald D. *Thomas Ewing, Jr.: Frontier Lawyer and Civil War General*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

- Snyder, Frank E. and Brian H. Guss. *The District: A History of the Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1866-1971*. Philadelphia: U.S. Army Engineer District Philadelphia, 1974.
- Spring, Leverett Wilson. *Kansas: The Prelude to the War for the Union*. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1885.
- _____. "The Career of a Kansas Politician." *American Historical Review* 4 (October 1898): 80-104.
- Spurgeon, Ian Michael. *Man of Douglas Man of Lincoln: The Political Odyssey of James Henry Lane*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2008.
- Stampf, Kenneth. *Indiana Politics During the Civil War*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949.
- _____. *America in 1857: A Nation on the Brink*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Starr, Stephen Z. *Jennison's Jayhawkers: A Civil War Cavalry Regiment and Its Commander*. Baton Rouge & London: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.
- Stephenson, Wendell Holmes. *The Political Career of General James H. Lane*. Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1930.
- _____. "The Transitional Period in the Career of General James H. Lane," *Indiana Magazine of History* 25, no. 2 (June 1929): 75-91.
- _____. "Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy," *Indiana Magazine of History* 26, no.3 (September 1930):177-217.
- Stoll, John B. *History of the Indiana Democracy, 1816-1916*. Indianapolis: Indiana Democratic Publishing Co., 1916.
- Swi-Kat-Si-Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, eds. *Reminiscences of Old Ogdensburg, 1749-1907*. New York, Boston, and Chicago: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1907.
- Taylor, Quintard. *In Search of the Racial Frontier: African Americans in the American West*. New York: Norton, 1998.
- Thurman, Melburn D. "Seminoles, Creeks, Delawares and Shawnees: Indian Auxiliaries in the Second Seminole War." *Florida Anthropologist* 30, no. 4 (December 1977): 144-165.
- Towers, Frank. "Looking Past the Lower North: Republicans, Natural Rights, and the Election of 1860." Paper presented for the Historical Society, Baltimore, Md., June 5-8, 2008.
- Van Deusen, Glyndon. *Thurlow Weed: Wizard of the Lobby*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1947.
- Villard, Oswald Garrison. *John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography Fifty Years After*. Boston & New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1910.

- Watson, Richard L., Jr. "Congressional Attitudes Toward Military Preparedness, 1829-1835." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 34, no. 4 (March 1948): 611-636.
- Welch, Murlin. *Border Warfare in Southeastern Kansas: 1856-1861*. Pleasanton, Kans.: Linn County Historical Society, 1977.
- Welcher, Frank J. *The Western Theater*. Vol. 2 of *The Union Army, 1861-1865: Organization and Operations*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Welles, Albert. Comp. *History of the Buell Family in England, From the Remotest Times Ascertained from our Ancient Histories, and in America, From Town, Parish, Church and Family Records*. New York: Society Library, 1881
- Welsh, Michael E. "Legislating a Homestead Bill: Thomas Hart Benton and the Second Seminole War." *Florida Historical Quarterly* 57, no.2 (October 1978): 157-172.
- Wayne, Jeannie M., Thomas A. Deblack, George Sabo III and Morris S. Arnold. *Arkansas: A Narrative History*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 2002.
- Wheeler, William Bruce and Susan D. Becker. *Discovering the American Past: A Look at the Evidence*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1998.
- Williams, Harry. "The Attack Upon West Point During the Civil War." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25 no. 4 (March 1939): 491-504.
- Williams, John Hoyt. *Sam Houston: A Biography of the Father of Texas*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Simon & Schuster, 1993.
- Wilson, Don. *Governor Charles Robinson of Kansas*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1975.