

THE
ALABAMA HISTORICAL
QUARTERLY



39

Vol. XXXIX

1977

No. 1, 2, 3 and 4

Published by the

ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT

OF

ARCHIVES AND HISTORY

THE ALABAMA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

39

Vol. XXXIX

1977

No. 1, 2, 3 and 4

CONTENTS

- Colonel Hilary A. Herbert's 'History of the Eighth
Alabama Volunteer Regiment, C.S.A.' edited by
Maurice S. Fortin 5

Milo B. Howard, Jr., Editor

Published by the
ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT
OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY
Montgomery, Alabama

SKINNER PRINTING COMPANY
INDUSTRIAL TERMINAL
MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

CONTRIBUTORS

MAURICE S. FORTIN of Sun City, Arizona, is currently working on a biography of H. A. Herbert.

COLONEL HILARY A. HERBERT'S
'HISTORY OF THE EIGHTH ALABAMA VOLUNTEER
REGIMENT, C. S. A.'

EDITED BY: MAURICE S. FORTIN

INTRODUCTION

"While thus we have so much cause for congratulation and pleasure; let us not and never forget the memory of the noble spirits who fell in the glorious work whose consummation we were spared to establish and commemorate."

Brigadier General William Mahone, C. S. A.

Hilary Abner Herbert, the author of the *History of the Eighth Alabama Volunteer Regiment, C. S. A.*, was the last Colonel of that Regiment. At the battle of the Wilderness he was seriously wounded, and this injury prompted his retirement. He subsequently had a distinguished public service career as Congressman from the 2nd Congressional District of Alabama from 1876 through 1892; and as Secretary of the Navy during Grover Cleveland's second administration, 1893-1897. He was the first Cabinet member from Alabama and also the first ex-Confederate appointed to a Cabinet post.

In 1903, Dr. Thomas M. Owen, Director of the Alabama Department of Archives and History, requested of Herbert the preparation of a sketch of the Eighth Alabama Infantry Regiment, to be printed by the Department along with other sketches of Alabama Civil War military groups. Herbert, while anxious to see such an history in print, was at the time very busy with his large law practice in Washington, D. C., and proceeded slowly. The result was a manuscript, completed in 1906, far longer than Dr. Owen's anticipated "sketch." What Colonel Herbert attempted to do was not to write a "sketch" but rather to write "the history of a representative unit of Lee's army," which he considered the Eighth Alabama Infantry to be, and thereby preserve the history of that gallant command. In a letter transmitting the manuscript to Dr. Owen, Herbert stated, "It is a history, necessarily, in large part, not only of the

Eighth, but also the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh and Fourteenth Alabama Regiments, all of which were brigaded together in the summer of 1862 and fought together to the close of the war."

It was then the custom to publish Alabama histories preliminarily in the Montgomery Advertiser, and publication of the *History of the Eighth Alabama Volunteer Regiment, C. S. A.* began in that paper Sunday, July 22, 1906 and continued in consecutive Sunday installments through September 16, 1906. After the publication of his "History" in the newspaper, Herbert proceeded to correct and revise, striking out portions and making additions to the manuscript. Accordingly, the manuscript and papers contain many annotations, elaborations, and inserts. There are indications that the length of the manuscript, along with certain appendices, was more than Dr. Owen's publishing budget could meet at that time. He also objected to certain contents of the manuscripts and suggested a major revision that would reduce the writings by some forty pages. The development of the manuscript is fully recorded in correspondence in the Alabama State Department of Archives and History.

Herbert's introductory to his "History" is a long essay in which he expounds his belief that the fanaticism of the northern abolitionists provoked the coming of the Civil War. Dr. Owen thought this chapter too long. He wrote Herbert, "I think you will agree that it would hardly be proper to embrace a sketch of the abolition movement with the history of the Eighth Alabama Regiment. It would not be improper to have a very brief preliminary sketch of two or three pages, but I think that a sketch of the length you propose would not be appropriate." Herbert, however, did not agree. He considered that chapter pertinent history and "not out of place in an introductory chapter, . . . inasmuch as my conclusion of the whole matter is that the abolition crusade was the direct cause of the antagonism between the two sections which resulted eventually in secession and war." On another occasion he again resisted any change in his manuscript and explained the relevance of his introductory chapter by writing: "For one, I am unwilling that my descendants shall misunderstand the motives and purposes underlying secession and the civil war." To him this

chapter was but a realistic examination of the facts. Herbert later expanded this chapter into a book, "The Abolition Crusade and Its Consequences," which was published in 1912. Both Herbert's 'Introductory' chapter to this history of his Regiment, and his book are notable contributions to the historiography of the abolitionist movement in our nation's history.

Herbert's well written and very readable "History," which he hoped "would be attractive not only to Alabamians but students of the war everywhere," offers new insights to the conflict. His generally excellent and truthful observations, which are well substantiated by other sources, are marred in his recollections of the early days of the Maryland campaign around Crampton's Gap and Pleasant Valley, just prior to the Union surrender of Harper's Ferry, (Chapter VIII). He credits "Stonewall" Jackson with capturing Loudoun Heights, whereas it was Brigadier General John G. Walker's forces who captured these heights, Jackson being involved at the time with the capture of Bolivar Heights.

Herbert states that his regiment passed into Pleasant Valley through Crampton's Gap after a march from Hagerstown. It is more likely that the regiment's march began south of Frederick and proceeded south-southwest to and through the Gap. It is also unfortunate that Herbert failed to elaborate upon and specifically reconstruct the Eighth Alabama's activities in Pleasant Valley. All that is known is that Wilcox's Brigade, of which the Eighth Alabama formed a part, then under the command of Colonel Alfred Cumming, was ordered to the support of Brigadier Generals Howell Cobb, William Mahone, and Paul J. Semmes. The three were attempting to withstand Union Major General William Buel Franklin's effort to pass Crampton's Gap just prior to the Union surrender at Harper's Ferry.

Nevertheless, in the same chapter Herbert provides a singular contribution to the events that occurred during the battle of Sharpsburg. He gives the story of what occurred to his regiment and to other Confederate troops during the day of battle in the lower areas of the battlefield near and around Pfeiffer's (Piper's) house. The Union forces were never successful in holding this ground. His account is the only report of Confederate action that this editor found, and is, accord-

ingly, a unique assessment of the day's action in the Pfeiffer's farm area.

The chapter on the battle of Salem Church (Chapter XI) relates a view of this battle from an officer who actively commanded a regiment totally involved in the battle and who received a commendation for his leadership during this action. This account is without doubt an important addition to the history of that day's combat.

Chapter XII offers important points on the general history of the battle of Gettysburg and includes a detailed account of the Eighth Alabama and other regiments of Wilcox's Brigade. The chapter is also interesting for Herbert's obvious criticism of Confederate Major General Richard H. Anderson's leadership because of his failure to support assaults by portions of his Division when success seemed assured.

The last three chapters provide personal accounts of officers who were actively involved with their troops in the severe actions of the Petersburg campaign and the months that followed. The 'History' ends with a pitifully pathetic description of the retreat toward Appomattox C. H. during the "Last Few Days" of this brave fighting group.

Herbert's enthusiasm for his "History" is not surprising. A main purpose of his efforts in writing of his old regiment was his patriotic feeling that his old comrades should be remembered. He felt that they were motivated with "that pride which was inborn in every Confederate" and with "true courage, willingness to die for one's conviction." This feeling applied to most of the men who fought alongside him in the Army of Northern Virginia, an army he considered one of the greatest military organizations of all time, and, considering its valiant history, that is not an unreasonable assumption.

Appendices of additional material which are relevant to the story of the Eighth Alabama Infantry Regiment are provided. All names in parentheses were added by the editor. The rosters of the officers of the Eighth Alabama Infantry Regiment, and of its ten (10) companies and supernumeraries, were obtained principally from the compiled service records of

Confederate soldiers who served from the State of Alabama, which are in the National Archives, Washington, D. C. The rosters were checked against records deposited in the Military Section, Alabama Department of Archives and History, and the soldiers mentioned in Herbert's "History".

A close study of Herbert's work results in the opinion that it was written without malice and that it is an excellent addition to the general literature of the Civil War. It is hoped other readers will agree. In any event, it is the editor's contention that Herbert's "History" merited publication in book form.

The editor desires to express his gratitude to Mr. Milo Howard, Director, Alabama Department of Archives and History, for permission to use the Herbert material and to members of his staff, Mr. D. Floyd Watson and Mrs. Margie Locker, of the Military Section, for their patience and assistance in bringing to light the records, rosters and files that provided much of the material for this book.

Maurice S. Fortin

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Editor's Introduction	5
Author's Preface	12
Author's Introductory	15
I. Organization, Ideas of Discipline	37
Field Officers	40
II. Yorktown. Being Trained	44
Davies and Kautz	50
III. The Siege of Yorktown	52
IV. Battle of Williamsburg	56
V. Battle of Seven Pines	59
VI. The Seven Days Around Richmond	64
Frazier's Farm	67
VII. Second Manassas	71
VIII. The Maryland Campaign	75
Sharpsburg	77
IX. Again in Virginia	85
X. Winter Quarters at Banks' Ford	89
XI. Battle of Salem Church	96
Disposition of Troops	98
XII. The Gettysburg Campaign	112
XIII. Gettysburg to Winter Quarters, Orange C. H.	131
XIV. The Wilderness to Petersburg	138
Cold Harbor	141
XV. Petersburg — The Crater	143
The Battle of the Crater	145
The Confederate Charge	148
Charge of the Alabamians	149
Sights at the Crater	150
Suffering of the Wounded	151
Peculiarity of the Fighting	151
Captain Featherston of the Battle of the Crater	154
XVI. From August 1864 to March 1865	173
Conditions At Petersburg in Spring of 1865	178
XVII. The Last Few Days	182
Appendix	
A. Consolidated Roll of 8th Alabama Regiment	192
B. Recapitulation of Strength, Casualties, etc., of Company F	194

Appendix	Page
C. Captain Wm. B. Young's Account of Battle of the Crater	197
D. Roster of the Officers of the 8th Alabama In- fantry, C. S. A.	201
E. Roster of Company "A", 8th Alabama Infantry	204
F. Roster of Company "B", 8th Alabama Infantry	216
G. Roster of Company "C", 8th Alabama Infantry	227
H. Roster of Company "D", 8th Alabama Infantry	238
I. Roster of Company "E", 8th Alabama Infantry	249
J. Roster of Company "F", 8th Alabama Infantry	260
K. Roster of Company "G", 8th Alabama Infantry	270
L. Roster of Company "H", 8th Alabama Infantry	281
M. Roster of Company "I", 8th Alabama Infantry	294
N. Roster of Company "K", 8th Alabama Infantry	306
O. Supernumeraries, 8th Alabama Infantry	318

PREFACE

Forty years and more have passed since the gallant old 8th Alabama laid down its arms at Appomatox; and it did not even then turn over its flag to the enemy, as required by the terms of the surrender. So frenzied with grief were those gallant veterans who from Yorktown to Appomatox had never lost a flag, that they tore their shot-riddled banner into tatters, and each of them who was fortunate enough to get a piece preserved it as a memento of the many fields on which they and their comrades had carried it to victory. Singular it is that, notwithstanding the spirit of devotion thus typified, not a member of the regiment during all the years since Appomatox has undertaken the task of writing its history. Indeed, during the civil war there were very few letters written from the regiment to the press at home — not one that the writer can now lay hand upon, to help him in his task. The general historian records that the men of the 8th were fighters, but they have written little for the press — far too little.

When recently it was published that at the request of Dr. Thomas M. Owen, Director of the Department of Archives and History at Montgomery, I had undertaken this history, a letter came from Captain W(illian) L. Fagan of Company K, now living near Havana, Greene County, Ala., offering me a diary he had kept, making frequent entries in it during the whole war, even down to Appomatox, where he was present. The regiment contained no more reliable officer than gallant Captain Fagan, and I have, therefore, made much use of his memoranda. There is before me also "A Short History of the 8th Alabama Regiment," written by myself in camp near Orange C. H., Va., in the winter of 1863-4, in response to a request, or order, from Colonel (William Henry) Fowler, the Adjutant General of Governor (Thomas Hill) Watts, requiring such a report from officers at the head of several Alabama commands. From this little sketch the following is a quotation:

In the accounts of each battle I have consulted with those officers who were most cognizant of the facts, and this account has been open to the inspection of all the officers of the regiment. Their comments have been invited and I have in several instances availed

myself of their suggestions. — The writer has been obliged to mention his own name oftener than he would have desired in a writing of his own. This has been unavoidable from the nature of the report called for, and the relation the writer has sustained to the regiment.

A like apology is perhaps now again necessary, as I undertake the task assigned me, of writing more fully and attempting to give a life color to the history made by my comrades.

It is scarcely fair, however, to myself, to speak of this little work as “a task” imposed upon me and executed under orders. It has been entered upon with alacrity, and with a spirit of thankfulness that I have at least been able to devote a portion of my time to the performance of this which has now come to be a duty to my comrades, dead and living.

Most assuredly the fullness of time has come when something more ought to be written, not only of the history of the 8th Alabama, but also of Wilcox's Brigade, of which it formed a part. This has been to me painfully manifest as I have proceeded with my investigations, for I have found no extended notice anywhere, either of the Brigade, or of the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, or 14th Alabama, which composed it.

What I have found is, that at Salem Church, where on May 3, 1863, Wilcox's brigade was the chief factor in one of the most glorious victories of the war, somebody has set up a tablet stating that the battle was won by General (Jubal A.) Early, when Early had nothing to do with it, he and his command being some five miles away.

Again I have discovered that recently some of the survivors of Mahone's old brigade were making the claim that they were entitled to the chief credit of the great Confederate triumph at the Crater, July 30, 1864, and that they were for a time discussing the project of setting up a memorial-tablet to their command on the Crater proper, when the fact is that Wilcox's brigade captured the Crater proper and Mahone only captured the works to the left of it.

To say, however, that it was Wilcox's brigade that captured the Crater is not historically correct, except in this: When the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 14th Alabama first came together Wilcox was their commander. Under him they first won reputation, and therefore its soldiers generally, during the whole war, and its survivors always since Appomatox, refer to themselves as members of Wilcox's brigade; but this by no means implies any imputation on the brave generals who subsequently had charge of it. After Wilcox had been promoted away from us, Abner Perrin was our general, until he was killed at Spotsylvania, May 11, 1864; then John C. C. Sanders, till he was killed near Petersburg, June 22, 1864; and then (Brigadier General) W(illiam) H. Forney was its general until the surrender. General Sanders is entitled to the credit of having led at the Crater. All our commanders were gallant officers and were in turn idolized by the brigade, yet it is natural, however, that these old veterans should cling always to the name by which the five regiments, as an organization, were first baptized with fire and glory in the battles around Richmond in 1862.

The story of the 8th Alabama is, to a large extent, necessarily a history of the brigade of which it formed a part, and it is hoped that the survivors of the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 14th Alabama Regiments will find in these pages a contribution which will be of value to them and to the memory of their dead comrades.

With sincere regrets that other demands upon my time have prevented me from making this little work more thorough than it can pretend to be, and yet with the feeling that what is here set down has been written with an earnest desire to state facts as they were, I submit this little work to the public; and especially do I ask for these pages the kindly consideration of the noble women of our State. It was the patriotism, the enthusiasm, the devotion and self-sacrificing spirit of our women that, more than all else, nerved the hearts of the Alabama soldiers who fought under Magruder and Johnston and Lee from Yorktown to Appomatox.

Hilary A. Herbert
Last Colonel 8th Ala. Vols.
Washington, D. C., June 1906

INTRODUCTORY

The Volunteer Spirit of 1861. Causes.

The formation in the spring of 1861 of the Confederate States of America was greeted with transports of delight, and young men who were the flower of the land volunteered into its armies with an alacrity which the reader of today will fail to understand without a brief survey of pre-existing conditions. We were then exulting over the dissolution of a union that at that time unfortunately had become hateful and we hailed with great gladness the setting up of a government of our own, just as the Norwegians were last year, 1905, rejoicing over peaceful separation from Sweden, their long union with which had become irksome and intolerable. In principle the two cases are parallel. Between Sweden and Norway, two sovereign states, there was a limited union. Norway felt that Sweden, the majority nation, was claiming and exercising powers not authorized by the Act of Union. There was no one to judge between the two sovereign States, and Norway seceded. Our case was the same.

The government at Washington was a limited union, formed by sovereign States, each State surrendering for the purposes of this union certain powers specifically designated in the constitution that brought them together. The broad limitation was that all powers not granted in this constitution were specifically reserved. The seceding States in 1860-1 withdrew from the union because in their judgment the majority section was claiming and exercising, and threatening still further to exercise, rights not warranted by the constitution, the basis of a union, which had now become to them exasperating and intolerable. The two cases of secession can be differentiated only in this, that between the two sections of the American union there existed far more bitterness, and there had been far more of vituperation and personal abuse, than has ever prevailed between the people of Sweden and Norway.

The Southern people believe in the right of a State to secede peaceably from our union, just as Norway has recently done from its union with Sweden, whenever in its own judgment the State had good cause; and public opinion on the sub-

ject in the early days of the Republic is thus stated by that eminent historiographer, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge:

When the constitution was adopted by the votes of States at Philadelphia, and accepted by the votes of States in popular convention, it is safe to say there was not a man in the country, from Washington and Hamilton on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment, entered upon by the States, and from which each and every State had the right to peaceably withdraw, a right which was very likely to be exercised.

Certain it is that the union could never have been formed if it had been plainly written down in the constitution that the general government was to be the ultimate judge of its own powers.

In 1797, only eight years after the adoption of our Federal constitution, Oliver Edwards, who had been a member of the convention, and Rufus King, both then United States Senators from Massachusetts, confidentially informed "John Taylor of Caroline," that if Congress should persist in carrying out certain policies the New England States might conclude to withdraw from the union.

During the war of 1812, Congress, as a war measure, imposed an embargo on American shipping. This bore hard on the shipping interests of New England, and in 1815, delegates representing the New England States in a convention at Hartford, threatened to secede from the union. But New England did not secede. Soon after the Hartford convention peace came with Great Britain, the embargo terminated, and the trouble was at an end.

Had the New England States in 1815 put into effect their threat to secede, it is safe to say there would have been no effort to resist the movement by an armed force. Public opinion would not have sanctioned it. But during forty-five years of prosperity intervening between 1815 and 1860 there had been a wonderful growth of union sentiment in the North, which

had found in the cotton producing South the best possible market for its manufactures, its meats and its breadstuffs. Immigration, too, had greatly strengthened Union sentiments at the North. Millions of foreigners had come into that section, knowing nothing of the history of our government, or of the Constitution, its basis. All they knew was that this was a great and free country, and with them dismemberment was not debatable. There was also a continually growing patriotic pride in the rapidly increasing strength and power of the United States, now coming into the front rank of nations. But the Southern people, — how could they, in 1860, feel pride in a government which from their viewpoint no longer protected them in their rights?

The agitation of the slavery question had now completely estranged the two sections. In my effort to show how this deplorable result came about, I shall rely for my most important statements on the two most eminent Northern historians who have written of it, (William) Goodell, the Abolition Historian, "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," 1852, and (James Ford) Rhodes, "History of the United States," Boston. Goodell is the highest authority among Abolition writers. Mr. Rhodes is the greatest living American historian, though he makes no attempt to disguise the fact that he is a follower of the Republican party.

The Crusade of the "Modern Abolitionists," 1831-61.

The name "Modern Abolitionists" attaches to those who founded in the North an anti-slavery party in 1831, because they promulgated the idea, then distinctly *modern*, that the people of the whole Union were morally responsible for the sin of slavery wherever and as long as it existed in any part of the United States. Previous opinion had been that, as the constitution gave the general government no power over slavery in the States, voters in the free States ought not to trouble their consciences about the transgressions of their friends in the slave States. This new or modern idea first took shape in "The Liberator," established in Boston, Mass., January 1, 1831, by William Lloyd Garrison.

The consequences which followed the founding of this new school and which it is the purpose of this chapter to briefly

sketch, constitute one of the most remarkable episodes in the history of mankind, finding parallels only in the crusades of the middle ages for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre, and in the history of the Reformation. Yet the acknowledged founder, or to speak more accurately, organizer of "Modern Abolitionism," was not intellectually remarkable. In this regard he was distinctly inferior to Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, James Julian, and hundreds of others who accepted his tenets and became his disciples. William Lloyd Garrison was great, if great at all, only in his self sacrificing devotion to a single idea, and he attracted attention not by his ability as a writer, but by the boldness with which he denounced slavery and slaveholders. His success illustrates the fact that a wire of moderate size suffices to bring down lightning from a cloud that is surcharged with electricity.

The mighty wave of anti-slavery sentiment that sprang up in Europe in the latter part of the eighteenth century was just about in 1831 to complete its great work in the British parliament; it had also freed, or provided for the ultimate freedom of slaves in the northern States of our Union; and now the progress of manumission by State legislatures had stopped short, at least for the present, at the borders of those of our States where slaves were most numerous. Within these States the problem was being debated, but at the time men in the North, who believed slavery to be a curse, had many of them begun to doubt whether the South would ever see its way to emancipation.

Even at the time of this writing there are many broad-minded men in that section, who, while admitting that the aggressive program of the Modern Abolitionists was lawless, nevertheless make for them the plea that the Southern States would not voluntarily have manumitted their slaves, and that the crusade was a necessity if slavery was ever to be abolished. My study of history does not incline me to accept this view. My belief is that the South, if left alone, would have fallen into line with the growing sentiment of the age and long before this would have found its way to emancipation. Certain I am that if the North, while refusing to advocate or countenance slave insurrections in the South, had proposed and voted for a constitutional amendment authorizing the general government to

abolish slavery and make compensation to owners from the public purse, as Great Britain did, the South would have accepted the terms with gladness. Such a scheme, or even some modification of it showing that Northern Abolitionists were willing to accept a reasonable share of the burden of emancipation, would have been fair and equitable. But no such proposition seems to have occurred to the northern mind, and it is therefore fair to assume that if "The Liberator" had begun its crusade on that line this generation would never have heard the name of Mr. Garrison.

Speculation however as to what might have been is profitless. Let me write of these things as they were. The Crusade of the "Modern Abolitionists" was conducted on the idea, from start to finish, that the Southern slaveholder was to "pay the piper," that *the sin of slavery in the South was something the Northern people were answerable for and that therefore it was to be abolished by their efforts and yet without any compensation to the slave owners.*

Slavery had once existed everywhere in the United States, but in the Northern States there had been only a few slaves because "the soil there was not adapted to slave culture." Into the South importations had been more numerous because slavery there was profitable. Originally the importing and buying of slaves was not a question, either North or South, of morals, but of profit. But later a tide of anti-slavery sentiment swept over the world, and in 1831 the Northern States had virtually already emancipated all their slaves that had not been sold to the South. In some of these States the laws had provided that the process should be gradual. Professor Ingram says the principal operation of these latter laws was "to transfer Northern slaves to Southern markets." (History of Slavery. London, 1895, p. 184, by Professor (John Kells) Ingram)

In the Southern States, long before 1831, slavery had become the bedrock of social and economical institutions, and there it was much more difficult to get rid of the fateful institution. Nevertheless many philanthropists in the South were moving for emancipation. Popular leaders like Jefferson and Clay favored it, and if we can take the United States census (free blacks) as authority, the people of the thirteen slave States had, in

1830, freed 44,541 more slaves by individual action than had been freed in the thirteen Northern states of individual and state action combined.

In 1831 "in the slave states the opinion prevailed that slavery in the abstract was an evil." (Goodell, pp. 10-11) (Josephus N. Larned, History of Ready Reference, Vol. v. p. 3371) (Rhodes, Vol. I, p. 54)

It was an inherited evil, coming over from times when slavery was not thought to be wrong, and practically it was difficult to deal with. How were owners to be compensated for emancipation, and what was to be done with the negroes if freed? The Southern people were addressing themselves seriously to these questions, and Judge (Oliver Perry) Temple tells us, in the "Covenanter, Puritan and Cavalier," that in 1826 out of 143 emancipation societies in the United States, 103 were in the South.

"Miss Martineau, (a noted author and traveller of that day), had conversed with many people on the subject (slavery) but she met with only one person who altogether defended the situation." (Rhodes, Vol. I, p. 54)

There had, it is true, as far back as 1819 been a sectional dispute about slavery. Missouri in that year had applied for admission as a state, with a constitution authorizing slavery; objection was made and a very exciting debate followed. The Southern people, although the thoughtful among them were not then ready to make what the lawyers call "full defense" of their inherited institution, resented this interference with a matter that, as they contended, concerned the states alone. The Missouri constitution was like theirs, and by sanctioning slavery the new state would relieve the South of some of its slaves without adding to the number of this population in the United States, their importation having long ago been forbidden by statute.

No doubt the debates in Congress over Missouri were bitter, and it is certainly true that many of the speakers naturally went to great lengths in defending an institution prevailing among their constituents; but the question, which then related

only to slavery in the territories and new states, was settled by the great Compromise of 1820. This let in Missouri with slavery and provided that thereafter every state coming from north of a line drawn on the parallel 36 degrees, 30 minutes, extending to our then Western border, should be free, and that any territory applying for admission as a state south of that line might have slavery or not, as its constitution might provide. This was the settlement of the question so far as our territories were concerned. *As to the States in which slavery then existed, the underlying postulate of the agreement reached was, that they were left to deal with it for themselves.*

The Missouri Compromise was intended to take the question of slavery entirely out of national politics and to be final, and so no doubt it would have been, if anti-slavery people at the North had allowed the people of the Southern States thereafter to deal with this purely domestic institution in their own way, as the Constitution of the Union plainly provided. And the spirit of their Compromise would have extended the line of 36 degrees, 30 minutes to the Pacific ocean, when subsequently we had acquired new territory to the westward.

The great pact of 1820 had proved beneficent; it quieted agitation. Eleven years had passed, and the Southern people were now discussing in their own emancipation societies the institution with which they found themselves encumbered; and as to the thought, at that time, of the North, Daniel Webster, in his debate with (Robert Young) Hayne in 1831, expressed it this way: Whether slavery is a curable or an incurable evil "I leave it to those whose very duty it is to decide, and this I believe is, and uniformly has been, the sentiment of the North."

Who disturbed these conditions? Who violated the Missouri Compromise? If I have studied the question fairly and do not mistake the imports of the facts I am about to relate, it was the Abolition party, starting in 1831, and the northern congressmen and legislators and mobs later joining with it that were the destroyers of that compromise, as well as of the peace it had brought about.

The "Liberator" was established in Boston by Garrison January, 1831, for the purpose of convincing the northern people

that slavery "was a concern of theirs." Garrison was for "immediate emancipation," and the "American Anti-Slavery Convention," an outgrowth of the agitation headed by the Liberator, two years later in Philadelphia added the words "and unconditional," making the announcement read "immediate and unconditional emancipation." Because of this new contention — that slavery in the Southern States was a concern of the northern people, Goodell and Rhodes and all other accurate writers denominate the party now founded as the "New Abolitionists." The underlying idea of this new school was that the States where slavery still existed would not, and that therefore the general government must, abolish the institution within their limits.

There were two obstacles in the way, and two only. First, the want of power in the general government to effectuate manumission in the States. This the advocates of the new school refused to discuss. Constitutions were not to stand in their way. The second was the question of compensation to the peoples who had inherited the institution of slavery. The British parliament just about that time under similar circumstances appropriated 20,000,000 pounds (\$100,000,000) to compensate the owners of slaves manumitted in the West Indies. The answer of the American philanthropists to this was that the poor slave, and not the wicked master, was entitled to compensation.

A new party has been born. It was the offspring of a union between philanthropy and outlawry. Its platform was "immediate and unconditional emancipation" in the States and everywhere else. For the Missouri Compromise this new party substituted "*no compromise with slavery.*" Their method, as announced in "The Liberator," was to draw attention to the horrors of slavery and to "make the slaveholder himself odious."

The reflective reader will at once see that the most effective workers along these lines would be the writers and the orators who could most successfully paint slavery as the most hellish of institutions and the slaveholder as the most fiendish of human beings. In the carrying out of such a program, if the Abolition writers and speakers were only fallible mortals and speakers (and they were), there would always be temptation, increasing as passions waxed hotter, to overdraw the picture. In the out-

set Garrison said in his paper: "*On this subject I do not wish to think or speak or write with moderation.*"

The Abolition leaders were not all saints; neither on the other hand were those whom they had deliberately chosen to personally antagonize. The Southerners were hot-blooded, and if the North was to be aroused from its present complacency about slavery by torrents of denunciation launched by the new sect at the iniquities of their Southern brethren, no one could fail to see, at least in part, the indignation that would be aroused among the luckless slaveholders.

The South right along, and for a time the North, with great unanimity looked on these "New Abolition" enthusiasts as nothing better than cheap philanthropists, who proposed to take away other people's property without taxing themselves a penny; and most certainly their avowed program was absolutely without warrant in the constitution of their country. But many of them soon showed the true spirit of martyrs — a willingness to sacrifice friendships, property, and even endanger life itself, if need be. Strange indeed is fanaticism!

Amid the tranquility then prevailing, the sound of the new doctrines was like a fire bell in the stillness of the night.

The north regarded the agitators as disturbers of the peace. "Good Society," etc., "opposed the movement" — (Rhodes). "The vast powers wielded by clerical bodies, missionary boards, conventions, and managers and committees of benevolent societies" were wielded "to cripple and crush abolitionists, who would persist in agitating the slave question." (Goodell, p. 436).

Meetings of Abolitionists were frequently broken up, their printing presses destroyed, and now and then their speakers were subjected to violence. But this was not the way, if indeed there was any way, to put down the new cult. The crusaders cried out persecution and thus gained recruits. They multiplied and became more extreme. A new tenet was "No wicked enactment can be morally binding." The reply to the arguments of the preachers that the Bible sanctioned slavery was a demand for "an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God."