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Chapter I

The Ante-Bellum Background, 1820-1860

In laying the foundation for an intensive study of Missouri politics during the Civil War, it will be necessary to consider the background of the period. Therefore, the geographic location of the state, its economic resources, the racial composition of its people, and their political history will be discussed.

The Geographic Situation

A study of the map shows that Missouri, as a slave state, was peculiarly located, both in respect to the other slave states and to the free states. She has well been described as a peninsula of slavery extending out into a sea of freedom. In fact, her only points of contact with her sister slave states were the Arkansas border on the south and a very small part of Tennessee and Kentucky in the extreme south east. Access to these neighbors was limited by the Ozark mountains in the case of the former and the Mississippi river in the case of the latter. The isolation of this part of the state was further increased by the fact that the principal interior river, the Missouri, lies entirely in the northern half of the state and extends northwestward to the Iowa line. Furthermore, the Ozark highland and the Mississippi flood plain below St. Louis made most of the southern half of the state undesirable for early settlement.

The Economic Resources

The census of 1860 gave the economic resources of Missouri as follows: agriculture, including farm land, $304,866,018;
personal property, $260,376,921; manufacturing, $41,781,650; railroads, $42,500,000. The principal manufactured articles, which were derived, in the main, directly from raw agricultural products, were: flour meal, $9,484,544; lumber, $3,236,962; sugar, $1,800,000; tobacco, $1,652,709; soap and candles, $1,650,560; provisions, (pork, sausage, beef) $1,823,914; liquor, $1,810,350; machinery, $1,563,152; cordage, $1,232,840. Of the total amount of manufactured goods St. Louis county, which included the City of St. Louis, produced $27,610,070 worth and Howard county, the next in rank, $1,005,087. The total amount of the corn crop was 72,892,157 bushels; of tobacco, 25,086,196 pounds; of cotton, 41,188 bales; and of hemp, 19,267 tons. The hemp was thus greater in quantity than either the tobacco or the cotton.


Ninety-two percent of the cotton was raised in the four southern counties of Stoddard, Shannon, Dunklin and Dallas, possessing a white population of 20,562 and a slave population of 513. Thus Missouri was not a cotton state and the slaves she did have were not engaged in the raising of cotton. Seventy per cent of the tobacco was raised in ten eastern central contiguous counties; Chariton, Howard, Randolph, Callaway, Macom, Lincoln, Monroe, Pike, Warren, and Franklin, possessing a white population of 116,637 and a slave population of 29,273. The ratio of slaves to whites in these ten counties was a little over twice that for the entire state. Sixty-five per cent
of the hemp was raised in the five counties of Saline, Lafayette, Platte, Pike, and Buchanan, possessing a white population of 74,570 and a slave population of 20,629. The ratio was about the same as in the case of the hemp counties. Corn was grown quite generally over the state. 2


In the years from 1851 to 1857, Missouri had authorized bonds to the amount of $24,950,000 in favor of six different railroad companies. That is, the state was extending her credit for the benefit of these companies which of course were under obligation to pay off these bonds with interest. By 1860, 715 miles of road were in operation: the Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad extending straight across the northern part of the state from Hannibal to St. Joseph; the North Missouri Railroad extending from St. Louis north-westward to Macon, a point on the Hannibal and St. Joseph line; the Missouri Pacific Railroad extending westward from St. Louis through Jefferson City, the capital, to Sedalia, with a branch line extending south-westward to Rolla; and the St. Louis and Iron Mountain Railroad extending southward from St. Louis to Ironton. 3 The Hannibal and


St. Joseph line was built by Boston capital and was referred to as a "Yankee Road". 4
SLAVES IN 1860

25-27 per cent of total population
15-24 "  "  "  "  "
10-14 "  "  "  "  "
5-9 "  "  "  "  "
below 5 per cent

none

Total population 1182012
Slaves 114931
Per cent of slaves 9.76
By 1860 all of the roads, except the last one mentioned, were defaulting on interest due the state and, in consequence, one of the big issues in state politics, even in the summer of 1860, was whether the state should grant further aid to the roads or sell them and apply the proceeds on the debt.

For the present, the slaves will be treated purely as an economic factor. In 1860 the total slave population of Missouri was 114,931 or 9.76 per cent of the entire population which was 1,182,012. The white population of the state was 1,063,489 and the free colored, 3,572. There were 24,652 slave-owners; this number meant an average of 4.66 slaves to each owner. The thirty one counties contiguous to the Mississippi and Missouri rivers, north and west of St. Louis respectively, had 527,255 whites and 76,738 slaves. The sixty counties lying south of these had 382,537 whites and 25,018 slaves. The twenty-two northern interior counties had 183,697 whites and 13,175 slaves.

As the number of whites and slaves has just been given,
FOREIGN BORN IN 1860

Total population: 1182012
Total foreign born: 160541
Per cent of: 13.5
the nativity and location of the whites will now be considered. Of the total population, 65 percent were whites born in Missouri and other slave states; 15 percent, in the free states and 15.5 per cent, in foreign countries. Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina, in the order named, furnished nearly all of those from the other slave states. Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania and New York, in the order named, furnished the greater part of those from the free states. The German states, Ireland and England furnished nearly all of those from foreign countries. Of these a little over 55 per cent were Germans; 27 per cent were Irish and 6.2 per cent were English.7

7 There were 5,283 French, 4,585 Swiss, 2,814 Canadians, 2,021 Scotch. Other nationalities were represented with less than 1,000 each. Ibid.

There was, however, a more important factor than the mere relative numbers of these various racial elements. This was their geographical distribution within the state. There were no census returns for 1860 on the location of native Americans by counties. In general, the Virginians and Kentuckians settled in the northern half of the state and the Tennesseans, in the southern half.8 Boone and Callaway counties were special centers of early settlements from Kentucky.9 Bollinger county, in
southeastern Missouri, was a center of settlement from North Carolina. Jasper county, on the Kansas border in the southwest, was settled by farmers from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and other northern states. 10

In St. Louis there were only 7,418 from the other slave states and 66,782 native Missourians, while the free states furnished 21,139 and the foreign countries, 96,086; of these latter 50,510 were Germans and 29,926 were Irish. 11 There were 1,013 free colored and 4,546 slaves. Thus, out of an aggregate population of 190,524, over 50 per cent were foreign born and only one third were born in slave states. About 16 per cent were natives of the free states. In other words, two-thirds of the residents in the city and county of St. Louis were born in free territory. 12

10 Campbell, Robert Allen, New Atlas of Missouri, passim, St. Louis 1876.
11 There were 5,513 English, 3,072 French, 2,560 Swiss, 1,352 Canadians, 1,101 Scotch. Other nationalities were represented by less than 1,000 each.
Twenty-two and four tenths per cent of all the whites were in the six contiguous river counties on the lower Missouri, two on the north side, four on the south. Less than 10,000 slaves and over 46 per cent of the foreigners were in these same six counties. Over 86 per cent of all the foreigners in the state were in eighteen river counties, most of which were within one hundred miles of St. Louis. 13

13 Ibid.

Political Influences

When Missouri was admitted as a state in 1821, Thomas Hart Benton and David Barton were elected as her senators and John Scott as her representative in Congress. 14 In the presidential campaign of 1824 the Missouri legislature nominated Henry Clay and these three all supported him. However, when the election was thrown into the House, Scott voted for John Quincy Adams whom Barton also favored but Benton came out strongly for Andrew Jackson. Scott was defeated for re-election in 1826 and Barton in 1830. Jackson carried every county in the state in 1828. Benton was by this time practically the political dictator of the state.15


15 Ibid.
From this time on until the Civil War, the Democrats carried every election in the state for governor and president. The Whigs, however, developed a strong opposition party quite early, and, in the fifties, by taking advantage of a split in the Democratic party and by fusion with the Americans, continued their existence longer than in most states.16


Audrain, Boone and Callaway (comprising the A. B. C. district) with a few other counties to the east and north were the main strongholds of Whig strength. Saline and Lafayette in the central western part of the state, Green in the southwestern part and New Madrid in the extreme south east were also quite consistently Whig.17 These counties had a high percentage of slaves and were nearly all river counties. None had a high percentage of foreign born. 18

17 See election returns in the appendix and maps following this page.

18 See maps on slaves and foreign born.

Benton's supremacy, within his own party, was not seriously questioned until in the early forties. On economic questions, however, Benton was in greater sympathy with the Whigs than with many of his own party.
The financial issue in Missouri in 1841 was whether the Bank of the State of Missouri should continue to use paper currency or restrict itself to gold and silver. Benton was a vigorous champion of hard money and his followers were called "Hards" and he himself was dubbed "Old Bullion". The opposing faction was called "Softs." The "Softs" were strong enough in 1841 to put their program, favoring paper money, through the state legislature.19


In referring to this financial legislation, Benton, on November 1, 1842, wrote from St. Louis to Governor Reynolds, as follows: "I find since my return from Jefferson City that many of the Whigs are entirely with us on all the currency questions.... On the other hand some Democrats are unsound upon all these points, and seem determined upon their own views.20

20 The original letter is in possession of the Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis.

The breach thus formed was widened when the first definite attack on Benton by the Democratic press was begun in the fall of 1843 by Shadrach Penn, Jr., editor of the Missouri Reporter. When Penn first came to Missouri from Kentucky in 1841 he supported Benton. In a series of ten open letters in his paper, addressed to Benton, during October and November, 1843 he turned
against him and in the last letter he drew up a declaration of principles entitled "Our Creed". The chief feature of these letters was a direct personal attack on Benton who was compared to Louis XIV of France and denounced as a political dictator and tyrant. He was accused of being out of touch with the Democrats of the state. His alliance with the "Central Clique", the Whig machine, and his general agreement with them on economic issues was also held against him. And, finally, came the challenge: "If you determine that, in connexion with the issues referred to, the battle cry shall be "Benton or no Benton: your fate will be sealed. 21


About the same time Benton opposed a Democratic measure for changing the basis of representation in the state legislature. According to the constitution of 1820 the number of representatives was limited to one hundred and each county was entitled to at least one. As new counties were created, it became necessary to reduce the delegation from the more populous counties. Since the latter were usually Whig and the new and less densely settled counties were Democratic, the Whigs naturally objected to the creation of new counties. Benton sided with the Whigs because of their unity with him on currency questions. The new counties being on the frontiers would probably be unsound on those matters from Benton's standpoint. 22
Previous to 1842, Missouri had elected her congressmen by general ticket. In that year Congress passed a law that required their election by districts. The Whigs, because of their numbers and the political skill of their leaders, had exercised an influence in Congress disproportionate to their part of the population. The new law tended to lessen their influence. Again Benton sided with the Whigs, not through opposition to the principle of re-districting the state, but, because the interests of his allies on economic issues were thereby jeopardized. 23

The main issue in the Democratic party in 1844 was Benton or no-Benton. The friends of the latter controlled the Democratic state convention in 1844 and nominated John C. Edwards for governor. The "Softs" nominated C. H. Allen on a ticket of their own which they called the Liberal Democratic. The Whigs officially supported this ticket. Benton now opposed the annexation of Texas which increased the opposition of his political enemies. The "Hards" carried the election. There were now 53 Whigs in the general assembly and 80 Democrats. Benton was re-elected senator after a hard fight by a margin of 8 votes. At the same time David R. Atchison was elected
as his colleague by a margin of 54 votes. 24

24 Ibid., pp. 265, 268.

The Jackson Resolutions

So far as the Democrats were concerned, Missouri politics during the decade of the fifties centered around the "Jackson Resolutions" whose main purpose was the elimination of Benton and the elevation to power of the ultra state rights faction. The party was apparently united when it entered the state campaign of 1848 as its candidate for governor, Austin King, was elected by a majority of 15,000 over his Whig rival James S. Rollins. But a group of younger men had arisen who knew not Benton and were determined to cast him out. His dictatorial methods and their strong southern sympathies prompted this action.

The fight began, at the instigation of their leader, Claiborne F. Jackson, with the introduction of a series of six resolutions in the Senate January 15, 1849. These resolutions denied the power of Congress to legislate, "so as to affect the institution of slavery in the States, in the District of Columbia or in the Territories"; they asserted that "the right to prohibit slavery in any territory belongs exclusively to the public thereof, and can only be exercised by them in forming their constitution for a State government, or in their sovereign capacity as an independent State: they stated that if Congress should pass an act in conflict with this privilege, "Missouri will be found in hearty cooperation with the Slave holding
States in such measure as may be deemed necessary for our mutual protection against the encroachments of Northern fanat- acism", and finally they declared, "that our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives be requested to act in conformity to the foregoing resolutions." 25


These resolutions passed the House by a vote of 53 to 27. Twenty-three of the "noes" were given by Whigs. 26 Benton opposed the resolutions and appealed from the legislature to the people. He opened this appeal with a great speech at Jefferson City, May 26, 1849, in which he maintained that the resolutions contained the spirit of nullification, disunion, in- subordination and treason. The ensuing campaign was one of the most violent ever waged in the state. 27 Before it was over he wrote to a friend from Washington, March 8, 1850: "Even the election of Whigs will be a triumph over them, and that is the over-ruling consideration at present. Fear of seeing Whigs elected can have no effect upon me, under present cir- cumstances. Not even a fear of seeing a Whig in my place! 26 Ibid.
This letter is not intended for publication—Friends may see it." 28

The Whigs took advantage of the situation to wage an aggressive campaign and elected the unusual number, for them, of sixty-four members to the general assembly. The balloting for a United States Senator began on January 10, 1851. The fortieth ballot stood Henry S. Geyer 80; Thomas H. Benton 55; B. F. Stringfellow 19; scattering 4. Geyer was a Whig from St. Louis and enough anti-Benton Democrats had voted for him to insure his election. 29 Such was the passing of Thomas Hart Benton from the United States Senate where he had served for thirty years or five "full Roman lustrums" as he was wont to say.

In 1852, however, Sterling Price was elected governor by the usual Democratic majority of 15,000 over James Winston, a Whig and a grandson of Patrick Henry. 30

In the same year Benton was elected to the national House of Representatives from the fifth district over another Democrat and a Whig. 31
31 Violette, E. W., op. cit., p. 283

In the House of Representatives he vehemently denounced the Kansas-Nebraska bill and in 1854 he was defeated for re-election on that issue by Luther L. Kennett, a Whig-American. But in the same election the Whigs returned six out of seven congressmen and Benton was blamed for their success. 32

32 North East Reporter, Aug. 17, 1854. See also quotation from Grand River Chronicle in Reporter, Aug. 31, 1854.

When the legislature met in December, 1854 the Whigs, with the help of twenty Bentonites, were able to elect William Newland speaker of the House. Francis Preston Blair, Jr. was the leader of the twenty. The speaker then appointed Blair chairman of the committee on elections. At the beginning of this session the Whigs split into two factions; the state rights or southern Whigs led by George W. Goode and William P. Dames, and the free-soil Whigs led by James Sidney Rollins and Joseph Davis. The former won in a Whig caucus to nominate a senator, A. W. Doniphan. The latter won on the speakership and elected Newland a follower of Rollins. 33

33 Frank Blair, and his confederates, have the audacity to confess and proclaim their treachery and treason. And who is the most intimate co-worker and co-juggler with Frank Blair in the State Legislature? Jimmy Rollins. Frank Blair an acknowledged free-soiler is courted, caressed and concerted with while every Whig or Democrat really sound on the slave question is stabbed and maligned by the "Columbia Clique". North East Reporter, June 14, 1855.

When it came to the election of a United States senator
the contest was three-cornered and so very bitter that no one was elected. Forty ballots were cast and the usual result was Atchison 51, Benton 40 and Doniphan 57.

In 1856 Benton tried again to come back. He ran for governor against Trusten Polk, a Democrat, and Robert Eving, a Whig-American. Polk was elected. "The election of 1856 completely demolished the Benton party in Missouri, of its remnants some returned to the re-united or "national" democracy; the others joined the newly established "Republican Party". 34.

34 Manuscript & Correspondence, Thomas C. Reynolds. This will be cited as the Reynolds MSS.

In the presidential campaign of 1856 Benton supported James Buchanan against John C. Fremont his own son-in-law.

On January 12, 1857, Governor Polk was elected to the United States Senate. He thereupon resigned the governorship and a special election for his successor was held August, 1857. This was a closely contested election. 35 and the Democratic candidate, Robert M. Stewart, won by a majority of only 334 votes over James S. Rollins, a Whig-American, running as an Independent. 36

36 Missouri Statesman, July 25, 1857. In a speech at Greenwood, Dade county July 8, 1857, Rollins stated that he was an independent candidate and ran in opposition to the anti-Benton party. The Benton faction in the Democratic party had
ELECTION FOR STATE REPRESENTATIVES 1858

Blue - Democratic
Yellow - Opposition
Ozark and Douglas tied
Total vote 127,669
had now disappeared. He also stated that he was a member of the American party but that he was running as an independent candidate. In 1848 he had been the straight Whig candidate for governor.

In the congressional and state elections of 1858 the Democrats, called National Democrats in this election, won 5 out of 7 congressmen, 20 out of 25 state senators and 87 out of 129 representatives. The opposing party was called either the Opposition or the Independent. 37

37 Ibid., Sept. 24, 1858.

The anti-Benton or Claiborne F. Jackson wing of the Democratic party was now in control of the state government and remained in power until after the Civil War began. The Opposition party, as it was usually called, which was mainly a fusion of Whigs and Americans, had steadily gained ground since the beginning of the feud within the Democracy and was to be an important factor in the events of 1861.

Summary

From the geographic standpoint, in so far as Missouri's relations to things eastward were concerned, St. Louis held an absolutely dominating position in 1861. Economically, Missouri had few interests in common with the South. She was not a cotton state and she did not have the plantation system in any form. As one of her ablest men of the time said, she had too many slaves for a free state and not enough for a slave state.

Perhaps, Missouri's greatest attachment to the South, and
this does not mean the lower South, as through ties of blood and common social manners and customs. But frontier conditions, silent and unperceived, had transformed Missouri by 1861 into a Western state.

The following quotation, from the Gate City, Keokuk, Iowa, June 2, 1862, contrasting the reaction of three border slave states to emancipation best expresses this attitude: "Missouri with the prompt decision and energy of the West, says 'Slavery is dead—henceforth it cumbereth the ground—take it hence from my borders'. Kentucky, with the hopefulness and patience of a conservative trying to restore herself and the nation to the old order of things, says 'Let slavery alone—it is not dead, but with peace and the Constitution it will revive again'. Maryland—'my Maryland'—with the pride and stoicism of a high-born dame bereaved regretfully of her domestic ally, admits the death, but repels all sympathy and all aid to bury the departed, and says: 'Leave me alone with my dead', Who does not see that Missouri alone pursues the course of true wisdom."

According to density of population Missouri had three well defined areas: 60 counties south of the Missouri river but not touching it; 22 northern interior counties; and 31, contiguous to the Missouri and Mississippi rivers and west and north of St. Louis. The first and second areas, being sparsely settled with few slaves and few foreigners, were comparatively unimportant. The third area was again divided into three well defined sections. With St. Louis as the center and with a radius of 70 miles, an arc drawn north-westward would include a zone of greatest density of population, with few slaves and nearly all foreign born.
A second arc, with a radius of 140 miles, drawn in a similar way, would take in another zone of great density, both of native whites and slaves, but with few foreigners. Another arc, drawn in like manner with a radius of about 300 miles, would bound a third zone of lesser density, fewer slaves and fewer foreigners. As described, the first zone, politically, was a battleground between the Democrats and the Whigs or the Opposition. The former had rather the best of it in the earlier fifties and the latter in the second half of the decade. The second zone was always consistently Whig or Opposition. The middle section of the third zone was likewise Whig or Opposition. The remainder of the third zone was nearly always Democratic. There was no Republican vote in Missouri in 1856. The greater part of the Republican vote in 1860 came from the first zone and from the Germans.

The situation can be briefly expressed. Attachment to the Union was greater the nearer one approached the strategic center, and, conversely, the doctrine of state rights was stronger the farther one moved from this center.
Chapter II

The State and National Elections of 1860

It must be kept in mind that state elections in Missouri previous to 1864 occurred early in August and national elections in November. This situation offers a good opportunity to study the change in public sentiment that usually took place between the two dates. It was also possible for the national campaign to cause a shift of emphasis on the issues or even the creation of new ones.

For the first time in the history of Missouri there were four parties in the field in 1860. As there was comparatively little change in the issues between the two elections that year the campaign of each party is treated separately from its beginning to its conclusion. The principal discussion of the Republican party, however, is included in the topic, "The Germans in Missouri".

The Democratic Parties

The Democratic state convention met April 9, 1860 for the usual threefold purpose of writing a platform, nominating a state ticket, and selecting a delegation to the national convention. Although the party had been outwardly united since the elimination of Thomas Hart Benton in 1866 the factional spirit was still running high. 1 The Douglas wing, apparently

1 For the account of the Democratic convention I have relied
upon Dr. J. F. Snyder's article, "The Democratic State convention of Missouri in 1860", Missouri Historical Review, Vol. II, pp. 112-150 (January, 1908) Dr. Snyder was a member of the resolution committee and read the platform to the convention.

almost identical with the old Benton group, was able to place only one member out of nine on the committee on resolutions and platform. After an almost continuous fight for twenty-six hours an ultra pro-slavery document was enthusiastically endorsed by the convention.

The platform began by endorsing the Democratic convention at Cincinnati in 1846 and continued with the declaration "that the Democratic party of Missouri affirms as right these cardinal principles on the subject of slavery in the Territories: (1) That Congress has no power to abolish slavery in the Territories. (2) That the Territorial Legislature has no power to abolish slavery in any Territory, or to prohibit the introduction of slavery therein; ... (3) That the provisions of the Constitution for the rendition of fugitive slaves from service or labor ... have unquestionably claim to the respect and observance of all who enjoy the benefits of our compact of Union; ..." The peaceable acquisition of Cuba, by purchase, was advocated. Congressional aid for the construction of a railroad to the Pacific was sanctioned. John Brown's raid was denounced as "a genuine demonstration of the intent and purpose of the Republican party." The eighth resolution "indignantly repelled the stereotyped charge of disunion sentiment so persistently attributed to the Democracy by leaders of the opposition for partisan purposes."
When the time came to nominate a candidate for governor, the southwestern part of the state, which had been neglected by both parties, strongly urged their favorite son Waldo P. Johnson. Claiborne F. Jackson of Chariton, however, was nominated on the third ballot. Sterling Price placed Thomas C. Reynolds in nomination for lieutenant-governor. He was nominated on the first ballot. Benjamin F. Massey was nominated for secretary of state. A complete ticket was placed in the field and a delegation selected for the Baltimore convention.

The following extract from the speech of H. C. Claiborne well expresses the spirit of the convention, when, at its close, he implored the Democrats of Missouri to unite and "stand firm against that hydra-headed amalgamation of Abolitionism, Douglasism, and Black Republicanism now confronting us intent on abrogating the Constitution and establishing an oligarchy upon the ruins of our Democratic institutions."

The convention as a whole was characterized by discord, riotous disorder, and intense personal antagonism between the Douglas and Anti-Douglas factions. There was no harmonious love-feast at its close.

When, soon after this, the national Democratic party divided into the Douglas and Breckenridge wings and Jackson and Reynolds declared for Douglas, the State Central Committee promptly deposed them from the state ticket and substituted Hancock Jackson and Monroe M. Parsons in their respective places.

On June 27, the orthodox Democratic press printed a call, signed by United States Senators, James S. Green and Trusten
Polk and others, urging the Democracy of Missouri to meet in a state convention at the state capitol in September, "to adopt measures which shall insure unity of action." The call further specified, "we also earnestly recommend the united support of the state and county tickets; and that the candidates for the legislature pledge themselves to abide by the action of the majority of their Democratic associates."

Shortly after this call, Senator Green, for the sake of political expediency, deserted the Breckenridge state ticket, which he had just helped to put in the field, and supported the Douglas ticket or rather the candidates who had declared for him. The election occurred on the sixth of August and C. F. Jackson, with the entire Douglas state ticket, was elected.

The anti-Douglas or the Breckinridge wing held their special convention September 19-20 as indicated above. It was a harmonious gathering of pro-slavery Democrats, purged of all free-soil or squatter sovereignty elements. The national Breckenridge ticket and platform were endorsed. The state Democratic central committee and the electoral ticket were reorganized by the elimination of the Douglas men and the substitution of Breckinridge men in their places.

The only note of discord was introduced by Westley H alburt on, of Sullivan, who offered the following resolution: "Resolved, that the electors of the Democratic party of Missouri are hereby authorized and instructed, if elected next November, to cast the vote of this state for any candidate for the Presidency; provided that by so doing the election of Lincoln can
be prevented; that being the first object of every true friend of the Union." The resolution was rejected.

Senator Green, now back in the Breckenridge camp, took an active part in this convention. Sterling Price was present merely as a spectator. John B. Henderson did not attend at all.* One of the most interesting events in connection with this gathering was the rather unexpected presence of Governor-elect C. F. Jackson. When called upon for a speech, he said that he approved of their platform and of Breckenridge and Lane. He said that he wanted the party to be harmonious, for the finances of the state required it and he expected the support of both sides as governor since to them he owed his election. 2

2 Missouri Statesman, Sept. 28, 1860.

On September 26, the Douglas party reorganized its electoral ticket with Douglas men. 3

3 Missouri Republican, Sept. 28, 1860.

Since C. F. Jackson was the mover of the "Jackson Resolutions" and held the well known position as an ultra-southern pro-slavery advocate, his subsequent course of vacillation requires some explanation, especially his coming out for Douglas. Of course he was put in a difficult position by the split in his party and, as long as possible, he avoided taking sides. But finally he was compelled to do so. 'A telegram, from Fayette,
June, 20, to the Missouri Republican, stated that Jackson and Reynolds would speak at Fayette that night and come out for Douglas. The truth of the prediction was verified in the Republican of July 1. The issue of July 3 stated that the disunionists of the city were thrown into spasms by the information.

On June 26, Benjamin F. Massey, Secretary of State, wrote Dr. J. F. Snider that John S. Phelps's coming out for Douglas had badly upset him. On July 4, he again wrote Snider, "But the Devil has broken out in another quarter. Jackson and Reynolds ... both came out strongly for Douglas. Isn't that a stunner?... I tell you sir, I am absolutely bewildered. Men are acting so entirely contrary to the course of their whole past lives as to confound me." The conclusion seems inevitable that this action on the part of Jackson and Reynolds was a matter of political expediency. The Douglas men had to be placated and the Breckenridge wing was not strong enough to defeat either a Douglas ticket or the Opposition.

After the election, the St. Louis Evening News stated that Green, Jackson and Reynolds had met in June and fixed up a plan by which the two latter were to come out for Douglas until after the state election and then go for Breckenridge. Green was to support them and be returned to the Senate.
The following statement is evidence to the same effect: "Hon. James S. Green is the sole cause of the triumph of C. F. Jackson, meagre as it is." Senator Green denounced Douglas, asserted this paper, but supported Jackson and the latter was voted for by the united Douglas party and fully 30,000 Breckenridge and Lane Democrats.

Senators Green and Polk supported Breckenridge for president and C. F. Jackson, John B. Clark, E. H. Norton, J. B. Craig, W. P. Hall, J. S. Phelps, and J. W. Neill supported Douglas. Charles D. Drake campaigned for Douglas and one of his speeches was so well liked by the Republican that it printed it entire and struck off 50,000 copies for distribution as campaign material. This was the same man who at a later time was to become the leader of the Radicals and practically the dictator of the state.

The Opposition or Constitutional Union Party

As will be shown later, the Opposition or the Constitutional Union party was, in the main, a fusion of Whigs and Americans.
The name "Opposition party" had been, however, in common use for several years. This was natural as the Democrats had been in power continuously from the beginning and their rivals were of course always in opposition.

It is difficult, in this case, to treat the state and national campaigns separately as the latter got under way first and lasted longer. As early as January 5, 1860, the St. Charles Demokrat, a German paper, came out for Edward Bates for president. Three weeks later the Zeitung favored Robert Wilson for governor, because he had not been a Know-Nothing but an old line Whig and as anti-slavery as a man could be in Missouri. A little later it favored Bates for president. 9 The Opposition members of the legislature held a caucus, the latter part of January, and endorsed Bates for the presidency and formed a state central committee. 10 On January 29, the Opposition held a state convention at Jefferson City and again Bates was endorsed for the presidency. James O. Broadhead of St. Louis called the convention to order and William F. Switzler of Columbia acted as temporary chairman. 11 The Demokrat referring

9 St. Louis Deutche Zeitung, in St. Charles Demokrat, Jan. 26, 1860.

10 Missouri Statesman, Jan. 27, 1860.

11 La Grange National American, March 10, 1860. Col. Switzler, his name notwithstanding, was not affiliated with the German element in any way.
to this convention said it was composed of Benton Democrats, old Whigs and Know-Nothings. It decided not to send delegates to the Baltimore Constitutional Convention. The only Germans present were those from Cole and St. Charles counties. 12

12 St. Charles Demokrat, March 8, 1860.

On March 1, some Whig and American bolters, from the convention mentioned above, held a meeting also at Jefferson City, nominated Bates for the presidency and appointed a committee to select delegates for the Constitutional Union convention at Baltimore. They also called a state convention for April 14. Nathaniel W. Watkins, a half-brother of Henry Clay, presided over this gathering. 13 This convention met as scheduled and, according to the St. Louis Democrat, was composed of Republicans, Free-Democrats, Whigs and Americans and was a harmonious affair. Bates was again nominated for the presidency. 14

13 Ibid.

14 St. Louis Democrat in Missouri Statesman, March 16, 1860.

Thus far there were only two points in common among the opposition elements: all opposed the national Democracy and favored Bates for the presidency. Their name and platform were still in doubt.

Edward Bates, at this time, was sixty-five years old.
He had been a member of the convention that framed Missouri's first constitution in 1820. He had been a Whig from the beginning of the party. In 1856, he had presided over the Whig national convention that ratified the American nomination of Millard Fillmore.

The opposition elements were at a standstill until Bates declared his position. This he did in his famous reply to a letter from the Republicans. The latter held a convention in St. Louis, March 10, at which they completed a state organization; selected delegates to the Chicago convention and instructed them to present the name of Edward Bates as a presidential candidate. B. Gratz Brown was president of this convention. On the twelfth, a committee, composed of Peter L. Hoy, editor of the St. Louis Democrat, Dr. Charles L. Bernays, editor of the Anzeiger, and nine others addressed a letter to Bates asking him to state his position on seven questions, four of which were as follows:

"First- Are you opposed to the Extension of Slavery? Second- Does the Constitution carry Slavery into the Territories, and as a subsidiary to this, what is the legal effect of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case? Fifth- Are you in favor of the construction of a Railroad from the valley of the Mississippi to the Pacific ocean, under the auspices of the General Government? Seventh- Are you in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas under the constitution adopted at Wyandotte?" Bates replied, March 17, to the above questions in part as follows:
First- "I am opposed to the Extension of Slavery, and in my opinion the spirit and policy of the Government ought to be against its extension."
Second- "I answer no."
Fifth- "Yes, strongly."
Seventh- "I think that Kansas ought to be admitted without delay, leaving her like all the other states, the judge of her own constitution." 15

15 La Grange National American, March 31, 1860

This statement of his position was a keen disappointment to Bates's old Whig associates. William F. Switzler, editor of the Missouri Statesman, voiced their opinion of his defection. A few quotations from this editorial will illustrate his reaction to Bates's reply. "We say in all frankness that this letter disappoints us, and that we do not endorse some of its doctrines. Nor do we believe that the great body of the forty-five thousand Whigs and Americans in this State will endorse them... We are no Republicans: never have been and never can be in the modern acceptation of that word.... We understand that Judge Bates, in this unfortunate letter, to cut loose from this truly conservative doctrine, and to embrace the Republican dogma of Congressional inhibition of Slavery in the territories, or the non-admission of any more Slave States into the Union. So understanding him, we utterly repudiate his theory of the spirit and policy of the government and cannot follow whither his doctrines lead—to slavery agitation, to Congressional
Freesoil codes for the territories, and to bitter strife and enstrangement among the people of our States." 16

16 Missouri Statesman in La Grange National American, April 14, 1860

The national party conventions soon selected the national candidates and defined the national issues. All four parties in Missouri made an active canvass though the Republicans had practically no organization outside of St. Louis and the nearby counties. The Constitutional Unionists first nominated Robert Wilson for governor but he declined because of old age and poor health. Sample Orr, of Green county, then announced himself and was well received by the Constitutional Union press. Orr was a little man, freckled-faced and red-haired but almost single-handed he put up one of the most memorable campaigns in the history of the state. For keen logic and biting, sarcastic wit he has seldom been surpassed on the American stump. He took the position that the slavery question should not be agitated but came out strongly for state aid to complete the trunk lines in the state. He was also opposed to their sale. He attacked Jackson on the issue raised by the "Jackson Resolutions" and took a decided stand for the preservation of the Union. 17

17 La Grange National American, July 21, 1860

Although the St. Louis Republican supported C. F. Jackson and Douglas it took the old Whig position on the railroad
question and as early as February 3 had stated that it would support no man for governor who did not favor the completion of the main trunk roads of the state and who was also against their sale. "This question, it went on to say, involves the prosperity of the State, and no mere consideration of offices to be bestowed on party men shall control our course on this question." 18


The Republican Party

The Republicans had practically no organization outside of St. Louis in 1860. Their candidate for governor, James B. Gardenhire formerly a Democrat, was nominated against his will and tried to withdraw from the race.

The Germans in Missouri

Until 1860, the Germans in Missouri had been Democrats. They never had been slave-holders and, of course, had little unity with the Whigs who were aristocratic slave-owners and the strength of the opposition to the Democracy. The German element, which began coming to Missouri in the early thirties, as a result of the influence of Gottfried Duden, was greatly augmented by the revolutionists of 1848 who fled from Germany upon their failure there to unify the German states on a constitutional basis. Under such circumstances they naturally were more inclined to enter the Democratic party especially
while it was under the influence of Benton. But, as the Democratic party became more and more identified with the pro-slavery position and state rights doctrines, the Germans began to look elsewhere for political fellowship. So far as they were concerned it was a question of free labor versus slave labor with all the social, idealistic, political and economic differences presented by that issue. 19

19 "Seit mehr als zehn Jahren kämpften wir in Missouri für Gleichstellung der freien mit der sklavenhaltenden Bevölkerung und nichts würde der guten Sache so großen Vorschub leisten als die Kandidatur von Bates" declared the St. Charles Demokrat, March 29, 1860.

On April 26, the Demokrat reviewed at length the history of the Germans in Missouri for the previous twenty years and decided that they could not follow a southern propagandist party. Since fresh German immigration must settle in new territory and since the slave-holders wanted this same territory here was a conflict of interests. 20 Moreover the Germans  

20 Ibid., April 26, 1860. The heading of the review was: "Wo haben die Deutsch-Amerikaner ihre Freunde zu suchen?"

of Missouri in 1860 were men who had risked their lives for an ideal in Germany. All their sentiments were instinctively against slavery and the doctrine of state rights.

After the Republican convention at Chicago, the Demokrat stated that the Germans were not bound by special influences to the Democracy, and would stand together at the next election and wield a powerful influence. 21 In June, 1860, this paper
headed an article "Republicans or Democrats?" and then went on to say that the Germans would be Republicans.

William H. Seward visited the state during the campaign and spoke in both St. Joseph and St. Louis where he made a very strong bid for the German vote. 22 The Germans were, in fact,


"It is very remarkable that in this contest the Germans for the first time, have taken a position as a powerful political element.... In St. Louis Mr. Seward publicly declared that Missouri must be Germanized in order to become free, and congratulated the State on its onward striving freedom loving German inhabitants. Other states are doing like Missouri- the Germans have turned away en masse from the corrupt Negro Democracy, and enlisted themselves under the banner of the noble Lincoln.... One is filled with wonder on looking at this new complexion of affairs, and cannot resist the impression that a new era has dawned for American politics. At the head of the German speakers, beyond doubt or cavil, stands Carl Schurz-.... It may now be considered certain that the States of the Great Mississippi valley will become essentially German, and Missouri above all others.

the main part of the Republican party in Missouri in 1860. 23

23 "What's the Matter?

Has the Democrat abandoned the Missouri Black Republicans.... Indeed, nearly all the labor of the canvass, outside of the German journals, seems to have devolved upon the Express." After the election both the Republican and the Democrat agreed that "No paper in the country, published in the German language, contributed more to the election of Mr. Lincoln than the Anzeiger. Missouri Democrat, Dec. 24, 1862, quoted in the Republican, Oct. 9, 1860"
Two-thirds of the Republican vote for governor came from the three counties of St. Louis, St. Charles and Franklin where the Germans were most numerous. The same proportion holds for the Lincoln vote three months later.

Political Re-alignments

Early in the year, the Democrats became alarmed over a rumored fusion of Whigs, Americans and Black Republicans. 24

24 Missouri Statesman, Jan. 20, 1860.

In March, the Statesman, referring to this fear of the Democrats, emphatically stated that the conservative, union-loving, national men of the country, North and South, East and West, would coalesce—not with the Republican party on the Republican platform; not with the Democratic party on the Democratic platform, but on a national, conservative candidate for the Presidency, and drive the bogus Democrats from power; for, the Democrat and not the Republicans are in power. 25

25 Ibid., in La Grange National American, March 3, 1860

The Lexington Express, quoted in the American, May 26, 1860, in announcing a meeting for May 31 to ratify the Baltimore ticket, used the following language: "... Whigs, Arouse! Awake! ... Such, Whigs, is the cry that comes to you from Bunker Hill and Ashland Invite your Democratic neighbors to go with you, and let all men of every party and none, be
invited, ..." 26

26 Lexington Express in La Grange Nat. Am. May 26, 1860

The St. Charles Demokrat, which supported Gardenhire for governor, stated that the Opposition party, for the state election in Missouri, was composed of Benton Democrats, Bates Whigs, Free-soil Know-Nothings and some Pro-slavery Know-Nothings; and that Benton Democrats, Bates Whigs, and a part of the Free-soil Know-Nothings had already declared themselves as Republicans, and that a part of the Free-soil Know-Nothings and the Pro-slavery Know-Nothings were for Bell and Everett. 27

27 St. Charles Demokrat, July 12, 1860

A few days after the election, Massey wrote to Snider: "I notice a very large proportion of those who are elected as Douglas Democrats, are old line Whig Democrats." 28 The Republican stated that ..."with the exception of the Hon. Mr. Anderson and a precious few others they [Breckenridge seceders] cannot get the Old Whigs on their side." 29

28 Massey, Ms$. Correspondence, June 26, 1860

29 Missouri Republican, Oct. 20, 1860.

The following placard announcing a political meeting in Columbia for September 3 proved to be true scriptural prophecy:
"Democrats Rally
Breckenridge and Lane
Come One! Come all!
'To your tents, Oh! Israel!" 30

Sterling Price and Gustavus St. Gem, members of the state central committee, published a long article urging the support of Douglas and the regular ticket in Missouri on the grounds of "regularity". 31

The Election Returns

In the August election, for governor Hancock Jackson, the Breckenridge candidate, carried only six counties and polled only 11,410 votes or 7.2 per cent of the total, yet 47 Breckenridge representatives and 3 senators were elected to the general assembly or a total of 50 out of a membership of 160.

It will be further noticed that, although C. F. Jackson, the Douglas candidate for governor received 47 per cent of the popular vote and carried 70 counties, there were only 37 Douglas representatives and 2 senators elected to the legislature.

Sample Orr, the Constitutional Unionist candidate, received 41 per cent of the total vote and carried 45 counties, yet only 36 Constitutional Union representatives and 2 senators were
ELECTION OF STATE SENATORS AUGUST 1860

Missouri

Blue - Douglas Democrats 9
Yellow - Opposition, Const. Union 8
Green - Breckenridge Democrats 15
Red - Republican 1
Total 33
elected to the legislature.

The Republicans polled 4 per cent of the total vote and elected 13 representatives and 1 senator.

There were 14 hold over Breckenridge senators, 6 Douglasites, and 5 Constitutional Unionists. 32

32 The above classification of new members was made by the Missouri Republican, Dec. 11, 1860.

The reasons for the disproportionate number of Breckenridge members in the legislature are found in the following facts: C. F. Jackson came out for Douglas as a matter of political expediency. He was supported by several thousand Breckenridge men because he was the "regular" candidate and was at least preferable to Orr or Gardenhire.

The extreme southern wing of the party had been in control of the state government for four years, a fact which was of great advantage to their candidates. Furthermore, practically all of the sparsely settled counties were carried by the Breckenridge wing, and as every county was entitled to at least one representative and few were entitled to more, this was another point in their favor.

In the November election, the two extremes, the Republicans at one end and the Breckenridge men at the other, each trebled their vote over that of August. The increase in the total vote of the four parties was less than 7,000. The Douglasites lost about 16,000 and the Constitutional Unionists a little over 8,000. One striking coincidence was that the 2 counties carried
by Lincoln contained 62 per cent of the foreign born and the 45 Constitutional Union counties contained 63 per cent of the slaves. The 22 Breckenridge counties contained only 3 per cent of either slaves or foreign born.

The following table illustrates the whole matter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties Carried by</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Foreign born</th>
<th>% of all Slaves</th>
<th>% of all f.b.</th>
<th>Total vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Douglas</td>
<td>371,394</td>
<td>33,168</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34,911</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. 24,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.U. 17,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. 8,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. 4,176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 54,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Bell</td>
<td>394,372</td>
<td>21,754</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>71,623</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. 21,896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.U. 32,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. 15,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. 1,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 72,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Breckenridge</td>
<td>108,623</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. 6,432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.U. 3,261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. 2,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 12,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lincoln</td>
<td>192,954</td>
<td>99,223</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. 10,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. 9,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.U. 5,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br. 869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 126,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,067,613</td>
<td>160,298</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>165,518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The slave holders of Missouri were quite well convinced that the secession of the state, whether successful or not, meant the extinction of slavery. Politically, the Breckenridge men occupied the extreme right and under certain circumstances
ELECTION FOR PRESIDENT 1860

Blue - Douglas 58801
Yellow - Bell 58372
Green - Breckinridge 31317
Red - Lincoln 17028
Total 165518
were ready to resort to rebellion. The Bell-Everett men, the most conservative of all, held the right center. The Douglas wing occupied the left center and the Republicans, the extreme left. They were also ready under certain circumstances, to resort to arms. This position of the two extremes was natural as neither had slave property at stake. Of course many slave owners eventually sided with the South. It is an interesting fact, however, that the Breckenridge vote in 1860, the state rights vote for delegates to the state convention in 1861 and the number of Missourians, over twenty-one years of age, in the rebel army was practically the same, a little over 30,000. In the opinion of the author this number represents the real strength of the secession element in Missouri.
Chapter III

The Old Flag or the New, 1860-1861

The Twenty-first General Assembly, December 31, 1860-March 28, 1861.

When the Twenty-first general assembly met at Jefferson City, December 18, 1860, South Carolina had already seceded and Missouri was confronted with the momentous question of choosing between the Union and secession.

One of the first acts in the House was the election of a speaker. John McAfee of Shelby, a pronounced pro-slavery Breckenridge Democrat, was elected to this position by a vote of 77 to 43 over Marcus Boyd of Green, a Constitutional Unionist. Thomas L. Price of Cole, a Douglas Democrat, received but 4 votes. This action shows that the Democrats of the House were quite well united on the vital issue of the day. 1


On January 3, 1861, Governor B. M. Stewart, a native of New York and an anti-Benton Democrat of moderate views, delivered his farewell address to the joint assembly. He attacked the abolition fanatics and insisted that the North should give proper guaranties to the South that she would be protected in her constitutional right of taking her property into any part of the common territory of the United States. Because of her geographical position, he continued, Missouri had a right to a voice in the councils of the nation.
"As matters are at present Missouri will stand to her lot, and hold to the Union so long as it is worth an effort to preserve it. So long as there is hope of success she will seek for justice within the Union. She cannot be frightened from her propriety by the past unfriendly legislation of the North, nor dragooned into secession by the restrictive legislation of the extreme South.... She will rather take the high position of armed neutrality. She is at present, able to take care of herself, and will be neither forced nor flattered, driven or coaxed, into a course of action that must end in her own destruction. ...The very idea of the right of voluntary secession is not only absurd in itself, but utterly destructive of every principle on which national faith is founded...." 2

2 Ibid., pp. 18-43.

On the afternoon of the second day of the session, the incoming governor, Claiborne Fox Jackson, delivered his inaugural address, the whole tone and attitude of which was more extreme than that of his predecessor. "The destiny of the slaveholding States of this Union," he said, "is one and the same. So long as a State continues to maintain slavery within her limits, it is impossible to separate her fate from that of her sister States who have the same social organization.... In the event of a failure to reconcile the conflicting interests which now threaten the disruption of the existing Union, interest and sympathy alike combine to unite the fortunes of all the slaveholding States.... Missouri will not be found to shrink from
the duty which her position upon the border imposes; her honor, her honor, her interests, and her sympathies point alike in one direction, and determine her to stand by the South.... Missouri, then, in my opinion, will best consult her own interests, and the interest of the whole country by a timely declaration of her determination to stand by her sister slave-holding States, in whose wrongs she participates, and with whose institutions and people she sympathizes." He recommended the calling of a convention of the slave-holding states which should formulate such amendments to the constitution, as they should judge necessary, and present them to the northern states for their action. He also advised the calling of a state convention immediately which should define Missouri's position on the questions then pending before the country. It was possible, moreover, that this convention would be called upon to instruct the delegates who might be sent to the convention of all the slave-holding states mentioned above. 3

3 Ibid., pp. 45-53.

A bill, making provision for the calling of such a convention, was soon introduced in both Houses. It passed the lower House, January 17, by a vote of 106 to 18, and the Senate, the next day, by a vote of 30 to 2, and was signed by the governor, January 21, 1861. This bill provided for the election, on February 18, of 99 delegates, three, the number of state senators.

The important sections of this act were the fifth and tenth
which read as follows: Fifth, "The delegates elected under the provisions of this act shall assemble at Jefferson City, on Thursday, the 23th day of February, 1861, and organize themselves into a Convention, by the election of a President, and such other officers as they may deem necessary; and shall proceed to consider the then existing relations between the Government of the United States, the people and Governments of the different States, and the Government and people of the State of Missouri, and to adopt such measures for vindicating the sovereignty of the State, and protection of its institutions, as shall appear to them to be demanded." Tenth, "No act, ordinance, or resolution of said Convention shall be deemed to be valid to change or dissolve the political relations of this State to the Government of the United States, or any other State, until a majority of the qualified voters of this State voting upon this question, shall ratify the same." The tenth section was an amendment and had passed by only a small majority. 4


Of the 18 opponents of the bill, as a whole, in the House, 11 were Republicans; 2, Douglas Democrats; 4, Constitutional Unionists and 1, a Breckenridge Democrat. One Republican and one Breckenridge opposed the bill in the Senate. No Republicans in either House voted for it. 5


There was considerable discussion as to the powers of this convention. One group maintained that it would be a strictly
representative body acting for and in the name of the sovereign people and its action could not be restricted by the law calling it together. Another group held that it would be a collection of delegates appointed by the people whose power would be limited to the functions and duties specified in the act calling the body together. The latter view was accepted by the vote of 81 to 40. The Senate debated the same question and the action of the House just mentioned. Section ten, the amendment referred to above, which had originated in the Senate, was the decision of both Houses in the matter.


It was quite generally believed that the calling of the convention was the work of the secessionists who intended and expected that it would take the state out of the Union. They felt so sure that the people were with them that they did not seem to realize or to care that the tenth section of the act would really mean a second submission of the secession question to the people.

7 Missouri Democrat, Dec. 31, 1860. "The object in calling for a Convention is to commit Missouri to secession;" Missouri Statesman, Jan. 1, 1860, "... the straight out secession members of our Legislature- and there are a few in each House- want to precipitate the question of disunion. They want a State Convention and secession by March 4 if possible." The Jefferson City Daily Inquirer, Jan. 10, 1861 opposed the state convention as a disunion measure.

During the afternoon session of the Senate and the House on January 18, 1861, Governor Jackson sent a message to each
stating that the Honorable Daniel R. Russell, commissioner from the state of Mississippi was present charged with the mission of informing the people of Missouri that the legislature of Mississippi had called a convention to consider the threatening relations between the North and the South and expressing the hope that Missouri would co-operate with Mississippi "in the adoption of efficient measures for the common defense and safety of the slave-holding States." 8 The legislature arranged at once to hear him that night at a joint session. Thomas C. Reynolds, 9 lieutenant-governor, presided over this session

9 Thomas C. Reynolds had a brilliancy of planning and a boldness of execution that Governor Jackson lacked. In fact he prepared many of Jackson's official papers for him and put out a number on his own initiative. Early in May he left for Arkansas and the South to ask for military intervention in Missouri. One of the most valuable pieces of primary source material for the spring of 1861 is the Manuscript & Correspondence of Thomas C. Reynolds written in 1867. The particular work examined is a typewritten copy in the Library of the Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis. The original is in possession of Reynolds' nephew, Mr. George Savage of Baltimore, Md.

and announced that: "When the Commissioner from the State of Mississippi is announced, the members of the General Assembly will rise to receive him," whereupon John D. Stevenson, a Republican representative from St. Louis, sprang up and inquired: "Are we here, Mr. President, to do homage to the ambassador of some foreign potentate?" After a brief but spirited altercation, Reynolds changed his command to a request. The commis-
sioner was thereupon introduced and delivered a long address. The gist of which was to the effect that Mississippi had seceded and was now asking Missouri to do likewise and to help form a Southern confederacy. 10 The speech and its sentiments were greeted with great applause but the legislature, just a few hours previous, by its own act, had delegated to another body the power of complying with his request.

A few days later a commission of five men was appointed to attend the Peace Conference at Washington. 11

11 "This was the convention that was called by Virginia and over which ex-President Tyler presided. It was in session Feb. 4-27, 1861 Twenty-one states were represented. It recommended to Congress, as a plan of adjusting the slavery question, a constitutional amendment, a little less favorable to the South than the Crittenden compromise. On March 4, Senator Critten presented the report of the convention in the Senate. It received 7 votes. Rhodes, J. F., Hist. of U. S., Vol. III, pp. 291, 308-306. The Crittenden Compromise was a series of proposed constitutional amendments intended to settle the slavery question forever along lines similar to the Missouri compromise. Chadwick, F. E., Causes of the Civil War, pp. 170-173.

A successor to Senator Green was elected at this session. According to the pre-election agreement with the treacherous supporters of Douglas, Green was to be returned to the Senate but when the time came his partners could not make good their side of the bargain. James S. Green 12 had been one of the

12 By November, 1861, his secession ardor had decidedly cooled. He visited Washington and had a pleasant interview with President Lincoln. He affirmed his strong attachment to the Union
and after practising law for a short time before the Supreme Court, retired to Missouri where he lived quietly through the War. He was bitterly reproached by his old associates for getting them into trouble and leaving them in the lurch. Mo. Statesman, Nov. 8, Dec. 20, 1861, Aug. 29, 1862; Canton Press, Sept. 4, 1862.

most outspoken secessionists in the entire state. He had strongly opposed Benton and Douglas, and just as vigorously supported Breckenridge. James G. Blaine pronounced him one of the ablest debaters in the United States Senate. His successor, Waldo P. Johnson, a Breckenridge Democrat, was elected on the fifteenth ballot. The vote then stood Johnson 81; A. W. Doniphan, a former Whig and a Constitutional Unionist, 36, Thomas B. English, a Douglas Democrat, 29. 13


A significant law, passed at this session, put the appointment and absolute control of the police force of St. Louis in the hands of the governor and Senate. 14


Another important law gave the exclusive monopoly of public printing in St. Louis county to Moritz Miedener. 15 This law served the double purpose of penalizing the Union press and of subsidizing a secession printer. 16

15 Ibid., pp. 100-102.
From the southern standpoint the great failure of this legislature was its refusal to pass a military bill that would have armed the state. 17

The Election of the State Convention

The campaign for the election of delegates to the state convention began even before the convention bill was passed. On January sixth, we find James O. Broadhead writing to Abiel Leonard and urging him to write to other men, such as, J. B. Henderson, George Anderson, Porter of Hannibal and William Newland of Ralls, to become candidates for the convention. Broadhead had been a Whig but voted for Lincoln. Henderson had been a Douglas Democrat but was to become a steadfast Republican. Broadhead had little hopes of finding safe Union men among the prominent Bell or Douglas men of St. Louis. 18

16 Peckham, James, Lyon and Mo. in 1861, p. 26

17 Snead, Thomas L., op. cit., p. 77.

18 James O. Broadhead to A. Leonard, St. Louis, Jan. 6, 1861, "I really cannot name a man of the Bell and Everett party here in St. Louis to whom you could write in safety--they have all been so much corrupted by an idea which has been urged with a great deal of perseverance, that it would be to the interest of St. Louis to be in a Southern Confederacy, that she would be the great manufacturing city of such a Confederacy--that it would be difficult to find a safe union man among the prominent men of that party--and that the Douglas men have been so much under the influence of the Republican that they are just
as bad—Breckenridge I have not talked with. The Evening News, on Saturday, took a decided stand in favor of the Union. It is very important to get the Bell and Everett men in the Legislature to take the right ground and you could do a great deal in that direction."

About the same time the pro-slavery, state rights people began a more aggressive campaign. For some time the southern extremists had been disappointed with the position of the St. Louis papers. Early in January, Thomas L. Snead, took charge of the Bulletin with the purpose of advocating, before March 4, a final settlement of the slavery question satisfactory to the slave holders. 19

---

19 Missouri Democrat, Jan. 6, 1861, copied from St. Louis Bulletin. The Bulletin, will under my control, advocate, earnestly and zealously, a full and final settlement, before the fourth day of March next, of all the questions which now disturb the peace of the country, and it will insist that they shall be settled upon such terms as will guarantee the equality and the safety of the slave-holding States within the Union or their independence out of it."—Thomas L. Snead

Early in the campaign very strong sentiment developed that the secession of Missouri would mean her economic ruin. The argument ran about as follows: Secession would make of her neighboring free states a Canadian haven for runaway slaves; their value would at once depreciate; slavery was most profitable in the hemp industry and a free trade southern confederacy would destroy this stronghold of slavery; slaves could not compete with white labor in raising grain, cultivating vineyards or in mining; southern capital would not develop Missouri's mineral resources under any circumstances; eastern capital would do this only if Missouri stayed in the Union. 20
Missouri Republican, Jan. 10, 1861, "Does Southern capital tend to investment in mineral lands, for the purpose of developing them... If this State ever succeeds in developing her mineral resources—that if this city ever assumes her true position, it must be by the indefatigable energy and activity of her own capitalists, miners and mechanics, aided by the accession of Eastern capital, experienced native and foreign miners, and Eastern mechanics. Now, will these accessions be best obtained by remaining in the Union or by Secession? Certainly not by secession." Ibid., Feb. 10, 1861; Jefferson Daily Inquirer, Jan. 10, 1861. See Missouri Democrat, Jan. 26, 1861. "Hemp and Secession." See a letter of Rollins to R. E. Dunn, from Columbia, Mo. Feb. 2, 1861: "Will we not by this act (disunion) bring to our very doors a Canadian frontier of 800 miles, inviting the escape of all the slaves in the State, and without any power whatever to reclaim them? In short, is not Disunion to us at once an act to emancipate all the slaves of the State and under circumstances to keep up a constant warfare between the people of our own and neighboring free States?"—Smith, Life of Rollins, pp. 124-225, passim.

A keen realization of the gravity of the political situation and the impending economic disaster in case of secession had two important results. One was that the campaign was non-partisan, that is, the candidates did not run on any ticket previously in common use nor were the old party names employed. Indeed, this attitude was so well maintained that it has been impossible to this day to discover the former political affiliation of some of the delegates elected. The second result was to bring out in many cases an unusual class of candidates, not the ordinary office-seeking politicians, but solid, substantial and conservative business and professional men. 21

21 "Let them (the people of St. Louis) send no prominent representatives of parties to the Convention. Let them send only representatives of the business, the capital and the labor of St. Louis." St. Louis Evening News, Jan. 28, 1861.
The date set for the election was so soon after its official announcement that the time for campaigning, especially in the more remote counties, was very short. The weekly press had scarcely time to get out two or three issues. In general it was a whirlwind campaign while it lasted. Although the issue was quite well understood to be union or secession, very few believed there would be war in either case.

Francis Preston Blair, Jr. and a few associates in St. Louis seemed to be almost the only unconditional unionists who felt war to be inevitable. Their organization and drilling of troops, chiefly Germans in St. Louis, is part of military history and except in its political aspect has no place in this discussion.

During the presidential campaign of 1860 the Republicans of St. Louis had organized clubs called the Wide Awakes whose duty it was to preserve order at political meetings. The southern sympathizers also had an organization called the Minute Men. Blair and his associates realized that there were not enough Republicans in Missouri to hold her in the Union and further that even the name Republican was repulsive to other unionists that they would not cooperate. It was, therefore, decided to drop the offensive party name and to reorganize the Wide Awakes as Union clubs. The latter was done at a public meeting at Washington Hall on the night of January eleventh. 22

22 Peckham, James, op. cit., p. 31. Blair finally achieved
the former though in spite of strong opposition from the Republicans. By great skill and tact he succeeded in having a composite ticket put in the field under the name of the Citizens Unconditional Union Ticket. The nominees were seven Douglas Democrats, three Bell-Everett men and four who had voted for Lincoln. This ticket was backed by the Missouri Democrat which had supported Lincoln and the Evening News which had supported Bell. It was of course also supported by the Republicans.

On the night of the twelfth, there was a great union meeting in which they took no part. 23 This meeting resulted

23 "It will be noticed, and we are very glad to be able to put it on record, that the Black Republicans did not participate in this meeting—that the leaders in a published handbill expressly advised their political friends and followers to refrain from taking any part in it, and this injunction was observed. We have a great deal more desire to show to the country that they took no action whatever in the matter than to acknowledge their cooperation in it. Let them slide." Missouri Republican, Jan. 13, 1861.

in the nomination of a full ticket, on February 4, called the Constitutional Union Ticket. This apparently had no connection with the ticket of that name in November, 1860. Two of the candidates on this ticket, Uriel Wright and Hamilton R. Gamble, both formerly Whigs and Bell-Everett men, were later, February 6, placed on the Citizens Unconditional Union Ticket. This meeting defined the issue as being for or against compromise.24

24 Ibid., Feb. 8, 1861. The substance of the article was, "Elect Mr. Blair and you elect a "No Compromise" ticket." "It means civil war and nothing else."

"True Blue Union Meeting
The Campaign Opened
No Secession! No Coercion!
How to preserve the Republic
Blair & Co. Exposed." Ibid., Feb. 9, 1861
The second ticket was supported by the Missouri Republican, a Democratic paper that had supported Douglas.

The third element in this struggle, those who believed in secession, conditional secession, or state rights, generally used the name States Rights or Anti-Submission Ticket. 25

---

25 "State Rights
(Picture of an eagle)
Anti-Submission Ticket
For the State Convention" Missouri Statesman, Feb. 22, 1861

The total vote in the state was about 140,000 and the majority for the Union men, both conditional and unconditional, was 80,000, that is, 110,000 to 30,000. 26 No authority has been found to claim the election of a single secessionist per se or of an abolitionist. The Citizens Unconditional Union ticket won in St. Louis by a majority of 5,000 in a total vote of 25,000. 27

---

26 Proceedings Mo. State Convention, June, 1863, p. 76

27 Snead, Thomas L., op. cit., p. 66.

W. L. Webb in his book, Battles and Biographies of Missourians, classifies the 99 members as follows: 52 unconditional union men and 47 who believed in secession under certain circumstances. Among the 99 members 88 were slaveholders. 28 There were only about 4 Republicans elected and
they were all from St. Louis. No Breckenridge Democrat was elected so far as is known. A very high percentage, especially of the leaders, had been Whigs and Bell-Everett men. The results of the election were very disappointing to the state officials and the members of the legislature who had urged the calling of the convention. 29

It is quite unanimously agreed that the convention was composed of an exceptionally able group of men, perhaps the ablest ever assembled in the state. Their average age was a little over 45 years. Their nativity was as follows: Virginia 29, Kentucky 30, Tennessee 9, North Carolina 3, Maryland 2, Alabama 1, District of Columbia 1, Missouri 13—the total from the slave states being 82; Illinois 2, Maine 1, New Hampshire 3, Pennsylvania 3, Ohio 1, New York 3, New Jersey 1—the total from the free states being 13; Prussia 1, Bremen 1, Austria, Ireland 1—the total foreign being 4. The principal occupations represented were: lawyers 45, farmers 25, merchants 11, judges 7, physicians 3. 30

No doubt the presence of so many lawyers in the convention was responsible for the numerous long speeches on the theory of
government in general and of our federal union in particular. These debates, exhaustive (alike to speaker and listener), resumes of the whole field of human endeavor, were replete with allusions, historical, mythological, literary and personal.

The State Convention, First Session, February 28-March 22, 1861

The convention met for its first session in Jefferson City, February 28, 1861. Sterling Price of Chariton, a Douglas Democrat and a brother-in-law of Governor Jackson, was chosen president by a vote of 7b to 1b over Nathaniel W. Watkins, a Whig and a Bell-Everett elector and a half-brother of Henry Clay. Price had been elected to the convention as a strong union man. Both he and Watkins later served in the southern army. Robert Wilson of Andrew, a well known Whig, was elected vice-president without opposition. 31


The first real contest in the convention came on the second day when the proposition, to require each member to take an oath to support the constitution of the United States and of the state of Missouri was adopted by a vote 65 to 30 but only after strong opposition. 32

32 Ibid., p. 12.

On the same day the convention adjourned to meet in St. Louis, March 4. The reasons assigned for making the change were, that, there was no convenient hall in Jefferson City,
the legislature being still in session there, that, the Mercantile Library of St. Louis had offered a suitable hall free of charge and that the railroad company had offered the delegates free transportation. 33 The real motive back of the

33 Proceedings, op. cit., p. 10.

move was, no doubt, the desire to be in an atmosphere more friendly to the Union.

On the same day, Luther J. Glenn, a commissioner from Georgia, arrived at Jefferson City for the purpose of asking Missouri to secede and join the Confederacy. He presented his credentials to Governor Jackson and that night he was serenaded by the secessionists to whom the governor introduced him as "the Hon. Mr. Glenn from our Southern sister State of Georgia, with whose interests Missouri is eternally identified," and to them he delivered a secession speech. 34

34 Peckham, James, op. cit., p. 89.

On the day following the governor notified the general assembly that the commissioner desired to confer with that body upon the subject of his mission. A joint resolution was rushed through within a few hours granting his request and appointing that same night, Saturday, March 2, for his address to the joint session. 35 Secession enthusiasm ran high in Jefferson City.

on these two days and nights. It probably never reached as high a point again.

On the following Monday, March 4, commissioner Glenn appeared in St. Louis and asked permission to address the convention. After a very spirited debate, the request was granted by a vote of 62 to 35. The burden of his speech was along the well-known lines of northern aggression on the constitutionally protected slave rights of the South. The speech was greeted with applause and hisses which the chairman suppressed with difficulty. 36


The next day, March 5, two important committees were appointed: the first, a committee of seven on federal relations, of which Hamilton R. Gamble was chairman; the second, a committee of seven to draft a reply to the speech of Mr. Glenn. John B. Henderson was chairman of the second committee. 37

37 Ibid., p. 30, 2b.

On the eighth of March, Dr. Linton of St. Louis introduced the following resolution: "Resolved, That the Inaugural Address of President Lincoln is one of peace, and not of war." A number of the members considered this a test issue and felt that the attitude of the people of Missouri would be determined by their action on it. A motion to table the resolution was laid on the table by a vote of 52 to 37. The issue was thus dodged.
Several members in explaining their votes said they thought it was a peace message but that a discussion of the matter would create trouble. On the following day, the convention decided without debate and with only one dissenting vote that the action of laying the motion, relative to Lincoln's address, on the table, was not to "be considered as any test whatever of the sense of the Convention relative to the sentiments enunciated in said resolution." 38

38 Ibid., pp. 46-53.

On the ninth of March, Gamble as chairman of the committee on federal relations, made the following report: 1. "Resolved, That at present there is no adequate cause to impel Missouri to dissolve her connection with the Federal Union, but on the contrary she will labor for such an adjustment of existing troubles as will secure the peace as well as the rights and equality of the States." 2. The second resolution was to the effect that the people of the state loved the Union and wanted peace and harmony restored. 3. The Crittenden resolutions were approved. 4. A national constitutional convention was proposed to be called in accordance with the ninth article of the federal constitution. 5. "Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, the employment of military force by the Federal Government to coerce the submission of the seceding States, to assail the Government of the United States, will inevitably plunge this country into civil war, and thereby
extinguish all hope of an amicable settlement of the fearful issues now pending before the country; we therefore earnestly entreat, as well the Federal Government as the seceding States, to withhold and stay the arm of military power and on no pretense whatever bring upon the nation the horrors of civil war." 6. Upon adjournment the convention should meet in Jefferson City, December, 1861. 7. The convention should elect a committee which should have the power of calling the convention together sooner if necessary. In the part of the report, preceding these resolutions, there appeared the statement that the North had abused the South, but the government itself had been fair. The report further stated, "In a military aspect, secession and a connection with a Southern Confederacy is annihilation for our State," and, in an economic sense it would mean the destruction of slavery. 39

39 Ibid., pp. 55-58.

The range of the debates on the various questions at issue embraced the origin, structure and object of the federal constitution, the rights of the states and of the people, secession, nullification and revolution.

One of the ablest men in the convention was Sample Orr of Green who had run for governor as a Constitutional Unionist in 1860. He was strongly opposed to permitting the commissioner from Georgia to address the convention. In his witty and sarcastic style he pointed out that some called this man a commissioner, others called him an ambassador. If he were an
ambassador, he missed the place; he should have gone to Washington City. If he were a commissioner from a sister state their oath forbade their forming an alliance with another state in the Confederacy, and in the course of his remarks, he said: "I do not believe, if they (the members) had told the people that they were coming here to haul down the stars and stripes and run up the Palmetto flag, that they intended to swap the American eagle for the pelican, that they had determined to barter off Yankee Doodle for the African song Dixie-I do not believe, if they had done this, that a solitary individual would have been elected." Later, when discussing the report of the committee on federal relations, he took the position that the seceded states were not and could not really be out of the Union. He was always ready to aid Lincoln in the discharge of any constitutional duty. He was firmly attached to the institution of slavery and believed that it had advanced this great government far ahead of what it otherwise would have been. Secession for Missouri would destroy all her slave property within one year's time. He further stated that the action of the convention was disappointing to those who called it into existence and consequently that they were now talking of repealing the law which created it. 40


James H. Birch of Clinton, an old line Whig, spoke long and frequently. He was, however, a strong Union man and looked upon the seceding states as erring sisters who were really not
out of the Union. He, perhaps, revealed his position best when he said that his son was studying for the university and he wanted him to graduate in the Madisonian school of "State Rights."
He denied the right of secession but recognized the right of revolution under certain circumstances. 41

41 Ibid., p. 41

Uriel Wright of St. Louis, another old line Whig, was well described as a "skillful performer on the organ of speech."
His main effort occupied the greater part of two days, in which he reviewed civilization from the time of Greece and Rome, thoroughly discussed the origin, nature and structure of our government and covered its whole history. He identified the Union with the Constitution and believed in neither coercion nor secession. His speech had little depth of thought; 42

42 Ibid., pp. 186-215.

he was what Disraeli called Gladstone, "a sophisticated rhetorician inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity."

E. K. Sayre of Lewis, an old line Whig and slave owner, a native of New Jersey and a graduate of Amherst college, took the position that the Union should be preserved but that force should not be used. He went on to say that the people of the seceded states were patriots and had "shown their love for their country to be as sincere and devoted as the love of country ever shown by any other people." He also strongly assail-
ed the North and the abolitionists.

John T. Redd of Marion introduced a resolution that Missouri was opposed to the doctrine of coercion and that in the event of an invasion of the South for the carrying out of such a doctrine Missouri would take her stand by the side of her Southern brethren. He considered Lincoln's inaugural a declaration of war against the institution of the South and involved the same doctrines employed by George III when he declared war against the colonies. 44

44 Ibid., p. 21,48.

Prince L. Hudgins of Andrew, an old line Whig, objected early in the session to taking the oath, prescribed by the convention for the members, on the ground that it would be taking the oath of a submissionist. Later, he declared that if he had any submission blood in him he would let it out of his veins. When the Union was dissolved, he was in favor of Missouri's going with the South. 45

45 Ibid., pp. 5,105

Samuel Breckenridge, an old line Whig from St. Louis, took a very decided stand against secession but thought the North might concede something on the slavery question. He denied any limitation on the federal government in the execution of its laws. 46

Isidor Bush of St. Louis, a Republican and a native of Austria, made the cleanest-cut, unconditional, union speech in the whole convention. In case of war he pledged himself and all the Germans to stand by the government and the Union. 47

47 Ibid., p. 244.

James H. Moss of Clay, an old line Whig, offered a resolution to the effect that Missouri would not countenance a seceding state in making war on the government nor furnish men and money to aid the government in coercing the seceding states. The resolution was voted down. He, however, did not believe in the right of secession. 48

48 Ibid., p. 61,180.

Hamilton B. Gamble of St. Louis, a Whig-American, as chairman of the committee on federal relations made a very able and dignified defense of the report. He wanted peace beyond all things else. 49

49 Ibid., pp. 178-180.

William A. Hall of Randolph, a Democrat and a native of Maine, made a logical defense of the government to execute its laws. 50

50 Ibid., pp. 75-76.
James McFerran of Davies, a native of Maryland, was the only one who stated, emphatically, that Missouri was a Western state. He also believed in her standing by the Union. 51

51 Ibid., pp. 82-83.

John B. Henderson of Pike, a Douglas Democrat, did not believe in secession. He made a very strong plea for the Union and described vividly what Missouri would lose by secession and yet he did not believe that the president of the United States had the right to use force in executing the laws. 52

52 Ibid., pp. 87-92.

James O. Broadhead of St. Louis, a former Whig who voted for Lincoln, emphatically affirmed the right of the government to execute its laws. He made the ablest presentation of the economic and geographic argument. The value of slave property was only one ninth of that of the state and it was engaged principally in raising hemp and tobacco. White labor must be depended upon to carry on her mining, manufacturing and commercial interests. Every able bodied newcomer was worth $2,000 to the state. He further said, "All these States (Eastern) want a communication through this State, and Missouri is the pathway through which they must travel; and they will have that pathway just as certain as we will have outlet to the ocean. And more than this, efforts have been made for the purpose of connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific Ocean, by means of
a railroad, in order that the wealth of the Indies may be poured into the lap of this country of ours. And Missouri stands in the pathway of nations: over her soil this pathway must run, just as inevitably as fate. And do you suppose that the accumulated interest of the East and West, and I may say of the world, will ever submit to have an interdict placed upon that pathway. I say, then, gentlemen of the Convention, that Missouri cannot go out of the Union if she would: and I think I know what I say when I speak it, that she has not the power to go out of the Union if she would." 53

53 Ibid., pp. 120-123.

When the convention met again on Monday, March 11, there was considerable excitement over an article in that morning's Republican entitled, "A Plot to Precipitate Missouri into Disunion Exposed." The gist of the alleged plot was that a group of secessionists considered the convention unsound and wanted to try to force secession. By a vote of 52-30 a committee was appointed to investigate the alleged plot. Two days later it reported that the conspiracy had fallen through and so the matter was dropped. 54

54 Ibid., pp. 59-61, 103-105.

This episode did not detain the convention long and as soon as the above committee was appointed, Redd introduced a minority report from the committee on the federal relations, signed by himself and Hough. This report took strong southern ground and called for a convention of slave-holding states
to propose amendments to the federal constitution to be presented to the free states for ratification or rejection. 55

55 Ibid., pp. 62, 64.

The debate on these reports raged furiously for about ten days. The vital issues were 1 and 5 of the majority report. The first was passed by a vote of 89 to 156 and the fifth, 56

56 Ibid., p. 216.

by a vote of 89 to 6. 57 It had, however, been amended by the addition of the following: "That it is the opinion of this Convention, that our cherished desire to preserve our country from the ruins of civil war and its devastating influences, and the restoration of harmony and fraternal feeling between the different sections, would be greatly promoted by the withdrawal of the Federal troops from such forts within the border of the seceding States, when there is danger of a collision between the State and Federal troops, and we recommend that policy." This was called the Shackelford amendment, from its author Thomas Shackelford, and was passed, March 20, by a vote of 54-to 39. 58 Although 39 voted against the amend-

58 Ibid., pp. 237, 246.
ment to the fifth resolution only 6 voted against the resolution in its final form. As the resolution then stood it really meant that the convention believed that co-ercion or the use of force by either side would mean civil war and it was hoped that this could be avoided by the withdrawal of federal troops from the seceded states. The question whether or not the national government had the right to use force was not raised. But, from their speeches, we can assume that the six men voting against the resolution were the only ones in the convention, at that time, who believed in the right of the national government to use force. These men were James O. Broadhead, Isidor Bush, Henry Hitchcock, John How, Hudson Bridge and Charles sitzen. The first five were from St. Louis and the sixth was from Gasconade. None were natives of Missouri. Two were born in Germany, one in New Hampshire, one in Pennsylvania, one in Virginia and one in Alabama. The two latter were lawyers; the other four were in business. At least four had voted for Lincoln. Ex-Governor Stewart, who had been absent the day the vote was taken, in a speech later distinctly claimed the right of the government to use force. 59

59 Ibid., p. 257.

The report of the committee, appointed to draft a reply to the speech of the commissioner from Georgia, came the next day, March 21. It disapproved of the constitutional right of secession and held that it would "be ruinous to the best interests of Missouri." The report at once met with strong opposition. It was first tabled, and next made the special
order of business for the third Monday of December next. 60

A committee of seven was appointed to attend a contemplated border state convention. Another committee of seven was appointed to call the convention together, if necessary, before the third Monday in December to which the convention adjourned, March 22, 1861. 61

Twenty-First General Assembly, called Session, May 2-15, 1861

Events moved rapidly in April. Early in the month the secessionists elected Daniel Taylor, a Bell-Everett man as mayor of St. Louis. Taylor had served in this capacity before and was quite popular. He was not known to be in accord with the secessionists, yet he was unfriendly to the Republicans. John How, the candidate of the Unconditional Union party, was defeated by 2,688 votes. His supporters were over confident. Taylor's vote cannot be taken as a true measure of the secession strength because he did not run on that issue. 62

A few days after the election, Governor Jackson, acting under the provisions of the new police law, appointed a board of police commissioners for St. Louis, which then elected a
chief of police. According to Snead a majority of this board were avowed secessionists. The great stake for which sides were now playing was the Federal arsenal in St. Louis and its immense military stores.

Captain Lyon was in command of the defenses of the arsenal and Major Hagner controlled the stores within the buildings.

As early as January 24, 1861, Brigadier-General David M. Frost, commander of the state militia of the first district, had written Governor Jackson that he had just visited Major William H. Bell, who was then in command at the arsenal, and had found him entirely satisfactory. Major Bell considered that Missouri had a right to claim the arsenal as being on her soil. When the proper time came, he agreed to surrender it to the duly accredited state authorities.

President Lincoln issued his call for troops on April 15. On the same day Frost advised Jackson as follows: 1. Convene
the general assembly at once. 2. Send an agent to the South to procure mortars and siege guns. 3. Prevent the garrisoning of the United States arsenal at Liberty. 4. Warn the people of Missouri that President Lincoln has acted illegally in calling out troops. 5. Authorize or command him (Frost) "to form a military camp of instruction at or near the City of St. Louis; to muster military companies into the service of the State; to erect batteries, and do all things necessary and proper to be done to maintain the peace, dignity, and sovereignty of the State." 6 Order Colonel Bowen to report with his command to him (Frost) for duty. 67

67 Ibid., pp. 147-149, complete text.

On the seventeenth, Governor Jackson replied to President Lincoln as follows: "... Your requisition, in my judgment, is illegal, unconstitutional, and revolutionary; in its objects inhuman and diabolical, and cannot be complied with. Not one man will the State of Missouri furnish to carry on such an unholy crusade." 68 Thereupon, Blair telegraphed Washington

68 Ibid., p. 102. complete text.

that he would raise immediately four regiments for active duty and urged their acceptance and the appointment of an officer to muster them into service. Barton Able went in person to Washington to further Blair's request. 69
The federal arsenal at Liberty had been captured by the secessionists, April 20, and the Unionists in St. Louis feared that the weapons secured there would be used in an attempt to seize the arsenal at St. Louis. In January, Lieutenant-

General Winfield Scott, commander-in-chief of the United States Army, transferred Major Bell to the East and placed Major Peter V. Hagner in command of the St. Louis arsenal. Major Hagner assumed command January 24, but Major Bell resigned rather than go east.

On January 31, Captain Nathaniel Lyon was ordered with his troops from Fort Scott, Kansas to the arsenal at St. Louis.

He and Blair at once became fast friends and co-workers. They both distrusted Major Hagner and began to work for his removal. Blair failed to get this done until after Lincoln's inauguration. Meanwhile, the secessionists were openly boasting
that if they carried the state in the election for convention delegates, February 18, they would seize the arsenal and equip the state guard. 74

74 Ibid., p. 126.

On March 13, an order was sent from Washington assigning Captain Lyon to the command of the troops and defenses of the arsenal. Major Hagner published the order, March 19, but still retained the position as commanding officer of the arsenal. 75

75 Peckham, op. cit., p. 69.

It must, moreover, be kept in mind that during all this time Brigadier-General William S. Harney was in command of the Department of the West with headquarters at St. Louis. 76

76 Snead, op. cit., p. 99.

General Harney also hampered Blair and Lyon in raising the four companies of volunteers which Governor Jackson had refused President Lincoln and which Blair had promised to raise. 77

77 Peckham, op. cit., pp. 107-111.

Blair was busy working for General Harney's removal. He appealed to Governor A. G. Curtin of Pennsylvania and his brother Montgomery, to use their influence for this purpose. 78
General Harney was relieved of his command April 21 and ordered to report to Washington. This he did on the twenty-third. Captain Lyon at once assumed supreme command and immediately enrolled and equipped the four companies so long desired. 79

On April 22, Governor Jackson issued a proclamation calling for a special session of the legislature to meet May 2 for the purpose of perfecting the organization and equipment of the state militia and of providing for the defense of the state. 80

He also ordered the state militia to assemble in their respective districts on May 3, to go into encampment for six days as provided by law. 81 In obedience to this order General Frost established Camp Jackson in the western part of St. Louis. 82

In his message to the legislature, the governor briefly reviewed the stock arguments of the state right doctrines, claimed a
similarity of social, political and other interests with the slave-holding states, and closed by urging a more efficient militia law. 83


While the legislature was wrangling over the governor's recommendations, the news came that Lyon had captured Camp Jackson. This event happened May 10. The Missouri State Guard bill, which had been stoutly opposed, was now passed in less than fifteen minutes. 84 The climax of abject terror, however, was reached late that night when the governor sent a message to each House stating that two regiments of Blair's troops were then on the way to the Capitol. 85

84 Switzler, op. cit., p. 31b.

85 Ibid., p. 315-516; Peckham, op. cit., pp. 165-167.

Under this double stimulus the following important bills were passed: 1. A major-general, to have entire command of the militia, was to be appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by the Senate. 2. Authority was given the governor to put down the rebellion in St. Louis and expel the invaders from other states. 3. The governor was empowered, at his discretion, to take possession, in the name of the state, of any or all of the railroads or telegraph lines within the state.
and to purchase foundries and other property and to perpetuate friendly relations with certain Indian tribes. 86


The effect of these laws was to make the governor an autocratic ruler of the state and the major-general a military dictator. Many loyal citizens joined the state guard thus created with no feeling of disloyalty toward the Union. Some withdrew when the state guard was merged with the regular Confederate army but many, unable to extricate themselves from an unforeseen difficult situation, were dragged on into open rebellion.

The Camp Jackson Aftermath

There is a very wide difference of opinion as to the effect of the capture of Camp Jackson. Some students of the subject hold that it was an outrage, a violation of the state rights of Missouri, and that it drove thousands into open secession. Others believe that its prompt and sudden execution nipped in the bud what might have been a very serious secession outbreak right in St. Louis and really saved Missouri for the Union from the military standpoint.

The incident probably did cause many to enroll in the state guard to protect, what they believed, was Missouri's constitutional rights. Even so staunch a Unionist as Switzler of the Missouri Statesman condemned it in very strong terms. Uriel Wright, from the steps of the Planter's House the night of the tenth, declared "if Unionism meant such atrocious deeds as had
been that day witnessed, he was no longer a Union man." 87

87 Scharf, John, History of St. Louis, p. 1480.

Back of this position there may have been some nativistic feeling. Unfortunately, a few bystanders were killed by the soldiers when a mob attacked the troops on the way back from the arsenal. The soldiers, however, did not return the fire until one of their number was first mortally wounded. The troops were practically all Germans. The secessionists were fond of likening themselves to the minute men of 1776 and the Germans of St. Louis to hired Hessians in Tory pay. No doubt many, especially in the Ozarks, went into the state guard and then into the Confederate army because of antipathy to foreigners on the Union side.

General Harney had not yet returned from Washington when the affair happened but he arrived the next day and issued a conciliatory proclamation. On the fourteenth he followed this with a second, even more significant in its statements, "It is with regret that I feel it my duty to call your attention to the recent act of the General Assembly of Missouri, known as the Military bill, which is the result no doubt, of the temporary excitement that now pervades the public mind. This bill cannot be regarded in any other light than an indirect secession ordinance, ignoring even the forms resorted to by other States. Manifestly its most material provisions are in conflict with the Constitution and the Laws of the United States. To this
extent it is a nullity, and cannot and ought not to be upheld or regarded by the good citizens of Missouri. ... It is right and proper for the people of Missouri to know that the main avenue of Camp Jackson, recently under command of General Frost, had the name of Davis and a principal street of the same camp that of Beauregard; ... No government in the world would be entitled to respect, that would tolerate for a moment such openly treasonable preparations." There were, however, many innocent men in the camp who were not aware of its treasonable character. 88

---

88 Le Grange National American, May 18, 1861.

Nevertheless, General Harney wanted peace and on the twenty-first signed with General Price, the famous Price-Harney agreement. Their common object was the restoration of "peace and good order to the people of the State in subordination to the laws of the General and the State Governments." Price agreed to direct the whole power of the state officers in maintaining order within the state. If this were done, Harney agreed to make no military movements which might otherwise create excitement and jealousies. 89 As the authorities at Washington did not approve this arrangement, Harney was soon relieved and Lyon put in his place. The agreement had also been a disappoint-
ment to many secessionists as it effectually tied their hands.90

90 Reynolds MSS.

Another very important interview was held June 11 between Lyon, Blair and Conant on one side and Price, Jackson and Snead on the other. Jackson came to St. Louis for this purpose under pledge of safe conduct. His proposition was to disband the state guard, break up its organization and make no attempt to carry out the militia bill, if the federal government would disarm the home guard and not station its troops in any new places. Lyon absolutely refused to do this and the conference broke up after six hours of fruitless discussion.

Jackson left for Jefferson City at once and ordered the railroad bridges to be burned behind him. The next day, he issued from the Capitol a proclamation calling for 80,000 men to repel invasion and protect the lives, liberty and property of the citizens of the state. He asserted that Missouri was still one of the United States and that the executive department of the state did not arrogate to itself the power to disturb that relation. That power, he continued, was in the convention which at the proper time would press the people's sovereign will. Meanwhile, the people should obey all constitutional requirements of the federal government but should also remember their first allegiance was due to their own state. 91

The governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary of state and many members of the legislature now fled from the capital. Troops under General Lyon and Colonel Blair occupied it the fifteenth and military operations began.

As the position of Lieutenant-Governor Reynolds has already been discussed, it will now be in order to consider the positions of Governor Jackson, Benjamin F. Massey, Secretary of State and Sterling Price, president of the state convention and later commander of the state guard. There seems no doubt that Governor Jackson had long believed in secession but when the critical time came, he was irresolute and hesitated. However, he probably would have taken action sooner if the state had been in a better condition of defense. On April 23, Jefferson Davis, in reply to the governor's request of the seventeenth, wrote that he approved the plan of attacking the arsenal and was sending guns and ammunition for that purpose. 92


On April 28, Jackson wrote to J. W. Tucker, editor of the Bulletin, that he had told Price to postpone calling the convention until the legislature could meet and arm the state. "I do not think Missouri should secede today or tomorrow, but I do not think it good policy that I should so disclose. I want a little time to arm the state.... Nothing should be said about the time or the manner in which Missouri should go out. That she ought to go, and will go at the proper time, I have no
doubt. She ought to have gone out last winter, when she could have seized the public arms and public property and defended herself." 93 On the nineteenth of April, Jackson had written to David Walker, president of the Arkansas convention: "From the beginning, my own conviction has been that the interest, duty and honor of every slave-holding State demand their separation from the Northern or non-slave-holding States..... I have been, from the beginning in favor of decided and prompt action on the part of the Southern States; but the majority of the people of Missouri, up to the present time, have differed with me. What their future action may be, no man with certainty can predict or foretell: but my present impression is, judging from the indications hourly occurring, that Missouri will be ready for secession in less than thirty days, and will secede if Arkansas will only get out of the way and give her a free passage." 95


95 Mo. Statesman, Aug. 2, 1861. The Tucker and the Walker letters were not made public until the Bulletin office was raided by federal troops July 14, 1861.

Benjamin F. Massey, while secretary of state, kept up a regular and frequent correspondence with Dr. J. F. Snyder, a leading Democratic politician of the state. Both were ardent secessionists. On April 26, he wrote Snyder that secession
was growing more popular every day. The important thing, he felt, was to hold it back until the people could be armed and had raised a "bully good crop". "The Missouri Republican as usual is doing all the harm it can.... It is probable Price will call the Convention shortly. He says he knows they would pass an ordinance of secession in a day, and but for that it would be called forthwith,... In the meantime you and "Old Abe" had better do what you can to keep the secession fever raging. Old Abe is some in that line sure-.

On the twenty-ninth, he writes Snyder that people have no further use for the convention. He doubts whether it would pass a secession ordinance. He does not want it to convene. The legislature can propose the ordinance and the people would ratify it. "A united north is fast making a united south, as those who are not with us will have to keep their mouths shut." By May 31, he had become quite pessimistic. In his letter to Snyder he questions whether it is worthwhile for Missouri to try to fight her way into the southern confederacy. "The long and short of it is in my estimation that a very decided majority of the governing influences are in favor of Missouri remaining with the old U. S. The policy of the state for the last 10 years has completely transformed the character of Missouri, and anything of a political character as a state she has done since that time proves it. Anyone familiar with the Missouri of 10 years since, can have no doubt what in an emergency like the present would have been her course, and I hate almost everything that has been done in that time, not alone because each in itself was wrong, but also
P. S. Get your house in order to live under Black Republicanism or emigrate—I shall leave, it may however be a year yet."96

Sterling Price, the third man now under consideration, had been, and still probably was, the most popular person in Missouri. He had won considerable fame as a general in the Mexican War. While governor of New Mexico in 1847 he had caused F. P. Blair, Jr. to be arrested. Blair seems never to have forgiven him, for, in 1857, when Price was governor of Missouri and Blair was a member of the legislature, he attacked Price in a very bitter speech. Previous to 1862, Price was a staunch supporter of Benton. In that year Benton entrusted his campaign more than ever to the Blairs. Price then deserted Benton. It is alleged that his feud with the Blairs was one cause of his taking the southern side in 1861. 97

When Price became a Union candidate for the convention, the southern rights senators at Jefferson City were amazed. He was bank commissioner at the time. According to Reynolds, "The 'money power' now perfectly secure, was exercised against the southern rights party: the example of Governor Price,
considered most sagacious in discovering the winning side in Missouri politics, was followed by others: both causes contributed most powerfully towards the overwhelming triumph of the 'conditional unionists' in the convention election. It is evident that neither side knew just where to place Price. On March 4, 1861, the Democrat, a Republican paper, printed the following: "We will not be accused of having had any irrepressible liking for Sterling Price, but his fidelity to the Union, of which we are well advised, obliterates the past so far as we are concerned."

Toward the last of the first session of the convention, March 19, Price voted in favor of a resolution that if the North did not settle the slavery question in a satisfactory manner and that if the other border slave states should secede, Missouri would do likewise. That night, he told Thomas Shackelford that war was inevitable and that he was a military man, a Southerner and would fight on the side of the South.

Reynolds claims, "General Price was driven by the blundering arrogance of Lyon into resistance to the United States Government." And May 20, 1861 Allen P. Richardson wrote
from Jefferson City to Broadhead, "I am convinced Sterling Price is a rebel, flattering his vanity by the appointment as commander-in-chief of Missouri Militia has turned his Unionism bottom upward. 101

Reynolds states that he urged Jackson, under the "rebellion act" to appoint Price commander-in-chief of the state forces to suppress the revolt begun by Lyon and Blair in St. Louis. This was soon after May 10. Jackson hesitated to make the appointment, and after it was made, Price hesitated to accept it. His reluctance was overcome only by the request of Robert Wilson, acting at Reynolds' suggestion. 102

Whatever may have been his motives, Price went from command of the state troops into the confederate service and was affectionately known by his men as "Pap" Price. There can also be no doubt that his going over to the southern cause influenced many others to do likewise.

The State Convention, Second Session, July 22-31, 1861

On the sixth of July 1861, a majority of the committee,
appointed in March for the purpose of calling the convention if necessary, issued a summons for it to meet July 22. The first act of the convention was to declare the office of president vacant and then to elect Rovert Wilson president and Aikeman Welch vice-president, both old line Whigs. A committee of seven was then appointed to consider the present condition of public affairs in Missouri. 103

This committee reported that the offices of governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary of state and all members of the general assembly be declared vacant and that the convention should fill the first three. The people should elect successors to the three on the first Monday in August 1862. The supreme court was to be increased from three to seven members and the governor, to be selected by the convention, was to appoint the four additional members who were to serve until their successors were elected in August 1862. And finally, the people at this time should vote whether or not the change in the judiciary should become a part of the constitution. 104

Immediately after this report was read, it was ordered to be printed and made the special order of business for the next day. Hamilton R. Gamble was then added to the committee as an eighth member. 105 Four days later, July 29, the com-
committee gave an amended report which would change the elections from August 1861 to November 1861 and which added a section that would submit the whole action of the convention to the people. This move alarmed some of the unconditional Unionists. 106

106 Ibid., pp. 17-18.
Gamble was recognized as one of the leading men in the convention and his adhesion to the Union was considered essential. Samuel T. Glover, a prominent and ardent Unionist of St. Louis, wrote to Broadhead on July 28.

"Why did you recomit the report and lose so much time. I like the report very well as it is--don't want any election in November nor till August 1862. You must be polite to Gamble, put him on the committee give him praises--magnify him into importance and then like as not encounter his opposition--What a windfall it was that Judge Gamble came to the convention. It would have been utterly impossible to have got along without him. My friend push your business through, much delay may ruin us." The next day, after reading the amended report, Glover wrote Broadhead in a different vein. "I am not disappointed merely but pained at the action of the convention.... In this way the relations of Missouri to the Union is to be balloted upon! I that these were the points we could not yield--I that we intended to fight over there no matter what the people said. Is this not Gambler's work? The course now proposed is a virtual submission of the secession question to the people--should the vote be against us we are all ruined. How in the name of God could you consent to such miserable giving up or the constitution or the United States? Put it to a vote!! God damn it don't you know how to vote no--Are you obliged to take anything because you can't get ye own--I have no good opinion now or the action of ye body--it will probably do harm and not good.

Yrs truly

S. T. Glover

I feared when you got Gambler on that committee trouble would come--how afraid you all are of him."

The original of these letters is in the Broadhead Papers in the Library of the Mo. Hist. Soc., St. Louis.

The main question thus raised by the report was the extent of the powers of the convention. The next question was whether
the action of the convention, provided it took positive action, should be submitted to the people.

Dunn of Ray county and Woodson of Boone wanted the federal government to recognize the southern confederacy and to allow each state to make her choice of allegiance.

Uriel Wright could see little good in anything. The Union was lost; there was no constitution and no government. Abe Lincoln was a usurper and Frank Blair was an assassin. Lincoln and Jackson were traitors and he did not care if both were killed. 107

107 Ibid., pp. 20, 38, 10, 54, 84.

Sample Orr did not like the administration; he thought both Lincoln and Jackson ought to be hung. Nevertheless, he believed firmly in the Union and in the power of the convention to do whatever it wanted to do. 108

108 Ibid., pp. 84-85

E. K. Sayre of Lewis believed the actions of the United States troops in Missouri were unconstitutional although he did not deny their right to be there. He was opposed to secession in all its phases. He held that an office was property and that the convention had no right to deprive a man of it.109

109 Ibid., pp. 81-83.
James H. Birch took the position that the action of the convention in annulling the various military laws of the last session of the legislature would cause many of Jackson's army to return home. Then the federal troops should also be withdrawn. He, however, recognized the right of the federal government to maintain troops in Missouri and he held that the governor's opposition to them was treason. 110

110 Ibid., pp. 69-72.

Gamble believed strongly in the power of the convention to do all the things proposed. He was also firmly attached to the Union without conditions. He did not think their action needed to be referred to the people. 111

111 Ibid., pp. 73-76.

Ex-Governor Robert M. Stewart of Buchanan took the position as in the first session that the convention was virtually the people collected in their sovereign capacity. 112 Ibid., pp.

112 Ibid., pp. 24, 46, 68.

The resolution to declare the first three state offices vacant was carried by a vote of 56 to 28. The offices of the members of the state legislature were vacated by a vote of 62 to 28. The first Monday in November 1861 was set for the election of the above officers. The ordinance to submit the action of the convention to the people was adopted unanimously. 113
Hamilton R. Gamble was then elected provisional governor by a vote of 68 to 0. Twenty-one were absent and 8 were excused from voting. 114

This vote attests the popularity of Gamble. The refusal of the eight to vote was not through objection to him but a protest against the assumption of power by the convention.

Willard P. Hall of Buchanan, a Democrat, was then elected lieutenant-governor by a vote of 63 to 0. Twelve were excused from voting. Mordecai Oliver of Springfield, an old line Whig, who had been a Democrat for a few years, was elected secretary of state. 115

After the voting was over, Howell requested permission to record his vote for Hall. Woodson and Long wanted to vote for all three. 116 The convention adjourned to meet in December 20, 1861.

If the secessionists had entertained any lingering hope
that the convention would pass an ordinance of secession, it was now dispelled forever. The convention had gone even further. It had denounced the doctrine of secession as unconstitutional. It had also removed practically the entire set of state officers and had taken, into its own hands, complete control of the government.

One of the last acts of the convention was to submit a general statement to the people of Missouri, reviewing the disloyal performances of the Jackson government, calling particular attention to the Walker and Tucker letters, and explaining and justifying the expulsion of that government and the creation of a new one.

On August 1, Gamble and Hall delivered their inaugural addresses in Jefferson City. On the third, Gamble issued a proclamation to the people of Missouri in which he stated that certain unjust practices of the militia would be stopped and further that any men now remaining in arms under Jackson's Proclamation of June 12 would be considered as enemies; if, however, they would come in and surrender they would be pardoned. 117


The State Convention, Third Session, October 10-19, 1861

On September 21, 1861, Governor Gamble issued a call for the state convention to meet in St. Louis October 10. 118
It met at the time designated. In his message to this body he stated that its main reasons for coming together were to adopt a more simple and efficient military law; to provide money for running the government, as the treasury was practically empty, and to consider whether or not the state elections, set for November, 1861, should be postponed. 119

During the three preceding months, there had been considerable fighting both of a regular and of a guerilla nature; the general situation was bad. This was reflected in the fact that only about half of the members of the convention were in attendance.

The elections were postponed to the first Monday in August, 1862 by a vote of 49 to 1. 120 Full provision was made for the

Missouri state militia. All able-bodied, free, white, male inhabitants of the state between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years were liable to service in the militia. 121
A great number of state offices were abolished to save expense and bonds were authorized to meet necessary obligations.

One significant act was passed October 16. This was the "test oath". Every civil officer in the state was required to take an oath to support the constitution of the United States and of Missouri and not to take up arms against the government of the United States nor the provisional government of Missouri. The office of any person failing to do this should be declared vacant. This act had also an amnesty feature whereby any person taking the oath, within ten days after receiving notice of the passage of the same and within fifty days of its passage, should be exempt from arrest or punishment for having espoused the secession cause. 122

122 Ibid., pp. 15-16. The four points mentioned were all in one ordinance entitled, "An ordinance providing for abolishing certain offices, reducing salaries and testing the loyalty of civil officers, and offering amnesty to certain persons on certain conditions."

The speeches in this session were few and comparatively short. The attitude of certain leaders, however, will be summarized. Judge Birch believed firmly in the power of the Union and was opposed to secession. Yet he was also a staunch defender of slavery, declaring, "If by any future possibility, assumption, or misadventure, the controversy shall degenerate on the part of that Government even in the direction of negro equality, or negro emancipation, or even negro insecurity, I will be amongst the first and the loudest to denounce, and
contribute to overthrow it. 123 Uriel Wright was very bitter


against limitations on freedom of speech and of the press, the suspension of the habeas corpus, and the declaration of martial law. His lamentation in his own words was, "the contest for ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of Executive power." 124 Soon after, Wright went over to the side of an-

124 Ibid., pp. 21-31.

other "Lost Cause". One of the ablest replies to Wright's speeches was given by Henry Hitchcock of St. Louis, the substance of which was, "no man can be loyal to the Constitution without being loyal to the Government which is formed under that Constitution." 125 This, he continued, did not require

125 Ibid., p. 48.

either admiration or approval of every act of every officer of that government. Aikeman Welch reviewed in an able and thorough manner the disloyal activities of Governor Jackson and the state legislature in 1861. 126 Philip Pipkin contended that

126 Ibid., pp. 60-62

the action of the convention in July, Governor Gamble's call
for troops, and General Fremont's emancipation order had all tended to drive men into Price's army. He also introduced a resolution denouncing the use of force by the general government against the seceded states. 127 Sample Orr again vigorously defended the government and attacked Wright quite heatedly. 128 Ex-Governor Stewart likewise defended the actions of the government and in so doing became involved in a bitter altercation with Prince L. Hudgins who savagely condemned those actions. 129 The convention adjourned sine die October 19.

127 Ibid., pp. 68-69.
128 Ibid., pp. 84-91.
129 Ibid., pp. 50-59.

The Jackson-Reynolds Secession Government

On August 5, 1861, the deposed Governor Jackson issued at New Madrid his so-called "Declaration of Independence of Missouri". After reviewing the compact theory of government and the alleged usurpations of the Lincoln administration, he quoted the act of May 10, 1861, "an act to authorize the Governor of the State of Missouri to suppress rebellion and repel invasion," and declared that by virtue of that authority the political connection existing between Missouri and the
United States of America was totally dissolved and the state of Missouri as a sovereign, free and independent republic, had full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract allegiance, establish commerce and perform all other acts which independent states may of right do. 130

130 Moore's Rebellion Record, Vol. II, doc. 163

On September 26, 1861, Jackson, at Lexington, appointed E. C. Cabell and Thomas L. Snead, commissioners from Missouri to make a treaty with the confederacy. 131 On the same day, he issued a proclamation convening the general assembly in extra session at Neosho, Newton county, October 21.

131 Rebellion Records, S. I. Vol. LIII, pp. 751-75

On the authority of Isaac N. Shambaugh, a representative from De Kalb who was present, there were 39 members of the House and 10 of the Senate in attendance. A quorum required 67 and 17 members respectively. 132 On October 28, this rump legislature passed an ordinance of secession and an act ratifying the constitution of the provisional government of the Confederate States of America. 133 Only Shambaugh in the House and Charles H. Hardin of Callaway in the Senate voted against the secession ordinance. The legislature then adjourned to

132 Missouri Republican, Jan. 26, 1866.

133 Rebellion Records, op. cit., pp. 752-753.
meet at Cassville, Barry county, October 31, 1861.

On the very same day, Cabell and Snead for Missouri and R. M. T. Hunter for the Confederacy signed a convention between the two "powers" which formed an offensive and defensive alliance during the existence of the war or until Missouri was admitted into the confederacy. This was done November 28, 1861. 134

134 Rebellion Records, op. cit., pp. 751-768

The session at Cassville lasted from October 31 to November 7 and adjourned to meet at New Madrid the first Monday in March, 1862. This meeting was never held.

Beginning with the Cassville session and continuing throughout the war, Missouri maintained a full delegation of representatives and senators at the Confederate capitol. Of course none of them was ever constitutionally elected or appointed. The former were often elected by Missouri soldiers in the field and the latter were appointed by the governor. After Jackson's death in Arkansas in 1862, Reynolds assumed his position, and so late as January, 1864, he appointed Uriel Wright as senator to succeed R. L. Y. Peyton deceased. John B. Clark and R. L. Y. Peyton had been elected senators at Cassville.
Chapter IV
The Struggle for Emancipation

Fremont forces the Issue

So far as political action was concerned, Missouri stayed in the Union, and mainly, from economic motives. The men largely responsible for this result were conservative slaveholders who were thoroughly convinced that secession, whether successful or not, meant the death of slavery in the state. These slave owners, however, were ably assisted by a very small number of Republicans and Germans.

Hamilton R. Gamble, the provisional governor, was a typical representative of this conservative element: firmly attached to the Union, supporting the Lincoln administration but rejecting its doctrines, as lenient as possible toward southern sympathizers and staunchly defending the institution of slavery. Such was the situation before the issue of emancipation was raised.

The man who raised the emancipation issue in Missouri and also in the nation was General John C. Fremont. In June, 1861, Missouri had been detached from the Department of the West and attached to the Department of the Ohio, commanded by General George B. McClellan. This had been done on the advice of General Winfield Scott, commander-in-chief of the army of the United States, and through the solicitation of
Attorney-General Edward Bates, Judge Hamilton R. Gamble (Bates and Gamble were brothers-in-law) and others who did not like Francis P. Blair, Jr. and Colonel Nathaniel Lyon. The Blair brothers, Montgomery and Francis, tried hard to have Lyon reinstated but failed. They succeeded, however, in getting a new department created, the Western Department, with St. Louis as headquarters and Fremont as commander.

Fremont took command July 25, 1861. On the tenth of August, Captain Lyon attacked the combined forces of the Missouri state guard, under General Sterling Price, and the regular Confederate troops, under General Benjamin McCulloch, at Wilson's Creek in southwestern Missouri. In the engagement Lyon was killed and his army forced to retreat. This invasion of the southwest had accomplished, however, the very important result of permitting the state convention to meet in safety and provide for Missouri's stand for the Union.

General Fremont was severely criticized for not having re-inforced Captain Lyon. If Lyon had been properly supported, the entire state might soon have been cleared of the enemy in the opinion of these critics. Fremont, however, thought the defense of Cairo was more important. He was also quite
inaccessible and maintained an imposing bodyguard of foreigners. Soon after the battle of Wilson's Creek, Blair and General John M. Schofield called on Fremont at his St. Louis headquarters. The evidences of Fremont's dilatoriness were so obvious that Blair went away greatly disappointed. The whole Blair family now turned against Fremont for general inefficiency and did not conceal their opposition to him. 2 In fact, F. P. Blair, Jr. went so far as to criticize Fremont in the public press. For this act Fremont had him arrested. This episode was the beginning of a feud which had important and far-reaching results, both state and national.

Possibly, Fremont might have weathered this storm if he had not antagonized President Lincoln by the issuance of his proclamation of August 30, 1861 which precipitated the emancipation issue into both state and national politics.

Several points are here selected from that famous document. Martial law was proclaimed throughout the state: all persons taken in arms within the lines of army occupation were to be court-martialed and shot if guilty. "Real and personal property of those who shall take up arms against the United States, or who shall be directly proven to have taken an active part with their enemies in the field, is declared confiscated to public use, and their slaves, if any they have,
are hereby declared free men. 3

In reply to this proclamation, Brigadier-General Jeff. Thomson, commanding the Missouri state guard of the First District, issued the following pronunciamento: "... for every member of the Missouri State Guard, or soldier of our allies, the armies of the Confederate States, who shall be put to death in pursuance of the said order of General Fremont, I will hang, draw, and quarter a minion of said Abraham Lincoln." Ibid., p. 59. doc. 24.

Lincoln wrote Fremont, September 2, 1861, that he should not shoot any man under the proclamation without first having the president's approbation or consent and also asked him to modify that part dealing with the liberation of slaves. 4


Fremont replied to this on the eighth defending his position but he asked Lincoln to direct him to modify the order if he still objected to it. This Lincoln did on the eleventh. 5

5 Ibid., pp. 418-420.

According to Nicolay and Hay the whole affair was a political maneuver to recover prestige lost through the disaster to Lyon. 6 Lincoln's opinion was expressed in a

6 Ibid., p. 417.
22, 1861. "General Fremont's proclamation, as to confiscation of property, and the liberation of slaves, is purely political and not within the range of military law or necessity." 7

7 Ibid., p. 421.

In this same letter he says: "The Kentucky Legislature would not budge till that proclamation was modified; and General Anderson telegraphed me that on the news of General Fremont's having actually issued deeds of manumission, a whole company of our volunteers threw down their arms and disbanded.... I think to lose Kentucky is nearly the same as to lose the whole game. Kentucky gone, we cannot hold Missouri, nor, as I think, Maryland." 8

8 Ibid., p. 422.

On the first of November, 1861, Fremont signed an agreement with Price that no arrests should be made in Missouri on account of political opinion or for the merely private expression of the same. All armed bodies of men acting without authority from either side were ordered to disband. 9

9 American Annual Cyclopædia, 1861, p. 493.

On the following day, Fremont was relieved of his command and General David Hunter put in his place. Hunter repudiated the Fremont-Price agreement on the seventh. The
order for relieving Fremont had been written October 24. Rumor, for some time, previous, had reported that he was to be relieved or that it was actually done. The first report of his removal aroused a tremendous storm of disapproval. The removal itself redoubled the fury of the tempest. As far back as the Mexican War, Fremont had captured the popular fancy by his daring exploits in the far West. He had capitalized and increased this popularity in the campaign of 1856 when the slogan "Free soil, Free men, Fremont" had fired the idealism of the new and enthusiastic Republican party.

George Hoadly, a member of Chase's law firm and later governor of Ohio, wrote Secretary Salmon P. Chase from Cincinnati, September 8, that the people were furious against Lincoln for his treatment of Fremont and quoted a political friend as saying that he would go to St. Louis to urge Fremont not to resign but to set the administration at defiance. Hoadly further went on to say that he had heard even "Conservative" men advocate the impeachment of Lincoln and the formation of a new party to carry on the war irrespective of the president and under Fremont. 10 B. R. Plumly wrote Chase


from the Headquarters of the Western Department at St. Louis, October 9, that the report of Fremont's rumored removal had stirred up the greatest popular commotion that he had known
there in thirty years. "Had the report been true," he said, "the army would have been virtually disbanded. I am sure that Col. Blair would have been killed in the street. I think that will be the end of him, sooner or later—so fearful is the hostility to him. A few powerful and active men sustain him, and what is singular, they have been heretofore his most active enemies,—beyond these he is friendless and powerless." 11

On the other hand, E. B. Washbourne, a member of Congress, wrote Chase from Cairo, Illinois, October 31 (he had been in St. Louis the day before): "Fremont has really set up an authority over the Govt. and bids defiance to its commands." 12

On November 7, 1861, Richard Smith, editor and owner of the Cincinnati Gazette, wrote Chase in alarm as follows: "Is it known to the Administration that the West is threatened with a revolution?... Why is it that it would not be safe to go into places where the Germans resort and publicly express an opinion favorable to the President?... Fremont.... is now so far as the West is concerned, the most popular man in the country. He is to the West what Napoleon was to France: while the President has lost the confidence of the people." 13

11 Ibid., p. 505.

12 Ibid., pp. 507-508.

13 Ibid., pp. 508-509.
Sometime in September, 1861, Mrs. Fremont sought an interview at midnight with President Lincoln. About two years later, Lincoln, referring to the episode, remarked to friends, "she more than once intimated that if General Fremont should conclude to try conclusions with me, he could set up for himself." In turn, one of the group observed, "It is pretty clearly proven that Fremont had at that time concluded that the Union was definitely destroyed, and that he should set up an independent government as soon as he took Memphis and organized his army." 14 John G. Nicolay left in his papers a sealed envelope endorsed, "A private paper, Conversation with the President, October 2, 1861." The first item was "Fremont ready to rebel." 15

14 Rhodes, J. F., History of the Civil War 1861-1865, p. 54.

a sealed envelope endorsed, "A private paper, Conversation with the President, October 2, 1861." The first item was "Fremont ready to rebel." 15

15 Nicolay, Helen N., Personal Traits of Abraham Lincoln, p. 177.

Fremont bade farewell to his troops, November 2, and reached St. Louis, November 8, where he was given an enthusiastic welcome. A great mass meeting of Germans was held in his honor and a set of resolutions presented to him. The last of these resolutions was as follows: "That while we submit to the action of the Government, as behooves loyal citizens, we regret to be deprived at the present moment of his services in conquering the rebel enemy, and believe we
recognize in this event a wise Providence, which may have reserved him for a still wider sphere of action an future times." 16

On the following day, there was a large mass meeting of German-Americans in Chicago which endorsed Fremont and stated that it had "lost all confidence" in the administration because of his removal. It adjourned cheering Fremont as the next president of the United States." 17

Fremont, during all this time, had the support of three distinct elements: 1. A large number of officers to whom he had given irregular commissions; 2 the Germans of Missouri who formed the nucleus of the radical faction and whose cause he had espoused; 3 men of strong anti-slavery convictions all over the Union who approved of his emancipation act. 18

The important political result of this whole matter was to divide the Unionists of Missouri into Radicals and Conservatives. Nationally, it laid the foundation for Fremont's candidacy in 1864. Blair seemed to be heading the conservative wing and his cousin B. Gratz Brown, the radical. Blair
was losing his following among the Germans. 19

19 Westliche Post, April 24, 1862, quoted in the Republican, April 28, 1862. "Mr. Frank P. Blair, the renegade, has endeavored on many occasions, in congress, to impeach the course of Gen. Fremont.... Mr. F. P. Blair, where would you now be, had not the Germans, (abolitionists and thieves, as we are being called by the Republican) in those days of sorrow (Camp Jackson) taken up arms for the government?"

As there were various changes in party names during the war period a brief sketch will here be given. From the election of Lincoln in 1860 until after the Baltimore convention, June, 1864, there was no organized Democratic party in Missouri. It will be recalled that there were four parties in the field in 1860: Republican, constitutional Union, Douglas Democratic and Breckenridge Democratic. From the nature of the circumstances which called them into being these four names could not endure. It was likewise improbable that four parties would continue to exist.

In the election of delegates to the state convention in 1861 all previously known were purposely dropped. There was no uniformity about the wording of the tickets actually used. The three elements participating were generally designated as Unconditional Unionists, Constitutional or Conditional Unionists and State Rights men or Anti-Submissionists. The turn of events eliminated the last group politically.

From the election of the convention delegates, February 18, 1861, until Fremont's proclamation, August 30, 1861, any
one who took a stand at all was known as a Unionist. The proclamation served to divide the Union party into Radicals and Conservatives. The former believed in emancipation while the latter did not. By the fall of 1862, the Radicals were divided into two factions the Charcoals, who wanted immediate emancipation, and the Claybanks, who wanted gradual emancipation. Many of the Conservatives came to this latter position. The Conservatives in St. Louis, however, who never favored emancipation in any form, were known as Chocolates. In the Congressional elections of 1862, in St. Louis, the three parties put separate tickets into the field. But generally in state and national elections during 1862 and 1863 the two opposing parties were known as Radicals and Conservatives and officially returned as such.

The party names, Republican and Democratic, cannot properly be used again before 1864. The Radicals and Conservatives sent rival delegations to the National Union Convention at Baltimore, June 1864. The former were pledged to Ulysses S. Grant and the latter to President Lincoln. The latter were refused admission and immediately upon returning home were instrumental in reorganizing the old Democratic party. It is probable that if the Radicals instead of the Conservatives had been rejected at Baltimore that there would have been no Democratic ticket in the field in Missouri in 1864 and that Fremont's candidacy would have attained more serious proportions.
Compensated Emancipation

In his message to Congress March 6, 1862, Lincoln recommended, "That the United States ought to cooperate with any State which may adopt gradual abolishment of slavery, giving to such State pecuniary aid, to be used by such State in its discretion, to compensate for the inconveniences, public and private, produced by such change of system. 20 Congress passed such a resolution and Lincoln signed it April 10, 1862.

On the same day, he invited the border state members of Congress to the White House for a conference on his plan of gradual compensated emancipation. Only two of the Missourians approved the plan, Senator John B. Henderson and Representative Hohn W. Noell. Francis p. Blair, Jr. favored it but was not present. 21 The Missouri state convention, which met again in June, 1862, failed to pass any kind of an emancipation measure. On July 12, Lincoln held another conference at which he read a written appeal asking them to help him adopt his policy. Twenty of those present sent a reply two days later in which they affirmed their loyalty but opposed his pay-for-slaves policy. The Missourians signing

this paper were Senator Robert Wilson and Representatives James S. Rollins, William A. Hall, Thomas L. Price and John S. Phelps. Henderson and they promised the president that they would make this question the political issue in Missouri.22

22 Ibid., p. 83.

It became so in November, 1862 and the emancipationists elected six out of nine congressmen and a majority in both branches of the state legislature. In December, Henderson and Noell introduced bills, in their respective Houses, offering $20,000,000 and $10,000,000 respectively to loyal slave owners in Missouri. Although these bills passed, the resultant compromise measure was delayed so late in the session that a small minority prevented its coming to a vote. In this minority were William A. Hall, E. H. Norton and Thomas L. Price all of Missouri. The matter ended there. 23

23 Ibid., p. 85.

A clause in the Missouri constitution of 1820 prohibited the state legislature freeing slaves without the consent of their owners and also without payment to the owners of the full value of slaves so liberated. Since the slave owners of Missouri claimed that their slaves were worth $100,000,000, the state was too poor, even with the proposed federal aid, to raise any such sum. The slave owners seemed unable to realize that slavery, under any circumstances, was doomed
and that, therefore, any money received then for their slaves really meant so much net gain.

Meanwhile, emancipation societies were spreading over the state intending to force the issue in the August elections. These groups headed up in one called the General Emancipation Society of the State of Missouri. In St. Louis it was composed largely of Germans. 24 The climax of the movement came

24 Missouri Republican, May 1, 6, 1862.

June 16, 1862 when an abolition convention was held in Jefferson City. The call for this Emancipation Convention appeared in the Democrat and was signed by B. Gratz Brown, Chairman of the State Central Committee and nine others. The purpose was to nominate a full ticket for the August elections. According to the Republican none of these were slave owners and the whole convention represented only 200 slaves and $2,000 in taxes. There were about 200 delegates present from about 25 counties. Blair did not approve this convention. Brown and the Germans were in control and the whole affair, in the eyes of the Republican, meant a revival of the Black Republican party. 25 The convention went on record as favor-

25 Ibid., May 21, June 17, 20, 23, 1862. The Republicans were usually referred to by their enemies as Black Republicans. Early in 1861 they had dropped their name entirely in order to merge with the Unconditional Unionists.
In July, the state convention at its fourth session, postponed the August elections to 1864. This change in addition to Lincoln's preliminary emancipation proclamation in September gave a new turn to events and a new direction to the work of the emancipationists.

The State Convention, Fourth Session, June 2-14, 1862

On April 28, 1862, Governor Gamble issued a call for the state convention to meet in Jefferson City, June, 2. The purpose of this session, as expressed in the call, was to divide the state into congressional districts and to transact other necessary business.

In his message of the convention he reviewed the past political and military events in the state. In this survey he rather sharply criticized certain federal troops within the state. Their misconduct, in his opinion, was due largely to their hostility to the people and the institutions of the state. As a result of this feeling on his part, which was shared by the conservatives in general, he had made a special arrangement with President Lincoln by which the federal government advanced Missouri various sums of money with which
to pay the state militia. Furthermore, the major-general of the department was also to be commissioned by the governor as major-general of the state militia. At that time General Henry W. Halleck held this double position. The immediate command in Missouri, however, was turned over to Brigadier-General John M. Schofield who likewise exercised this two fold function. 28 This peculiar arrangement was a fruitful source of trouble. The point in controversy was over the appointment of new officers in case of vacancies. The radicals accused the governor of trying to eliminate the anti-slavery officers and the conservatives, in turn, accused the radicals of wanting officers who would make their slave property unsafe.

The governor, finally in concluding his message, submitted to the convention for its consideration whether or not it should postpone the August elections and require an oath or loyalty from all voters. 29

On the fifth day of the session, June 6, Sterling Price, Robert W. Crawford, V. B. Hill, Uriel Wright and W. W. Turner were expelled from their seats in the convention on the charge of disloyalty. The seats of John R. Chenault, Robert A. Hatcher and Nathaniel W. Watkins were declared vacant on
account of absence from the state. This action was taken unanimously. 30


The convention, at this session, divided the state into nine congressional districts, repealed a previous ordinance which would have submitted the act of the convention to the people, continued the present state officers until 1864, and amended the constitution so that all state officers should be elected in November instead of in August. 31

31 Ibid., pp. 3-22.

The really important measures were the second and third. The state was in such a disturbed condition that the convention did not believe a fair election could be held. There was also so much sympathy for the southern cause that the provisional government was unwilling to subject its tenure of office to the will of the electorate.

There were two main controversial issues before the convention: emancipation and the test oath. In reality they were two sides of the same issue. The conservatives, who now controlled the state, were placed in a dilemma. The rising tide of radicalism or abolitionism was threatening the institution of slavery and impeaching the loyalty of its defenders. A test oath might help to acquit them of the charge
of disloyalty, but, on the other hand, it would decrease their strength at the polls and thereby give the radicals an opportunity to gain control of the machinery of government. The governor, lieutenant-governor, the two national senators, at least one representative and a number of state and federal officers, civil and military were still members of the convention and practically every civil officer in the state was subject to removal by some of these members. Thus, a small group of conservatives exercised both legislative and executive functions and held, in their own hands, complete administrative powers.

An emancipation ordinance was introduced by Samuel Breckenridge of St. Louis. It provided, "That all negroes and mulattoes who shall be born in slavery in this state, from and after the first day of January, A.D. 1865, shall be deemed and considered slaves until they shall arrive at the age of twenty-five years, and no longer, unless sooner permanently removed from the State. Provided always, that it shall be the duty of the General Assembly... to provide by law for the payment to the owners of those negroes and mulattoes who would but for this ordinance have been born slaves for life, a full equivalent for their value at the expiration of their term of service, and also to provide by law for their removal to such place or places beyond the limits of this State... of such persons as they arrive at the age of twenty-five years...." It stated also that Missouri would accept the financial aid, in accordance with the president's
resolution, passed by Congress April, 1862. 32

Breckenridge defended his proposition in a long and able speech, in which he insisted that slavery was already doomed in Missouri and that if this measure were adopted it would steal the radicals' thunder; if it were not adopted, their thunder would be accompanied by lightning which would do the state much harm. 33

A typical position of the majority was expressed by George W. Zimmerman who "offered a resolution that, if the Committee on Elective Franchise see proper to report a bill disfranchising Southern sympathizers, they also report a bill disfranchising Abolitionists.... Should gentlemen of Southern feelings be disfranchised and Abolitionists be permitted to vote, I fear that the Abolitionists elected to the Legislature might pass an act to deprive us of our slaves. I own a few slaves and I do not want them forced out of my possession. 34

James H. Moss warned the members that there was a radical movement on foot at Washington to free the slaves in Missouri and he pointed out that, unless the convention acted very care-
fully, it would pass into the hands of men who were more to be dreaded than secessionists.

James O. Broadhead plainly warned the conservatives that if they permitted traitors in Price's army to support slavery by voting against "ultra men", the consequences would be serious. The provisional government of Missouri owed its existence to the administration at Washington and the latter would not tolerate this leniency to traitors.

John F. Long advanced the old argument that war was for the maintenance of the government—"a constitutional war— not a nigger war."

William A. Hall of Randolph prophesied that the coming congressional elections in the North would put a stop to the radical legislation of Congress and if the emancipation bill then before that body did not pass at that session it would never pass.

Senator Henderson took the opposite view that the North would not continue to furnish men and money to suppress rebellion without emancipation. 35


The emancipation ordinance was tabled by a vote of 52 to 19. Ten of the 19 were from St. Louis, 6 were from six southern and eastern counties and 3 from three northern counties. Hence, St. Louis and nearby counties furnished most
of the emancipationists.

The test oath act provided that all voters must take an oath of loyalty to the constitution of the nation and of the state. They were also to swear that they had not taken up arms against either government since December 17, 1861. A similar oath of loyalty was to be required of all jurymen, lawyers, teachers and preachers. 36 The test oath was passed June 10 by a vote of 39-to 27.

There was strong sentiment, in the convention, openly expressed, that the preachers had been among the worst instigators of secession in the state.

On the last day of the session a resolution was passed, to be forwarded to President Lincoln and to Congress, that while the convention recognized the liberality of the government in offering to cooperate with any slave state in some plan of compensated emancipation, a majority of the membership of the convention did not feel authorized to take action in the matter. 37

36 Ibid., Appendix, pp. 13-14.

37 Ibid., p. 22.

The convention adjourned June 14 to meet again July 4, 1863.

The Congressional Election, November, 1862

As has been mentioned, already the state convention in
June postponed the election of state officers to 1864 of the state legislature and congressmen to November, 1862. The action of the convention on the question of emancipation was of course not satisfactory to the radicals and the campaign began at once on that issue.

The conservative position was well expressed by the Statesman when it said that the extremists were frustrated. In this paper's opinion the emancipation agitators on the one hand and secession sympathizers on the other were greatly disturbed because the state elections were postponed so long: the postponement, however, insured conservatism. 38 The Anzeiger was hostile to the action of the convention and to Gamble even before the former adjourned. 39 After Lincoln issued his preliminary emancipation proclamation, in September, the issue in Missouri congressional campaign was for or against its support. 40

Some time before this the Democrat, once Blair's own organ, turned against him. It charged him with being too conservative and with having deserted the Germans and his old
Republican party friends. 41 Blair realized as early as July

41 Blair had established the St. Louis Union and was being supported by the St. Louis Evening News, a Bell paper in 1860, and the Tage Cronic, a German Catholic pro-slavery paper. He was even accused of opposing Lincoln's proclamation. Ibid., Oct., 29, 1862.

that he was losing some of his old following in Missouri and sought to win back the Germans by procuring appointments for their leaders. He had Francis Sigel appointed a major-general and Peter J. Osterhaus, a brigadier-general. Henry Boernstein, editor of the Anzeiger des Westens, who had been absent on a mission procured for him by Blair, returned in the middle of July and the Anzeiger began to speak well of Blair once more.42

42 Missouri Republican, July 2,18, 1862.

In the congressional elections of 1862 the Radicals elected the following men who were classified as supporters of Lincoln's emancipation proclamation: John W. Noell, Henry T. Blow, Semphronius H. Boyd, Joseph W. McClurg and Benjamin F. Loan. Its opponents, elected by the Conservatives, were: James S. Rollins, William A. Hall, Austin A. King and Francis P. Blair.43

43 Missouri Democrat, Dec. 23, 1862.

Noell died soon and his former opponent, John G. Scott, was elected in his place. Blair was unseated, near the close of the session, June 10, 1864, on account of alleged fraud at the polls, in favor of James Knox a charcoal Radical. 44 There
ELECTION FOR CONGRESSMEN 1862

Blue - Conservatives 44920
Red - Radicals 45075
Total 87995

White - No returns
is no evidence to show that Blair would have actually opposed the proclamation. He was then serving in the army.

A majority of emancipationists, either gradual or immediate, was elected to both branches of the state legislature. In St. Louis all five senators and eleven of the twelve representatives were charcoals. A single claybank was elected on account of the failure of one of the charcoal candidates to file the required oath. 45

45 Missouri Republican, Nov. 27, 1862

The Twenty-Second General Assembly, December 29, 1862-March 23, 1863

When the twenty-second general assembly met December 29, 1862, the House elected as speaker, L. O. Marvin of Henry, an emancipationist, over Joseph Davis of Howard, a conservative, by a vote of 67 to 42. Marvin was a Universalist minister and had voted for Lincoln in 1860. 46


In his message to the legislature, Governor Gamble, after reviewing the events of the past two years, called attention to the serious financial condition of the state government and of the railroads. But the central part of his message dealt
with the question of emancipation. He had no objection to slavery as such. Yet he had been convinced for some time that Missouri's economic interests would be furthered by gradual compensated emancipation. He called attention to the following constitutional provision: "The General Assembly shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves, without the consent of their owners or without paying them, before such emancipation, a full equivalent for such slaves emancipated." As the finances of the state would not allow such compensation, he suggested that the children of slaves might be freed at little expense. 47


On January 6, 1863, John B. Henderson was elected United States senator to fill out, to March 4, 1863, the unexpired term of Trusten Polk who had been expelled. Thirty ballots were taken in vain effort to elect his colleague for the term expiring March 4, 1867. B. Gratz Brown was one of the leading candidates. During the course of the balloting he wired President Lincoln: "Does the administration desire my defeat, if not, why are its appointees working to that end?" Lincoln replied that the administration was not taking sides between its friends and knew nothing of the activities of its appointees in the matter." 48

The parties in this legislature were known as Charcoals, Claybanks and Snowflakes. The Charcoals were "the double dyed Republicans, the black Black Republicans, the Gratz Brown men, who, like a certain Kentucky radical 'are unequivocally in favor of the Proclamation, emancipation, confiscation, subjugation, desolation, extermination, hell and damnation!'" The Claybanks were Republicans also and Emancipationists but were not so radical. Their favorite candidate was Samuel T. Glover. The Snowflakes were "neither nor very black." They were more concerned about the white man than about the "nigger". Their candidate was John S. Phelps. The vote for senator stood as follows on the first ballot, Brown 51, Phelps 51, Glover 35, with 8 scattering. Missouri Statesman, Feb., 13, 1863.

The St. Louis Election for Mayor, April 6, 1863

Since the legislature just closing failed to do anything definite toward emancipation the Radicals centered their efforts on winning the city election in St. Louis April 6, 1863. It seemed for a time as if the charcoals and claybanks might unite for this election. 49 However, each faction held its own convention. The charcoals called theirs the Republican Emancipation Convention and nominated Chauncey Ives Filley for mayor. Among the charcoals B. Gratz Brown was a moving spirit. Some time before he had said of them, "We are the revolution." This slogan was proudly accepted by his followers but viewed with alarm by the Conservatives. 50

49 Missouri Republican, March 10, 1863.

50 At a meeting of the charcoals in the second ward this sentiment of B. Gratz Brown was endorsed in the following language: "We endorse the sentiment proclaimed by B. Gratz Brown, that 'We are the revolution'. Yes, when it is neces-
sary to destroy every traitor in the land, then 'We are the revolution'! When it is necessary to proclaim and make war against slavery, corruption, bigotry and Know-Nothingism then 'We are the revolution'! and last when, in the coming April election it shall not only be necessary, but our will and duty, to support only such candidates who give us sufficient guarantees for an economical, liberal and just city administration, and that we will bear no further arrogance from the so-called Sunday laws, then once more 'We are the revolution!'" Ibid., March 13, 1863.

The claybanks designated their convention the Union Emancipation Convention and nominated Oliver Dwight Filley for mayor. The Filleys were cousins and of New England stock: O. D. Filley had been mayor from 1859 to 1861. 51

51 Stevens, Walter B., Mo the Center State. Vol. I, p. 40

The Democrats nominated Joseph O'Neill for the same position. According to the Republican the secessionists secretly supported O'Neill to encourage General Price in his expected invasion of Missouri and capture of St. Louis. This paper backed Filley because he was conservative. 52

52 Missouri Republican, April 3, 1863.

Chauncey I. Filley was a typical representative of the charcoals or extreme Radicals. The Neue Zeit well represented their position in these words: "As long as Halleck is Commander in Chief of our armies, as long as Seward and Blair, in the name of the President, indulge in conservative policy, and as long as Fremont and Butler are not put in active service again, the liberal party of this country has no sufficient
reason to fight under the flag of loyalty."" 53 This situation apparently alarmed the Republican for the next day it said of the charcoals, "They now declare their readiness to depose the existing Government of the State and to substitute for it a Military Despotism, and this may follow the election of O. I. Filley." 54 Election day revealed the fact that the charcoal Pilley was the winner in a closely contested triangular race. 55

Although the direful predictions of the Republican did not materialize, there was one rather important outcome. Nine days later, the state convention was called for June 15 by Governor Gamble whose action was no doubt largely determined by Filley's election. 56

53 Neue Zeit quoted in Missouri Republican, April 4, 1863

54 Missouri Republican, April 5, 1863.

55 Ibid., April 7, 1863. O. D. Filley 3,141, O’Neill 4,034, C. I. Filley 5,632.

56 Davis and Durrie, An Illustrated Hist. of Mo., pp. 181-182. The St. Louis election April, 1853 caused Gamble to call the convention lest the sentiment should spread and cause immediate emancipation. Mr. Filley himself states positively that his election as mayor of St. Louis in 1863 caused Gamble to call the convention. Statement of Chauncey Ives Filley to the author, Feb. 9, 1921.
The State Convention, Fifth Session, June 15-July 1, 1863

The fifth and last session of the state convention was held June 15 to July 1, 1863. In his call for the convention Governor Gamble stated that it was of the highest importance to the interest of the state that some scheme of emancipation should be adopted. He also stated that the general assembly had taken no action in the matter on account of constitutional limitations but had clearly indicated that the convention should be called to take such action. 57

57 Journal, Mo. State Convention, June, 1863, p. 3. The author has failed to find any such indication on the part of the general assembly mentioned above.

In his message to the convention the governor remarked that although he was not prejudiced against slavery, he had believed for some time that free labor would better develop Missouri's material interests than slave labor. Furthermore, he declared, since the southern confederacy was founded on the cornerstone of slavery, Missouri as a free state would be undesirable and hence the South would leave her in peace. He also pointed out that emancipation would cause the state to be flooded with desirable immigrants. Finally, he announced his resignation as governor to take effect on the last day of the session. 58

58 Ibid., pp. 5-12.

The first important committee appointed or rather elected...
by the convention was the one on emancipation, composed of nine members, one from each congressional district: Hamilton R. Gamble, Isodor Bush, Joseph Bogey, M. H. Ritchy John F. Phillips, A. Comingo, Willard P. Hall, William A. Hall and John B. Henderson. Sample Orr later made the charge that none but abolitionists were allowed on this committee. 59

59 Ibid., pp. 13-15

Prince L. Hudgins of Andrew and A. S. Harbin of Barry were expelled for disloyalty. The seats of James Proctor Knott of Cole and of Vincent Marmaduke of Saline were declared vacant: Knott had left the state and Marmaduke had been sent South by Major-General Schofield for disloyalty. 60

60 Ibid., pp. 23, 27, 31, 32.

Eleven new members were sworn in at this session. They had been elected to fill vacancies created by death, resignation or expulsion. Of these only two were understood to be opposed to emancipation and only one or two more, to immediate emancipation. The eleven represented all sections of the state except the extreme northeastern. Thus the radical movement had spread fairly well over the state. 61

Charles D. Drake, who made the above statement, was a new member himself and destined to be from that time on the leading Radical in the state. In 1860, he had been a prominent Douglas Democrat and friendly toward slavery. His changed attitude, according to his own statement, was due to his realization that slavery was the cause of the revellion. This change dated from the fall of Fort Sumter. 62

62 Ibid., pp. 24-25.

On June 23, Governor Gamble as chairman of the committee on emancipation brought in a majority report which provided, "That slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, shall cease to exist in Missouri on the fourth day of July, eighteen hundred and seventy-six; and all slaves within the State on that day are hereby declared to be free." One section of the report forbade the general assembly from emancipating the slaves without the consent of the owners. 63

63 Ibid., p. 135.

Isidor Bush presented a minority report which provided that, "From and after the first day of January, eighteen hundred and sixty-four, slavery and involuntary servitude, except for crime, or as hereinafter provided, are abolished, and all persons who on that day may be held in bondage in this State, as slaves for life, are hereby declared forever free: provided, however,
that they and their issue thereafter born shall thereupon be and become indentured apprentices to their former owners, their assignors or representatives, and as such held to service and labor from that date until the fourth of July, eighteen hundred and seventy, and no longer." On section of the report provided that the people should vote for or against this emancipation measure at the election in August, 1863. 64

64 Ibid., pp. 134-137.

In the course of the ensuing debate it developed that there were three well-defined groups in the convention. A small but vigorous number was opposed to emancipation in any form. Their leaders were Sample Orr and James H. Birch whose chief occupation was twitting Gamble on his desertion of his pro-slavery sentiments and claiming their constitutional right to own negroes. At the other extreme were the immediate emancipationists. Their chief leaders were Charles D. Drake, Robert M. Stewart and Isidor Bush. Drake introduced a resolution to the effect that the emancipation question should be referred to the people. Only nineteen voted for it. Bush prophetically warned the convention that the nineteen spoke the voice of the people. The middle and largest group was willing to grant gradual emancipation. Its leaders were Hamilton R. Gamble, John B. Henderson, Willardp. and William A. Hall, James O. Broadhead and Samuel Breckenridge.

As the great majority were in favor of emancipation, there
was a difference of only some 12 years in the extreme demands—
the question naturally arises why a compromise could not have
been reached which would have settled the matter. After compar-
ing the situation in Missouri with that of France in the French
Revolution, F. K. Sayre said he would vote for the majority
report in order to avoid a far greater evil. 65 The immediate

65 Ibid., p. 365.

emancipationists insisted upon a date not later than 1864
because they feared that a later date would give the conserva-
tives an opportunity to elect, in November, 1864 a legis-
lature which would repeal the test oath. The emancipation or-
dinance would then be submitted to the people and would be
repealed by the help of the rebel and the copperhead vote. 66

66 Ibid., p. 264.

Joseph W. McClurg of Camden, a slave owner, put his opposi-
tion to slavery on humanitarian and Christian grounds. He
expressed surprise that so few speakers, in fact, only two
others in his knowledge, had ever voiced similar sentiments. 67

67 Ibid., p. 267. McClurg was elected governor in 1868.

Sample Orr had the keenest insight into the results of
emancipation exhibited by any one in the convention. He said
that the next demand after emancipation would be that the negro
should hold office and vote, that he should attend the same common schools, and that he should sit on the same jury and fight on the same battle-field. He elaborated his argument by referring to the principle on which the Revolutionary War was fought: taxation without representation etc. A free negro, he continued, would own property, he would pay taxes, and as a tax-payer he would demand all the privileges of other tax-payers. The culmination of penetration into the future was reached in the following: "Mr. Stanton says, 'he that votes must fight'. Governor Yates says, 'he that fights must vote.'" Those now "who are taking such a bold stand for Sambo, will naturally expect Sambo to remember them at the ballot-box! and Sambo will no more vote for me than the foreigner used to vote for the Know-Nothings." 68

---

68 Ibid., p. 217.

A compromise date of July 4, 1870 was finally agreed upon and the emancipation ordinance was carried July 1, 1863 by a vote of 51 to 30. Those wanting immediate emancipation and those wanting none at all voted against it. 69

---

69 Ibid., p. 367-368.

Nearly forty of those voting for the ordinance were slaveholders.70

---

70 The Canton Press, July 16, 1863 gives the number 39, the St. Charles Demokrat 36.
As early as June 23, the convention, by a vote of 47 to 34, had requested Governor Gamble to withdraw his resignation and to continue in office until November, 1864. 71 On the last day of the session, July 1, he replied to the above in part as follows: "I therefore withdraw my resignation, and will again involve myself in the cares and perplexities of office: not to be, as the sagacious President of the United States regards me, the head of a faction, but an officer of the State above all party influences, and careless of everything but the interests of the State." 72


72 Ibid., p. 368.

The Committee of Seventy

The strained relations between the radicals and conservatives, and their respective attitudes towards President Lincoln came to a crisis in the summer and fall of 1863. The radicals accused the provisional government of being too lenient toward southern sympathizers and opposed to the use of negro troops. The provisional government accused the radicals of being Jacobins, revolutionists and of wishing to overthrow its authority. Briefly, the conservatives thought a slave owner could be a loyal supporter of the national government and rather lenient toward southern sympathizers. The radicals said he could be
neither. Both sides continually appealed to the president for support.

The period now under discussion began with the removal of General Samuel R. Curtis, March 10, 1863, at the request of the conservatives. General John M. Schofield took his place. In making this change, Lincoln stated plainly that he did not remove Curtis because he had done wrong but because the Union people of Missouri had entered into a pestilential factional quarrel among themselves, with General Curtis as the head of one faction and Governor Gamble, the head of the other. Since he could not remove the governor he removed the general. 73


The emancipation act of the June session of the state convention did not, of course, suit the radicals. The sack of Lawrence, Kansas, August 21, 1863, by Quantrell’s band, and General Schofield’s refusal to allow the governor of Kansas to pursue the raiders into Missouri, fanned the fury of the radicals to fever heat. 74


In the midst of this excitement the Radical Union Emancipation Convention met in Jefferson City, September 1, 1863. 75

75 Ibid.
There were 69 counties represented by 417 delegates, 243 of whom were Germans. While the platform committee was drawing up its report, Charles D. Drake delivered a bitter speech against the conservatives in general. The report condemned the action of the national government for delegating military powers to the provisional state government which used this power to uphold slavery and reactionary tendencies and to paralyze the federal power in suppressing the rebellion. It heartily endorsed the principle of Fremont's proclamation of freedom August 30, 1861, "and afterwards sanctioned and embodied in the President's proclamation of September 22, 1862 and January 1, 1863." The provisional state government was severely arraigned as disloyal and oppressive to the loyal people and as lenient to the rebels. Under the latter head the definite charge was made that known and avowed disloyalists had been enrolled, commissioned and brought into active service. Enrollment of negro troops and immediate emancipation were demanded. A new state convention was also demanded. Governor Hamilton R. Gamble and Lieutenant-Governor Willard P. Hall were requested to resign and Lincoln was asked to remove General John M. Schofield. Candidates for the supreme court were nominated: Henry A. Clover, Arnold Krekel and David Wagner. The most important action taken, perhaps, was the appointment of a committee of seventy, with Drake as chairman, to visit President Lincoln and to present to him their grievances. 76

76 Switzler, Hist. of Mo., pp. 447-448.
Possibly, the most alarming action, to the conservatives, was the passage of the closing resolution: "Resolved, That in view of the serious complications that are arising out of hostilities on the part of the Provisional State Government to the National authority and the National policies, and the absence of protection from inroads from guerilla bands, we hereby instruct the President of this Convention to appoint a general committee of Public Safety, composed of one from each Congressional district, whose duty it shall be to confer with the loyal men of the State to organize and arm them for the protection of their homes, and in the event of no relief being obtained from our present troubles, to call upon the people of this state to act in their sovereign capacity, and take such measures of redress as shall be found necessary for their welfare." 77

77 Nicolay and Hay, Lincoln A Hist., Vol. VIII, p. 213. An interesting sidelight is thrown on this convention by a minor issue that agitated the delegates for a time. The Republican of Sept. 3, characterized the convention as composed of Puritans and German infidels. When the question of having an opening prayer was raised, the Germans opposed it. But the Puritans wanted it opened with prayer and it was so done.

The conservative camp was thoroughly frightened but came into action at once. General John M. Schofield issued an order September 17, 1863 announcing that martial law would be enforced against persons encouraging mutiny, exciting insurrection by uttering or publishing falsehoods or misrepresentations, and that newspapers violating the order would be suppressed. On September 20, he sent to Washington a collection of inflammatory newspaper articles with a report that: "The revolutionary
faction which has so long been striving to gain the ascendency in Missouri, particularly in St. Louis, to overthrow the present State government and change the policy of the National Administration, has at length succeeded, so far as to produce open mutiny of one of the military regiments and serious difficulties in others." He enclosed his order of the seventeenth for approval which was granted on the twenty-sixth. On October 1, he wrote the president further about the discharge of his duties. On the same day, Governor Gamble wrote the president that he had "exhausted the resources of the State in maintaining the supremacy of the Federal Government," and he asked the president in turn to "order the general commanding this department to maintain by all the force under his control the integrity of the State government." 78

78 Ibid., pp. 224-226.

The newspaper clippings, which Schofield had enclosed in his letter to Washington, were taken mainly from the Republican and were translations from various German papers under the heading "The Spirit of the German Press". In general they were very bitter against the 'Gamble dynasty' and the national government for allowing rebel sympathizers to oppress the loyal people. They complained also that troops were used to restore runaway slaves. The arrangement by which state troops were under control of the state was attacked as savoring too much of state rights doctrine. 79
The climax of the whole movement was reached September 30 when the committee of seventy had a very dramatic three hours interview with President Lincoln at the White House. The movement had now attained national importance for the seventy were the spokesmen for the radicals of the nation. For half an hour, the chairman Charles D. Drake, read to the president, in a deep, sonorous voice, slowly and impressively, a long list of accumulated grievances. The document reviewed at length the origin and development of the antagonism between the Gamble administration and the radical Union men. The things demanded were: "First, That General Schofield shall be relieved, and General Butler be appointed as commander of the Military Department of Missouri; Second. That the system of Enrolled Militia in Missouri may be broken up, and national forces substituted for it, and Third. That at elections, persons may not be allowed to vote who are not entitled by law to do so." Lincoln's reply, dated October 5, was one of the longest letters he ever wrote, also one of the ablest and most judicious. He refused to grant the two first demands but promised to direct Schorfield to enforce the last. Among other things he said that the question was a perplexing compound of Union and slavery and there were four classes of Union people concerned." Thus, those who are for the Union with, but not without, slavery: those for it without, but not with: those for it with or without, but prefer
and those for it with or without, but prefer it without. Among these, again, is a subdivision of those who are for gradual, but not for immediate, and those who are for immediate, but not for gradual, extinction of slavery." 80


On the evening of the day that the seventy were at the White House, they were given a reception by Secretary Chase. This was considered significant as Chase was talked of for the presidential nomination by the radical opposition to Lincoln. From Washington the seventy went to New York City where they were received by a great mass meeting in Cooper Institute. 81


On October 2, the Republican headed an article "Drake's Bitters" and two days later it quoted an interesting discussion from the Neue Zeit under the caption:

"The End of the Song

"The pilgrimage to Washington seems to have brought no results for Missouri i. e. no immediate result... But though there is now certainly no talk of a revolution, we can neither believe that the refusal of Mr. Lincoln will put an end to the complaints of Missouri.... Hence let us hear from the people at the next election! Let them condemn the miserable Missouri policy of our hopelessly deluded President in the most decided possible manner and let us thus become a free people again."
On October 12, Governor Gamble issued a long proclamation in which he refuted all charges of disloyalty against him, reviewed his activities in behalf of the Union and for emancipation and warned all persons "against any attempt to effect a change by means of violence." On the thirteenth, Lincoln replied to Governor Gamble's former request for help. He thought the governor was unduly alarmed and that General Schofield was able to prevent any revolution by violence. The situation now became less tense but the struggle was continued at the ballot-box. 82


Election of Supreme Court Judges, November 3, 1863

The contest over the election of supreme court judges November 3, 1863 was bitterly fought. The Radicals, as was mentioned above, nominated Henry A. Clover, Arnold Krekel and David Wagner. The Conservatives held no convention but supported the men then in that office, Barton Bates, a son of Edward Bates, William V. N. Bay and John D. S. Dryden. 83

83 Switzler, op. cit., p. 450.

The Radicals were trying, apparently, to elect judges who would declare that Gamble was not governor but usurper. 84

84 Canton Press, Nov. 12, 1863.
This jubilation was suddenly cut short when the final returns showed that the Conservatives had won by a majority of about 700 in a total vote of over 93,000. 86

86 Switzler, op. cit., p. 450. "About 700 votes! That is all Abraham Lincoln. 'By the anger of God!' as the Kirchen Zeitung calls him and all his myrmidons, in Post Offices and other places, together with all traitorous copperheads, have only been able to defeat us Radicals of Missouri by a few hundred votes. We Radicals of Missouri have reason enough to carry our heads high, for Abraham 'By the anger of God,' will nevertheless be finally compelled to bow down before us." Westliche Post, quoted in Missouri Republican, Jan. 8, 1864.

Twenty-Second General Assembly, Adjourned Session, November 10, 1863 to February 16, 1864

In his message to the adjourned session of the twenty-second general assembly, Governor Gamble considered the emancipation question settled. As a consequence of the emancipation of the slaves he expected a shortage of labor which he would provide against by recommending the official appointment of agents to visit Europe and solicit immigrants, especially in Germany. 87

87 Journal, Mo. Senate, Adjourned Sess., 22nd Gen. Assembly, pp. 6-12.

One of the important acts of this session was the election of two United States senators. It will be remembered that thirty ballots had been taken without result at the previous session. On the thirty-second ballot, counting the thirty mentioned, B. Gratz Brown was elected for the term expiring March 4, 1867. 88

88 Ibid., p. 1617.
Henderson was a Conservative and Brown was a Radical.

There was both a national and a military phase of this election which must be considered. General Schofield was accused by the Radicals of being opposed to the election of Brown. Lincoln's intimate friend E. B. Washburne of Illinois had so reported Schofield's position to him. As a matter of fact Schofield had said that he did not believe the two conflicting elements could be so harmonized as to elect a senator representing each faction, a solution which Washburne had suggested. As a result of this misunderstanding Lincoln wrote Secretary Stanton, December 18, 1865, that Schofield must be relieved of his command of the Department of Missouri or otherwise a question of veracity would be raised which ought to be avoided. The solution of the problem as suggested by Lincoln and finally carried through was the appointment of Schofield as a major-general and his transfer to another field. He understood that both Henderson and Brown would favor this plan and their working together on it might help in another way to heal the Missouri trouble. Lincoln then appointed General W. S. Rosecrans as Schofield's successor who was reasonably satisfactory to both sides. 89

89 Nicollay and Hay, Lincoln A Hist., Vol. VIII, pp. 472-475. There was strong opposition to Schofield's confirmation. The Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Democrat wrote his paper: "The Administration seems to hang on to Schofield with an infatuation which is as singular as it is obnoxious to the loyal people of the land. This question of the tyranny practiced by the Gamble-Schofield dynasty in Missouri, and its toleration by the National Administration, has been lifted from the local arena of Missouri politics, and made a national issue." Quoted in the Daily Constitution, Keokuk, Iowa, Dec. 31, 1865.
Governor Gamble died January 31, 1864 and Lieutenant-Governor Willard P. Hall succeeded him. Through the death of Gamble "the Conservative party lost its most conspicuous leader, and from that time forward rapidly declined in prestige and numerical strength." 90


A very important act of this session was the passage of an ordinance, approved, February 13, 1864, providing for a new state convention. The election for this convention should be held in November 1864. The qualified voters should be permitted to vote "for a State Convention" or "against a State Convention". Delegates to the convention should also be elected at the same time. If the majority of the voters favored the convention, the delegates should assemble in St. Louis on January 6, 1865 and "proceed to consider, first, such amendments to the Constitution of the State as may be by them deemed necessary for the emancipation of slaves; second, such amendments to the constitution of the State as may be by them deemed necessary to preserve in purity the elective franchise to loyal citizens, and such other amendments as may be by them deemed essential to the promotion of the public good." 91

91 Journal, Mo. State Convention, 1865, pp. 5-6.
At the November election in 1864 the people were called upon to vote for the usual number of state and national candidates. They were also to vote for or against a new state convention and for delegates to the same.

Fremont's boom for the presidency got under way quite early, too early in the opinion of the St. Charles Demokrat of March 10, 1864, that is, it suffered the fate of many early booms in reaching its climax and spending its force too long before election time. While Fremont was the first choice of this paper it was willing to support either Benjamin F. Butler or Salmon P. Chase.

Early in January, the Anzeiger was losing hope of defeating Lincoln. Wendell Phillips, in its opinion the real leader of the Radicals, had eliminated Chase and was favoring Fremont. Most of the German Radicals were also favoring him but many others were thinking more of a well regulated retreat than of an energetic advance in favor of "Fremont and Jessie." 92

92 Quoted in Missouri Republican, Jan. 6, 1864. Jessie Fremont, a daughter worthy of her father, Thomas Hart Benton, will be remembered for her romantic elopement with John C. Fremont and her subsequent vigorous defense of her husband in his controversy with President Lincoln and the Blairs. The slogan mentioned above was used in the campaign of 1866.

The election of a Radical mayor of St. Louis in April 1864 was claimed by the Neue Zeit as a victory for Fremont. In this election E. B. Thomas, the Radical candidate, defeated J. G. Woerner, the Conservative nominee by a vote of 6,477 to 3,873. 93
The *Westliche Post* stated quite positively that it would not support Lincoln under any circumstances. According to this paper, Lincoln's removal of Fremont from his command in 1861 had saved a rebel army from annihilation. 94

"Thus we suddenly see a new coalition of the Blair and Bates Conservatives, who have always blown the whistle of loyalty, with those Radical renegades who have now been converted to loyalty a la Lincoln.... We have at present nothing to do but to declare herewith once for all, that "we, supported by honest conviction of all friends of freedom in our State, cannot support Mr. Lincoln's reelection under any circumstances whatever."" Quoted in *Mo. Republican*, Jan. 15, 1864

The *Anzeiger* was hoping for a Radical national Convention which would nominate a Radical like Fremont, Chase or Butler.

"But," it added, "the movement seems to meet with little favor. Even the *Missouri Democrat* has not yet had pity on it." The *Evening News*, St. Louis, was ready to support the candidate of the National Union Convention and considered Lincoln sufficiently radical. 95

On February 22, 1864, a national convention met at Louisville, Kentucky known to the public press as the Louisville Freedom Convention. Its official name was the Slave-State Freedom Convention. The initial call for this meeting was signed by the Missouri Radicals. By a vote of 64 to 53 the convention refused to summon a Radical national convention. The *Neue Zeit* blamed Drake for this result as he was the only
member of the Missouri delegation who, in the Missouri caucus, opposed such a convention. However, when Colonel James H. Moss of the same delegation proposed the convention on the floor, other Missourians failed to support him. The distribution of the Pomeroy circular, which favored Chase for president, also contributed to the same result." 96

96 Westliche Post and Neue Zeit quoted in Daily Constitution, Keokuk, la. March 3, 1864. A report of the Louisville convention is in the Am. Ann. Cyc. 1864, pp. 450-451. Senator Pomeroy of Kansas was the chairman of a committee that issued a circular advocating Chase for the presidency and calling for a more vigorous prosecution of the war.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Louisville convention to sponsor such a gathering, a Radical National or People's Convention met in Cleveland, May 31, 1864. The Missouri Radicals were represented but, mainly by Germans. John C. Fremont was nominated by acclamation. According to the Republican of June 3, "the Cleveland nomination and platform seems to have produced the greatest enthusiasm amongst the German radicals." When Lincoln heard of Fremont's nomination he read to a caller a verse from the Bible, First Samuel 22:2, "and every one that was in distress and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him; and he became a captain over them; and there were with him about four hundred men." 97 Lincoln, however, was too shrewd a poli-

97 Oberholtzer, Ellis Paxson, Abraham Lincoln, p. 313.
tician to take chances on the possible influence of Fremont's following and lent himself to a bargain by which Fremont was to withdraw from the race and Lincoln was to request Montgomery Blair's resignation from the cabinet. Fremont published his letter of withdrawal September 22 and Lincoln requested Blair's resignation the following day. 98 Blair promptly resigned

98 Rhodes, Hist. of U. S. Vol. IV p. 52; Nicolay and Hay, Lincoln Complete Works, Vol. II, p. 579, (text of letter to Blair); Arnold, Isaac N., Life of Lincoln, 3d ed., pp. 390-391, "Fremont's friends made the removal or retirement of Montgomery Blair a condition of Fremont's declining the Cleveland nomination for the Presidency." At the request of the national committee Judge Ebenezer Peck of Illinois, a friend of the Blairs and of Lincoln, went to the President. He said to him: "Your reelection is necessary to save the Union, and no man must stand in the way of that success. Mr. Blair himself,... will gladly retire to strengthen the ticket." Arnold says this was the personal statement of Peck to him.

and worked for Lincoln's election.

On May 18, 1864, a Republican Conservative Convention met in St. Louis "pursuant to a call issued by F. P. Blair, Willard P. Hall, James S. Rollins, Wm. F. Switzler, Samuel F. Glover (acting with what is called the Unconditional Union party)"

The convention elected delegates to the National Union Convention at Baltimore and declared for Lincoln. Thomas L. Price headed the delegation. 99

99 Missouri Republican, May 19, 1864.

The Radical state convention met at Jefferson City, May 25, 1864. By a vote of 341 to 91 it decided to send a delegation to Baltimore. Drake was at the head of this delegation
which was instructed for Ulysses S. Grant. The Neue Zeit claimed that Drake's vote represented the whole Know-Nothing strength. Emile Pretorius, B. Gratz Brown and Henry T. Blow bolted the convention; they were too strongly opposed to the Lincoln administration. 100

The request for admission to the Baltimore convention by these rival delegations, officially referred to by the convention as the "Unconditional Union" delegation and the "Radical Union" delegation, 101 raised the vital question of the party's attitude on the radical issues. The Missouri Radicals represented the rapidly developing radical sentiment of the nation. The Conservative delegation could not be admitted without offending that powerful element. The situation was well summed up in the Republican, June 9, 1864: "The Radicals were not mistaken in the notion that the admission or exclusion of these delegates would define the position of the Convention with reference to Radical policies. Mr. Curtis of New York stated the case in that body. He said: 'The Missouri question is one which must be met and settled, and nowhere can it be so well met and conclusively settled as in this National Convention of Union men... As a practical contest, there is no man
in this Convention who does not know that the admission of the radical delegation from Missouri is the practical settlement of this question, and the practical adhesion of the great national party of this country, to the policy and measures which will save the country.'" The Statesman was surprised at the rejection of the Conservatives and believed the Radicals were surprised at being admitted. It also considered part of the platform objectionable. 102 The Republican also objected to

102 Missouri Statesman, June 17, 1864.

the platform and maintained that Lincoln could not accept the nomination and endorse the platform without self-stultification. 103

103 Missouri Republican, June 21, 1864

The two planks to which the Conservatives objected were the third and the sixth. The third maintained that slavery was the cause of the rebellion and that it must be extirpated and the constitution amended to that effect. The sixth said "That we deem it essential to the general welfare that harmony should prevail in the national councils, and we regard as worthy of public confidence and official trust those only who cordially indorse the principles proclaimed in these resolutions, and which should characterize the administration of the government." This clause was supposed to be aimed at Bates, Montgomery Blair and Seward. It was even alleged beforehand that the Missouri Radicals would go to Baltimore and demand
as their support of Lincoln his dismissal of these three men from his cabinet. 104


When the roll was called for the vote on presidential nominations the Missouri delegation cast their twenty-two votes, as they were instructed, for "the head of the fighting radicals of the nation, Ulysses S. Grant." Before the final result was declared, they changed their vote from Grant to Lincoln and moved that the latter's nomination be made unanimous. 105


After their defeat at Baltimore the Missouri Conservatives took a prominent part in a "Democratic" state convention at St. Louis, June 15. This convention elected Delegates to the National Democratic convention to be convened at Chicago, August 29, 1864 and adjourned to meet in September, 106 Thomas L. Price, erstwhile chairman of the Conservative delegation at Baltimore, presided over the St. Louis gathering. In his opening address to the convention he said he observed many old and familiar faces of gentlemen whom he had long known, who had belonged to the Democratic and Whig organizations, but who now harmonized for the sake of liberty and Union. Robert Wilson

106 Missouri Statesman, June 24, 1864.
James H. Birch, James H. Moss, formerly well known Whigs, took prominent parts in this convention. 107

107 Canton Press, June 23, 1864.

At the September convention Thomas L. Price was nominated by the Democrats for governor. Samuel Orr, an old line Whig and candidate for governor in 1860 on the Constitutional Union ticket, was made an assistant elector at large. In their issues of September 16, 1864, two of the influential old line Whig papers, the Missouri Statesman and the Liberty Tribune, came out for McClellan and Price. The Missouri Democrat once Benton's paper and later, Blair's but which since 1861 had been quite radical, stood for Lincoln. Drake wrote Lincoln, June 22, that although he did not think the president had treated the Missouri Radicals as kindly as he might, still, all except the German Radicals would vote for him. He predicted that the Conservatives would vote for the Chicago nominee. After Fremont's withdrawal the German Radicals also supported Lincoln. The Missouri Republican supported McClellan. 108


The Radical state convention of May 25 nominated Thomas C. Fletcher for governor. According to Judge H. C. McDougal, this was the "first distinctively Republican State Convention
VOTE ON CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION 1864

Blue - Against 26632
Red - For 56418
Total 83250
White - No returns
ever held in Missouri." 109

The Radicals, or as they might now be called, the Republicans swept the state in November. Only one Democratic congressman was elected, a John Hogan, from the first district which comprised a part of St. Louis. In the fourth district, John Kelso an independent Radical was elected over S. H. Boyd, who had already served one term as a Radical. The Radicals also elected a large majority of both branches of the state legislature. There was a majority of 29,000 for the state convention and a great majority of the delegates elected were Radicals. McClellan received about 600 more votes than Price. Fletcher received about 2,000 more votes than Lincoln. The total vote for or against the convention was 20,000 less than the total for president. There were more counties that made no returns on the convention vote than on the presidential vote. The total congressional vote was 105,391; slightly greater than that for either president or governor. The Republican majority for governor was 42,000; for president, 40,000 and for congressman, 20,000. The counties which cast a majority for McClellan and against the convention were almost identical. There were fifteen McClellan counties and eighteen against the convention. Ten of these were the same. The majorities for McClellan and against the convention were also from the counties where the
Whigs and Americans were strong before the war. 110

The Republican accused thousands of secessionists of voting for Lincoln and claimed that this result came from Price's raid. 111

"The counties most suspected of secession propclivities are those which have given Lincoln the heaviest majorities. Price's raid did the business for the Democracy, for it gave the Radicals a pretext for work which they would otherwise have been unable to do. Thousands of secessionists voted for Lincoln, either of choice or through cowardice. There may have been military intimidation in some quarters, but we have precious little sympathy to expend upon parties who give this as an excuse or explanation of conduct unbecoming, to say the least, to American citizens. We trust the secessionists who voted for Lincoln in preference to McClellan are satisfied with the result. So far as we are concerned, we, too, are satisfied." Missouri Republican, Dec. 14, 1864.

The Constitutional Convention, January 6, - April 10, 1865

The members of the Missouri State Convention of 1865, generally called the constitutional or the emancipation convention, were for the most part comparatively unknown men. Only three had been elected to the original convention of 1861. These three were all from St. Louis. Two were native Prussians and one was a Kentuckian. 112
The nativity of the 66 members was as follows: 22 from free states; 8 from German states; 1 from England; 9 from Missouri; and 26 from the other slave states. According to occupation there were 10 farmers, 14 physicians, 13 lawyers, and 12 merchants; the remainder were scattered, not over one to a separate calling or occupation. According to occupation there were 10 farmers, 14 physicians, 13 lawyers, and 12 merchants; the remainder were scattered, not over one to a separate calling or occupation. 113 A comparison of the membership of the convention of 1861 with that of 1860 discloses the fact that in the former there was a high percentage of lawyers and natives of the slave states while in the latter there were few lawyers, more natives of the free states and twice the number of foreign born. Whether the fine-spun theories about constitutional rights so prevalent in the first convention were due to its superabundance of lawyers and the more direct action methods of the second were due to their absence, will be left to the mental testers to determine.

Of greater significance, however, was the personnel of the officers of the new convention. The members met in St. Louis, January 6, 1860, and organized by electing as president, Arnold Krekel of St. Louis, a native of Prussia and editor of the St. Charles Democrat. Charles D. Drake of St. Louis and a native of Ohio was elected vice-president. Amos P. Foster of Franklin county and a native of New Hampshire was elected secretary. The assistant secretary was a native of Ohio, the doorkeeper was born in Prussia and the sergeant-at-arms first saw the light in England. 114 The old time southern, pro-slavery
group was certainly not in control.

On the fifth day of the session, January 11, an ordinance of immediate emancipation was passed by a vote of 60 to 4, two members being absent. The four were Samuel Gilbert of Platte, Thomas B. Harris of Callaway, William A. Morton of Clay, and William F. Switzler of Boone. Clay and Platte were in the same district as were also Boone and Callaway. 115 These two dis-


tricts were centers of Whig strength before the war. Switzler was editor of the Missouri Statesman, one of the leading Whig papers of the state. On January 12, a committee was appointed to inquire into the loyalty of members. 116 Later, the com-

116 Ibid., p. 28.

mittee reported that Thomas B. Harris was disloyal. He was expelled March 6 by a vote of 30 to 16.

On January 16, by a vote of 52 to 5, the convention in-

118 Ibid., p. 131
As the session progressed and the Radicals realized their power they decided to make an entirely new and complete constitution for the state. On February 15, Charles D. Drake moved that the constitution proceed to make such a constitution. The motion carried 29 to 19. 119

119 Ibid., pp. 89-90.

The constitution in its final form was adopted on the seventy-seventh day of the session, April 6, 1865, by a vote of 38 to 13. Eleven of the thirteen did not sign the document. 120

120 Ibid., pp. 247-248.

The most interesting and troublesome part of this constitution was the third section of the second article which prescribed an iron-clad oath of loyalty for every voter and the ninth section of the same article which prescribed the same oath for lawyers, preachers, and teachers. The substance of this oath, known as the "Oath of Loyalty," was to the effect that the person taking it had never "by act or word" manifested his "adherence" to the cause of the enemies of the United States, or a "desire for their triumph;" or "sympathy" for them. Furthermore, a pledge of loyalty to the constitution of the United States and of Missouri was also required. 121

121 Ibid., Appendix, pp. 258, 259, 260.
Provision was also made that the electoral franchise should be granted to foreigners who had declared their intention of becoming citizens of the United States. The section, "Education," was made much more specific than that of 1820 and gave rather full instructions for an elementary, intermediate and higher system of public instruction including the state university. 122 Restrictions of the suffrage, however, were so severe on rebels and copperheads that many enemies, even among Unionists, were raised up against the new constitution and another one was drawn up in 1865. The document was to be submitted to the will of the people, June 6, 1865, and no person ineligible to vote under the oath of loyalty prescribed in the proposed constitution itself, was to be allowed to vote at this election. 123

122 Ibid.

123 Ibid., pp. 275, 276.

Another important ordinance, commonly called the "ousting ordinance" was passed by this convention. A part of the first section of this reads, "That the offices of the Judges of the Supreme Court, of all Circuit Courts, and of all courts of record established by any act of the General Assembly, and those of the Justices of all County Courts, of all clerks of any of the aforesaid courts, of all Circuit Attorneys and their assistants
and of all Sheriffs and County Recorders, shall be vacated on
the first day of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five,
and the same shall be filled for the remainder of the term
or each of said offices, respectively, by appointment by the
Governor." 124 This law had important consequences which will

---

124 Ibid., p. 282.

---

be discussed later. The convention adjourned sine die April
10, 1865 after having been in session seventy-eight days.

Owing to the dominant part taken by Charles D. Drake, the
convention has been known as "the Drake Convention" and the
constitution as "Drake's Constitution" and the disfranchising
section as the "Draconian Code". 125 David Bonham, a farmer

---

125 Switzler, op. cit., p. 458.

---

and a native of England, also played a leading part in the
convention as chairman of a special committee on elective
franchise. He was the author of section eighteen of the second
article which permitted foreigners to vote upon taking out their
first papers. 126

---

126 Ibid., pp. 260-261, "The Constitutional Convention of
1865," MSS. in Library of State Hist. Soc. of Mo.

---

The campaign over the adoption of the constitution was
very bitter. A decided reaction against extreme radicalism
was beginning to set in. As early as the latter part of
January the Westliche Post was protesting against the Puritan tendencies of Drake's constitutional convention. 127 Friction between the Puritan element in St. Louis and the Germans began as early as 1859 when the mayor, Oliver Dwight Filley, a native of Connecticut, enforced a law against Sunday saloons which the Germans wanted. 128 A large and influential group of well-known Union men spoke against the constitution. Among them were Edward Bates, James O. Broadhead, Samuel T. Glover, Robert J. Rombauer, General John McNeil, Dr. M. L. Linton, Isidor Bush, Charles P. Johnson, and Colonel T. T. Gantt. 129 Even Governor Fletcher and Senator Henderson at first opposed it. 130 Both, however, finally came to its support. Drake led the fight for adoption and he stigmatized as rebels or copperheads all who opposed it. 131

127 Missouri Republican, Jan. 26, 1865.


129 Missouri Republican, May 26, 1865.

130 Missouri Statesman, April 28, 1865.

The election returns were slow in coming in and the final result depended upon the soldier vote. The majority for the constitution was 2,562. The soldier vote showed a majority for it of 2,827. The total vote was 84,978. This includes the soldier vote of 5,163. As the total vote in November, 1864 was about 105,000 there was a decrease of about 20,000.

Although the test oath may have excluded some from the polls it must be remembered that an abstract issue, voting on a convention, does not bring out the vote like a concrete issue where the personalities of individual candidates are involved. The Republicans have been sharply criticized for the severe test oath of 1865 but it cannot be overlooked that the test oaths of October, 1861 and of June, 1862 were passed by Whigs and Democrats who then controlled the state as Unionists.

A comparison of the election map on the constitution with those before the war reveals the fact that the old Whig counties furnished the main opposition to the new constitution.

The election map shows that the counties of St. Charles and St. Louis, which the Radicals had carried during the war, were now again in the more conservative column, a fact which suggests the origin, both date and place, of the Liberal Rep-
ublican movement. Such a discussion, however, is beyond the limits of this study.

Twenty-Third General Assembly, Regular Session, December 26, 1864- February 20, 1865

Governor Hall's farewell address to the twenty-third general assembly had dealt largely with a defense and commendation of the Missouri enrolled militia. Up-to-date, he said, Missouri had furnished 81,767 men to the federal army and over 60,000 to the militia. He had predicted that the constitutional convention would make great changes in the organic law and that it would devolve upon the legislature to have the statutes of the state conform to them. "Slavery will be abolished, with the almost unanimous approval of the people of Missouri" Abolition, he then observed, would in turn create different relationships between the races which would require new legislation. 134


The inaugural address of the incoming governor, Thomas C. Fletcher, was characterized by an optimistic outlook. He forecasted the end of the war in the spring and dealt mainly with reconstruction issues. He appealed to the victors to be magnanimous to all and to work for the general welfare. However, he recognized that the ballot box must be protected by the registration of all qualified voters. He urged also the passage of some law which would enable liberty-loving foreigners to acquire the electoral franchise, in a shorter time. 135
When the convention passed an immediate emancipation measure January 11, 1860, Governor Fletcher, on the same day, issued a proclamation putting it into effect. He sent this to the legislature and he also notified the governors of the free states of the event. They, in turn, wired back telegrams of congratulations. 136

This session of the legislature was not very important as it was overshadowed by the convention which was in session at the same time. The attitude of the senate toward the convention was well shown by a resolution passed February 1 affirmed that the convention members were not meeting the expectations of the loyal people of Missouri but were "wasting their time in fruitless debates and in speech-making, and considering questions for which the public mind is not prepared." The resolution further recommended a new convention which should make only laws of a general nature. Nothing came of this action. 137

A few days later, the Missourians, resident in Washington City, held a meeting at which a series of resolutions, endorsing the proposed thirteenth amendment to the federal constitu-
tion, were passed. These resolutions were sent to the presi-
dent of the Missouri senate. The third requested the entire
Missouri delegation in Congress "to imitate the example of 
Hon. Austin A. King and James S. Rollins, to discard party and
vote for the amendment to the Constitution forever abolishing
slavery, that amendment having been first proposed by one of
Missouri's noblest sons, Hon. John B. Henderson,..." 138

138 Ibid., p. 252.

Ousting the Judges, June 14, 1865

The apex of Radical control in Missouri was reached June
14, 1865 when William Y. N. Bay and John C. S. Dryden, two of
the supreme court judges, were forcibly removed from the court
room by the state militia, under the order of Governor Fletcher
acting in accordance with the vacating ordinance of March 17,
1865. The third judge, Barton Bates, had previously resigned.
Governor Fletcher appointed David Wagner and Walter E. Love-
lace to take the places of the ousted judges. The event created
great excitement. But it was at once pointed out that these
ousted had originally secured their appointments in exactly
the same way when Gamble, as head of the provisional government,
under authority granted by the first constituent state conven-
tion, had deposed their predecessors in 1861. 139

139 Skinker, Thomas K., "The Removal of the Judges of the
Supreme Court of Mo. in 1865," Mo. Hist. Soc. Coll., Vol. IV,
pp. 243-274.
From its beginning as a state in 1821 until about 1851, Missouri was southern in population, social customs and economic interests. One striking exception was the absence of the plantation system. During the decade from 1851 to 1861 the state underwent a gradual but decided transformation. This change was caused by a large immigration of Germans, an increased stream of settlers from the northern states and of capital from the East, and the disintegration of the Democratic party with the consequent increase in the strength of the Opposition composed mainly of Whigs.

The Germans, highly idealistic by nature, and also economically opposed to slave labor, settled in and near St. Louis, the strategic center of the state. Moreover, they had no sympathy with state rights or secession doctrines as many of them had recently fled their own country after an unsuccessful attempt to unify the German States.

Northern enterprise and a new transportation system which ran westward instead of southward was rapidly making Missouri the gateway to the West. Thomas Hart Benton described the situation well when in a famous speech at St. Louis he pointed toward the Golden Gate and dramatically exclaimed, "There lies the East, there is the road to India!"

Benton was the chief instrumentality by which the Democratic party was divided into two wings. One of them led by
himself, was devoted to the nationalistic principles as typified by Andrew Jackson and the free-soil tendencies exemplified by Martin Van Buren. The other faction, led by C. F. Jackson, was equally attached to the state rights and pro-slavery doctrines of John C. Calhoun. It was natural and easy for the Germans to follow the fortunes of the first wing; and in so doing, they merged finally with the Republican party. The Whigs took advantage of the family feud of the Democrats and thereby prolonged their own existence. One of the means of accomplishing this was amalgamation with the Americans or Know-Nothings. Being slave-owners, the Whigs were naturally drawn into an alliance with the pro-slavery Democrats. As the Germans had just left the latter, the Whigs stepped into their deserted position, a move which was made thereby the easier because of their Know-Nothing affiliations. The Whigs, however, were too strongly attached to the Union to follow the pro-slavery Democrats into the secession camp. They were unwilling to entrust the future security of their slave property to either the fortunes of successful rebellion or to the vicissitudes of war conditions. The Breckenridge Democrats, who were the main strength of the secession forces, were not slaveholders and therefore lacked the conservatism that properly interests induce.

The early spring of 1861 found the pro-slavery, state rights Democrats in control of all branches of the state government with C. F. Jackson as chief executive. When this group attempted to take the state out of the Union, the Whig-Americans, Douglas Democrats and Republicans united in the state convention as a Union party, to prevent secession. In the
beginning, very few of the coalition party, except the Republicans, (and they were chiefly Germans), were unconditional Unionists as they believed that the state could maintain a position of neutrality. The shock of war, however, drove most of them to take a firm stand for the Union. Democratic and Whig slave owners, whose idealism was not great enough to cause them to support a Republican president, were now compelled by their economic interests and those of the state in general, to sustain Lincoln's administration. This economic necessity was reinforced by the aggressive military activities of Captain Nathaniel Lyon and Colonel Francis P. Blair and their German allies.

The dominant leadership of the convention—conservative, pro-slavery, but strongly anti-secession—deposed the Jackson regime and placed Hamilton R. Gamble at the head of a provisional government which in conjunction with the convention ruled the state for over three years.

In the course of time, when the tide of rebellion had receded southward, the issue shifted to that of emancipation, inasmuch as slavery was felt to have been the cause of disunion. The Gamble regime was unable to adapt itself quickly enough to the rapid change in public sentiment. New leaders arose who threw the Conservatives on the defensive by impugning their loyalty, when they opposed immediate emancipation and they finally succumbed before the rising tide of radicalism.

This group of Radical Republicans under the leadership of Charles D. Drake and aided by the test oath, gained control
of the three departments of state government just at the close of the war.

Each of the periods outlined above was dominated by a striking personality: Claiborne Fox Jackson in the period of pro-slavery and secession control; Hamilton R. Gamble in the period of pro-slavery and union control; and Charles D. Drake in the period of union and emancipation control. The character of each of these men has been fully described in the foregoing pages.

None will deny the outstanding ability and timely services of Francis P. Blair, Jr. but his energies were divided between the political and the military fields. His greatest political strategy was the merging of previously hostile elements into a Union party for the convention campaign in 1861. His chief military service, in Missouri, was his share with Colonel Lyon in the capture of Camp Jackson and in the driving of Governor Jackson from the state. After that and during the period under discussion he figures comparatively little in the politics of the state.

Thus in a period of less than five years the state of Missouri passed from the control of its southern, pro-slavery, state rights spokesmen, who did not express the will of a majority, into the hands of its northern, Puritan, foreign born, and nationalistic group of leaders, who likewise did not represent the mass of the people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Governor, Douglas, Democrat</th>
<th>Governor, Jackson, Democratic</th>
<th>Governor, Van Buren, Constitutional</th>
<th>Governor, Harrison, Constitutional</th>
<th>Ford, Jackson, Republican</th>
<th>Ford,仓field, Republican</th>
<th>Forbush, McDowell, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
<th>Ford, Conkling, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atchison</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrain</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollinger</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Gir</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass (Vanderhyde)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariton</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Pop. 1850</td>
<td>Pop. 1860</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasconade</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalle</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnigton</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maries</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moniteam</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Madrid</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodaway</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemiscott</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettis</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Charles</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Clair</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Francois</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Genevieve</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Louis</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>14285</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taney</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ also Butler and Wright
++ aggregate of 15th senatorial district: for 1834, against 470.
+++ includes soldiers vote: for 3995, against 1168.

3. Missouri Statesman, Nov. 27,1863.
Practically all of the unprinted material used in this dissertation has been found in the archives of the Missouri Historical Society at St. Louis and consists of the memoirs and personal correspondence of a number of the most prominent men of the state. Among these are the Memoirs & Correspondence of Lieutenant-Governor Thomas C. Reynolds, especially full for the spring of 1861; the Massey Collection consisting, among other things, of the regular and frequent correspondence of Benjamin F. Massey, Secretary of State with Dr. J. F. Snyder, very illuminating for events in 1860 and 1861; the Broadhead Collection which includes in part important letters of James O. Broadhead, John B. Henderson, Samuel T. Glover, Allen P. Richardson and others; the Treat Collection consisting in part of the memoirs of Judge Samuel Treat; a few letters of Francis P. Blair, Jr.; and one of great importance by Thomas Hart Benton.

Printed Memoirs and Correspondence
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