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Chapter I

Anti-Slavery Parties

At Alton, Illinois, on the night of November 7, 1837, Elijah Parish Lovejoy suffered death at the hands of a mob for the offence of maintaining an anti-slavery journal in a pro-slavery community. Freedom of the press was stifled in Alton but the anti-slavery cause had gained a champion as well as a martyr, for a younger brother, who had come from their home in Maine to share with Elijah the danger and discouragement of the last year of his life, knelt before his brother's dead body and vowed never to forsake the cause for which he died.¹

Owen Lovejoy, then nearly twenty-seven years of age, had prepared himself for the ministry at Bowdoin College and by a subsequent theological course. He came to Illinois with Episcopalian leanings but gave up that preference when he found that before he could be ordained in the Episcopal church he must pledge himself not to agitate the slavery question.² When in October 1838 he became pastor of the Hampshire Colony Congregational Church at Princeton, Illinois,³ he entered a community where New England influences were dominant and preached to a congregation composed largely of men and women to whom anti-slavery sermons were neither novel nor disagreeable.⁴ During a pastorate of nearly seventeen years he built up a large church and made Princeton a center of anti-slavery

1. Philip Atkinson in an article entitled "Anecdotes of Owen Lovejoy" printed in a Princeton (?) newspaper of which the name does not appear, dated Sept. 22, 1895; and B.C. Cook in Chicago Tribune June 12, 1874.
2. Letter of Owen Lovejoy to his brother cited by B.C. Cook in Chicago Tribune June 12, 1874.
3. Kett, The Voters and Taxpayers of Bureau County, Ill., 128
4. Ella W. Harrison in Bureau County Record, Jan. 10, 1912.
sentiment. He did not escape criticism and discouragement for not all his hearers relished his perpetual emphasis of the evils of human bondage; but when opposition grew acute a majority of his church always supported him warmly. He had many of the qualities that make a popular preacher. Abounding physical strength, a powerful voice of pleasing quality and a countenance radiating good humor, gave him an attractive personal presence. His sermons emphasized the ethical and practical rather than the doctrinal aspects of religion. A facility of expression and a readiness to illustrate a point with an apt story or a telling Scriptural comparison combined with a remarkable ability to stir the emotions of his hearers gave him the power to hold and sway an audience. He denounced every form of evil with passionate earnestness and sometimes with immediate effectiveness if the story be true that he drove a newly-installed saloon out of town by a scathing philippic from the pulpit. Slavery was, however, the object of his bitterest condemnation and the subject of many a sermon. Rarely did he complete a service without some reference to the injustice and iniquity of "property in man". Country people from miles around came to hear the "abolitionist" preacher and they tied their teams in long lines to the fences outside while crowded the seating capacity of the little church to overflowing.

Princeton was one of the stations of the Underground Railroad and to the Lovejoy farm just east of town many a trembling fugitive was conveyed under cover of darkness, to be sent northward at the earliest opportunity. Numerous stories are told of Lovejoy's courage and coolness in thwarting angry masters in their efforts to recapture their property. For several such affairs he was brought to trial but in a community so largely sympathetic this served only to

1. Ella W. Harrison in Bureau County Record, Jan. 10, 1912.
2. Heagle, Owen Lovejoy as a Gospel Minister, 12, and Ella W. Harrison in Bureau County Record, Jan. 10, 1912.
increase his popularity and deepen public sentiment against the institution of slavery. The circle of his influence widened as years went by and he became known through northern Illinois as an anti-slavery lecturer. He encountered hostility and sometimes personal annoyance in towns where "abolitionists" were regarded with abhorrence by the mass of the people; but his courage won him hearers and his arguments, reinforced as they always were, by unmistakable earnestness, often won his hearers for the cause he had at heart.

The political parties founded on the issue of human freedom enlisted the hearty support of Owen Lovejoy. For two decades before the election of Lincoln in 1860 a little group of men in Illinois were working, amid persecution and contempt, to create a public sentiment against slavery that should somehow make itself effective. These were the so-called "Abolitionists" — the men who threw themselves enthusiastically into the Liberty, Free Soil, and Free Democratic movements in turn and who finally were first in Illinois to see the possibility of a new party that should fuse hitherto discordant elements into hearty cooperation on the slavery issue. David Nelson, Zebina Eastman, Ichabod Codding, James Collins, and Owen Lovejoy are the prominent names in this group. On the death of David Nelson, Lovejoy succeeded to the leadership of the Liberty party.

He was far from being an Abolitionist of the Garrison type for the Constitution was to him a charter of freedom under which the United States had the right to prohibit slavery in the territories and in the District of Columbia but could not interfere by legislation with slavery in the states. The extinction of slavery must come through the agency of an enlightened public sentiment in the slave states themselves. Radical and often over-violent in his denunciation of the southern institution he nevertheless won the respect and affection of the Liberty men of northern Illinois in the decade from 1840 to 1850. In the campaign of 1843 when

1. Philip Atkinson in newspaper article; B.C. Cook in Chicago Tribune, June 12, 1874.
Lovejoy and Codding took the stump for the congressional nominees of the Liberty party and distinguished themselves by convincing speeches and courteous treatment of their opponents, these two became the idols of the party.¹

In 1846 Lovejoy himself was nominated for Congress in the fourth district. He took the stump again and his growing personal popularity is shown by the fact that he polled twice the vote cast for the Liberty candidate in the preceding election.² In 1847 at the Buffalo national convention his name was one of those proposed for the vice-presidential nomination. In 1848 the Free Soil party was born. The Liberty men had named candidates early in the year and Lovejoy, again a candidate for Congress had begun a campaign for which a committee had been organized and a fund of $388 subscribed.³ The Liberty men declared themselves ready to unite with any party which should take a stand in opposition to slavery or its extension. They were as good as their word. In August a convention at Buffalo, to which Lovejoy was a delegate, resulted in the fusion of the Liberty men, the Barnburners, and the Conscience Whigs, in the Free Soil Party.⁴ The Illinois leaders made a vigorous canvass for the ticket of the new party but the Whigs rendered much of their argument ineffective by inserting in their platform a declaration of opposition to slavery extension, and the Free Soil state ticket received fewer votes than the Liberty party had polled in 1846.⁵ Lovejoy got 3142 votes in his district — 389 less than he had polled in 1846.⁶

The Free Soil party soon gave way to the Free Democrats and Lovejoy was one of the Illinois delegation at the national convention at Pittsburg in 1851 and again in 1852 when Hale and Julian were nominated. Lovejoy took the stump

2. Wentworth (Dem), received 12115 votes; Kerr (Whig), 6079; Lovejoy, 353. Official Records in office of Secretary of State at Springfield.
4. Ibid. 162.
5. Ibid. 169 ff.
6. Wentworth (Dem), 11857; Scammon (Whig), 8302; Lovejoy 3142. Official Records in office of Secretary of State.
for the candidates of Free Democracy and one who heard a speech of his at Galesburg during the campaign recalled many years later the absence of any affectation of ministerial dignity by the speaker and his droll application of Biblical quotations to the political situation.¹ The developments of the next two years in state and national politics gave an unexpected impetus to anti-slavery sentiment in Illinois and the vigilant leaders of the party were not slow to seize their opportunity. A bill passed by the legislature in 1853 forbidding the importation of free negroes aroused much latent sympathy for the negro. In that year the Free Democratic party organization was strengthened in every state of the Northwest and such was the disintegration of the old parties that "what was now needed was a center of irritation around which a new party could be crystallized."² That center of irritation was furnished by the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

In every state of the Northwest except Illinois, the Anti-Nebraska men joined in a new party in 1854, the Free Democracy cheerfully merging its existence in that of the new organization and rejoicing at last in the formation of a powerful party on the slavery issue.³ In Illinois the situation was peculiar. Apparently the first move toward the organization of a new party was made by a convention of Anti-Nebraska men who met at Princeton July 4, 1854, nominated Lovejoy for the state legislature and adopted resolutions favoring united action on the part of all persons opposed to the extension of slavery.⁴ In August a Free Democratic convention in Du Page County at which Codding, Giddings, and Lovejoy were prominent speakers, accepted the name Republican.⁵

A few months later Lovejoy and Codding were the leading spirits in an attempt to bring Illinois abreast with her neighbors in the matter of a party or-

---

¹ Philip Atkinson in newspaper article.
³ Ibid, 297.
⁴ B.C. Cook in *Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 1874.
⁵ Harris, *Negro Servitude in Illinois*, 190.
ganization. A call was issued for a convention to be held at Springfield October 4; but when the delegates assembled on the day set, only Lovejoy, Codding, Throop, Farnsworth and a few others were present — so few that they adjourned until the next day. On October 5 the attendance was more encouraging and an organization was effected. The members adjourned to hear a speech by Lincoln at the State Fair then being held in the capital, and were so pleased with what they heard that after adopting a moderate set of resolutions as their platform they named the Whig leader a member of their state committee. Someone ventured a doubt as to the wisdom of this but Lovejoy settled the matter by a hearty endorsement of Lincoln's position on the slavery question. Lovejoy had more faith in Lincoln than that cautious Whig leader had in the political sagacity of the anti-slavery men who composed this convention but it is probable that his only information of the proceedings and purpose of the convention came from the meager and inaccurate reports in the Springfield papers. The Illinois State Register published what purported to be the set of resolutions adopted October 5 but what was in reality a much more radical series adopted by an anti-slavery meeting in Kane County.

1. This account of the convention of Oct. 4 - 5 is taken largely from an article Paul Selby, The Genesis of the Republican Party in Illinois, in Ill. State Hist. Soc., Trans., 1906, pp. 270-283. He gives the resolutions adopted at Springfield (ibid. 282), which declare that Congress has violated the Missouri Compromise; that it is the right of the central government to prohibit slavery in the territories; that the Nebraska bill is in principle a surrender of the traditional policy toward slavery; that the right of trial by jury and habeas corpus should never be abrogated; that the spirit of the convention is not one of antagonism to the South but one of hope for co-operation with them; and finally that the convention heartily approves the course of those men in other states who have united in the cause of free soil.

2. Lincoln, Works (Fed. ed.), III, 251. These resolutions figured prominently in 1858 when Douglas brought them forward at Ottawa as the platform of the first Republican convention in the state. Ibid. III, 189.
Lincoln declined to serve on the state central committee, explaining his action in a letter to Codding. 1 "I suppose," he wrote, "my opposition to the principle of slavery is as strong as that of any member of the Republican party, but I have also supposed that the extent to which I feel authorized to carry that opposition, practically, was not at all satisfactory to that party. The leading men who organized that party were present on the 4th. of October at the discussion between Douglas and myself at Springfield, and had full opportunity to not misunderstand my position. Do I misunderstand them?" From this it seems fairly certain that he had not read the resolutions really adopted by the convention. Their cardinal principles were opposition to the Nebraska bill and the right and duty of the general government to prohibit slavery in the territories. Had Lincoln realized this he could scarcely have failed to recognize the harmony between his position and theirs. During the year 1854, when he was trying hard to induce the Whig party as a whole to declare opposition to the Nebraska act, Lovejoy was "the bogey being held up to deter him from entering any combination with those who had been stigmatized . . . with the title of Abolitionists." 2 In August 1855, however, when several months nearer agreement with Lovejoy and Codding, Lincoln wrote "I think I am a Whig, but others say there are no Whigs and that I am an Abolitionist." 3

The state elections in the fall of 1854 were preceded by a general discussion of the question of slavery extension. Trumbull, Palmer, Koerner, Arnold, Cook — former Democrats — joined with the Whigs — Lincoln, Browning, Yates, and Swett — in opposition to the Douglas policy. The united votes of anti-Nebraska Whigs and Democrats, and the old Free Soilers, newly christened Republicans, resulted in a legislature controlled by anti-Nebraska men, and among

them was Owen Lovejoy as the representative of Bureau County in the House. This was his formal initiation into official political life. From this time until his death ten years later, although he did not resign his pastorate until 1856, political responsibilities absorbed most of his time and attention. For one year his activity was confined to Illinois; thereafter national politics claimed his services.

1. Illinois House Journals, 1855, p. 5
Chapter II

The Organization of the Republican Party

In his short term of service in the legislature of Illinois Lovejoy showed himself actively interested in legislation for his own district, in education, in temperance measures, above all in matters affecting or affected by the slavery issue. He was member of the committee on education, licence, and the state library and he was made chairman of a joint committee to visit and investigate conditions in the state institutions at Jacksonville. The "negro question" made its appearance early in the session. On January 4 Lovejoy voted against a scheme of colonization in Africa and a day later he voted for an inquiry into the superior advantages of Canada as a field for colonization. Other measures intended to ameliorate the conditions of the negroes of Illinois enlisted his support.

The most important business of the session was the choice of United States Senator which was set for February 8. On February 6 Lovejoy offered a series of resolutions the purpose of which was to put on record the sentiment of the House before the election. A preamble declaring the repeal of the prohibitions of 1787 and 1820 a violation of a sacred contract was adopted by a vote forty-four to thirty. The first resolution instructing the Senators and requesting the Representatives in Congress, to support a bill for the restoration of those prohibitions, was likewise adopted, but the second and third resolutions, respectively declaring against the admission of any more slave states, and demanding the repeal or the modification of the fugitive slave law, failed of adoption. On February

1. House Journal, 1855, pp. 11, 12, 15.  
2. Ibid. 70.  
3. Ibid. 24, 25.  
4. Ibid. 66, 86, 266.  
5. For the resolutions see House Journal 283, 284; for the votes, ibid., 306 - 309. These resolutions, like the series alleged to have been adopted at Springfield in 1854, were given publicity in 1858 when Douglas used them in
8 the election took place with James Shields as the Democratic candidate for re-election, while Lyman Trumbull and Lincoln represented the anti-Nebraska Democrats and Whigs respectively. The story of the balloting, of Lincoln's generous withdrawal of his name, and of the consequent election of Trumbull is too well known to repeat. Lovejoy voted for Lincoln on the first three ballots; on the fourth he gave his vote to Ogden, carrying a few others with him; on the eighth and thereafter he voted for Trumbull, who was elected on the tenth.¹

After the adjournment of the legislature in February Lovejoy returned to his pastoral duties and devoted his abundant energy to them for a year longer. It is easy to imagine the keen interest with which he must have watched the watched the progress of the new party which he had tried to organize in his own state in 1854. A national organization of the Republican party was effected early in 1856. Lovejoy was a delegate at the national convention in Pittsburg February 22 and 23, at which twenty-three states were represented. The parson-politician from Illinois took a prominent part in the preliminary arrangements, and was asked to open the convention with prayer.² There was a suppressed murmur of applause when he asked God to enlighten the mind of the president of the United States and turn him from his evil ways, and if this was not possible, to remove him so that an honest man might take his place.³ The enthusiasm was a bit dampened when Horace Greeley made a speech in which he plead for moderation and extreme caution, but revived again when Giddings appeared. With a view to neutralizing the effect of Greeley's speech Giddings called on Lovejoy, introducing him with a droll story.⁴

In a fiery speech Lovejoy denounced the administration, the border ruffians of his charge of abolitionism against Lincoln and his supporters. Lincoln, Works, (Fed. ed.) III, p. 315.

1. House Journal, 348 - 361. Ogden had been at one time a candidate for Congress on the Free Soil ticket.
2. Proceedings of the first three Republican Conventions, 7.
4. Ibid, 316.
Kansas and the Lecompton legislature. Other speakers followed and the various necessary committees were appointed. On the committee on national organization Lovejoy was the member from Illinois. 1 The resolutions adopted demanded the freedom of Kansas, and of all the territories, which meant the restriction of slavery to the states in which it already existed. The convention was not controlled by politic statesmen — those of that type who were present took little active part in the proceedings, and many others remained entirely aloof until events pointed to success. "It was the element of uncalculating radicalism which baffled the policy of timidity and hesitation and saved the cause." 2 Owen Lovejoy was the representative par excellence of that element in Illinois.

The national nominating convention met at Philadelphia June 17 - 19, 1856. It was characterized by the elevation of sentiment and the lofty enthusiasm which animate a new movement in which a moral issue is involved. Lovejoy's was one of several informal addresses on the first day. His declaration that the destiny of the American nation was to maintain the truths of the Declaration of Independence did not sound trite to an audience newly awakened to a determination to realize that destiny. He explained his "abolitionism" with a drollery that aroused laughter; he maintained that there must be no invasion of the rights of the South — slavery must be excluded from the free territories and two hundred and fifty thousand slave-holders must no longer be allowed to control the government — but when the victory should be won, the South must be treated fairly. 3

Meanwhile Illinois had at last fallen into line. While the national party was being organized at Pittsburg in February a group of anti-Nebraska newspaper men met at Decatur to plan an organization of the Republicans of Illinois. 4

2. Ibid., 322.
Men were ready for the movement that had failed in 1854. The convention which met at Bloomington May 29, 1856, as a result of this editorial conference, is a memorable event in the political history of the state. Whigs, Democrats, and Free Soilers came to Bloomington determined to find common ground for political action in the coming national and state campaign. They found that their old differences had vanished in the light of recent events. The latest news from Kansas fanned the flame of excitement, and when Governor Reeder told the crowd, on the evening of May 28, enthusiasm mounted high. The next morning brought the Chicago papers with the news of the destruction of the Free-State Hotel at Lawrence. When the convention assembled Bissell was nominated to head the State ticket and the delegates listened to speeches from John M. Palmer, O. H. Browning, Lovejoy and Lincoln. Judge Cunningham describes Lovejoy's speech as vigorous but tactful.

Many of his hearers knew him only by what his enemies had said of him and expected to see a veritable "Abolition Ogre." He knew that this was his opportunity to make friends and he used it well. He had mingled with the crowd and knew that the spirit which gave them common ground was opposition to the extension of slavery.

So he denounced the Douglas policy and its results in Kansas, making a characteristic portrayal of the horrors of the Kansas situation. He not only carried his miscellaneous audience with him but broke down, once for all, much of the prejudice against himself.

A month later a Republican convention for the third district met to name congressional candidates. The northern counties of this district were settled largely by people from the North Atlantic and New England states who were inclined to radicalism on the slavery question. In the southern counties on the other hand, the predominating element consisted of emigrants from the border states and such of them as had enlisted in the new party had no love for "abolitionists." Lovejoy, as the candidate of the northern counties, was nominated by a majority of

1. In a paper in Ill. State Hist. Soc. Trans.1906, p. 103 et. seq.
2. The state had been redistricted since 1846. Will, Bureau, Livingstone, Mc-
one. The dis satisfied minority called a bolting convention at Bloomington at which an independent candidate was chosen and a canvass planned. In the evening a ratification meeting was held in the court-house square, and was addressed by several speakers. At last one Gridley made a violent speech in which he denounced Lovejoy as a "nigger-stealer" and indulged in other abusive remarks. The meeting was about to close when someone shouted Lovejoy! and those who supposed him at home in Princeton were astounded to see his broad shoulders thrust their way the crowd to the platform. He faced the unfriendly audience in the realization that much, perhaps everything, in the coming contest, depended on the impression he should make. Ignoring the abuse of the preceding speech he explained his position on the slavery question as simple conformity to the injunction of Jesus "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." He disclaimed all right to interfere with slavery in the states but insisted that the fugitive slave law should be modified. He captured his audience and the crowd dispersed with three cheers for Lovejoy. Thus the bolting movement came to naught.

The Republicans worked hard and hopefully in the campaign of 1856. Lovejoy was busy making stump speeches in the district and writing to his friends as to the management of the campaign in those parts of the district where he was unable to go himself. The election returns were a disappointment in that Buchanan carried the state, by a narrow majority, but the Republican state ticket was elected and four districts sent Republicans to Congress. Lovejoy's majority in the third district was 6061 out of a total of 32075 votes. On the tenth of Dec-

1. Philip Atkinson in newspaper article; Ezra M. Prince, Reminiscences of Owen Lovejoy, in a clipping from a Bloomington paper (no date, no name).
2. Letter to J. W. Fell, October 25, in the possession of the Misses Fell, Bloomington, Ill.
ember the Republican leaders celebrated the election of their state ticket by a banquet at the Tremont House in Chicago, where Lincoln, Lovejoy, Turner, Cook, and others made stirring speeches. The new party which had won so great a measure of success in its first campaign might well look forward to complete victory four years later.

To Owen Lovejoy, especially, must the triumph have been sweet. Distrusted by the conservative leaders of the party at the outset of the campaign and regarded by many of the voters as the personification of abolitionism, he had succeeded in disarming prejudice without offending his old friends. Many men were won by the unexpectedly moderate stand he took on the question of interference with slavery in the states, while his past record assured him the confidence of the radicals. They could be certain that when opportunity came Owen Lovejoy would through never betray timidity or over-caution the cause he had served twenty years of unpopularity and contempt.


Chapter III

Congress and the Kansas Question

Although the Dred Scott decision in the spring of 1857 seemed to augur well for the partisans of slavery extension, the verdict of the supreme court had not settled the Kansas question. Governor Walker's just and efficient administration won the support and co-operation of the free-state citizens, and with the cessation of riot and outrage, public attention turned away from Kansas and became more and more engrossed in the series of financial disasters which ushered in the panic of 1857. The Kansas situation, however, although quiet, was ominous. The Lecompton convention, chosen at an election where the free-state party had refused to vote and thus representative only of the pro-slavery faction, proceeded, in the face of a territorial legislature, largely free-state, to concoct a scheme for forcing a pro-slavery constitution on the people of Kansas: at an election set for December 21 they were to vote for "the constitution with slavery" or for "the constitution with no slavery". But the constitution itself contained a clause guaranteeing non-interference with the right of property in slaves already in the territory. Governor Walker denounced this proposition as a miserable fraud but through the southern Democratic leaders were determined to push it and they found in Buchanan an easy tool.¹

¹. For an account of the situation in 1857, see Rhodes, Hist. of United States, II, Chap. IX.
whole Kansas question had, he averred, occupied too much of the public attention and it was high time that it were directed to more important affairs. The Kansas question was to be, nevertheless, the dominant political issue of the winter. Douglas, waiting for no further revelation of the administration policy, denounced the Lecompton scheme in the Senate December 9, as a violation of the principle of popular sovereignty. A breach was thus created in the Democratic party and the southern leaders had no epithet too stinging for the conduct of the traitor; but the western Democrats stood by their leader and in the Senate and House throughout the session, the Republicans were reinforced in their opposition to the Kansas policy of the administration by the anti-Lecompton Democrats.

That policy became more evident as the months went by. Governor Walker had been forced to resign in November and Acting Governor Stanton was removed soon after, because of their opposition to the Lecompton project. The election ordered by Lecompton convention was ignored by the free-state men and resulted in a large majority for the "constitution with slavery;" a few days later at an election ordered by the territorial legislature, a much larger majority voted to reject the constitution. It was evident to any intelligent observer that Kansas was opposed to slavery by a large majority, but Buchanan grew daily more compliant to the demands of the southern leaders. In his message of February 2 he urged the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution. The bill framed in accordance with the presidential recommendation passed the Senate March 23 after weeks of debate which Douglas boldly opposed the course of the administration at the cost of a general proscription of the office-holders who remained loyal to him.

In the House the Republicans constituted a vigorous minority which

2. Ibid. p. 533.
exercised its opposition chiefly against the alliance between the president and the southern politicians. Of that minority Lovejoy led the most radical element. His reputation as an "abolitionist" and the aggressiveness of his attitude made him an object of especial attack by members from the slave states, while as yet he exerted comparatively little influence in his own party. The Kansas question was, in his own words, "the paramount thing" in this session and for him few paths of opposition led elsewhere than to the matter of the Lecompton constitution.

In the House, as in the Senate, the president's message of February 2 gave rise to violent and acrimonious discussion. On February 17 Atkins of Tennessee made a speech in support of the presidential recommendation, closing with a threat that persistence in the policy of opposition to the extension of slavery would mean dissolution of the Union. Lovejoy immediately took the floor and in a speech that bears evidence of careful preparation, argued against the admission of Kansas under a pro-slavery constitution on the broad ground of opposition to any extension of so hideous an evil as slavery. The struggle was, he declared, not between North and South but between freedom and slavery. If the small class of southern slave-holders should be annihilated there would still be a South which divided among small freeholders, might become again the garden of America. The small dominant class, however, could alone bring the controversy to a happy issue if they would agree on some wise process for ridding themselves of the slavery system, then indeed might the nation rejoice. The evils of that system he said, were once acknowledged by southern men. "But all this is changed now. The demon slavery has come forth from the tombs. It has grown bold and defiant and impudent.

2. Ibid. 130.
3. See his remarks on the treasury note bill, Ibid. 132.
4. Ibid. 751.
5. Ibid. 752 - 754.
It has left its lair, lifted its shameless front toward the skies, and with horrid mutters contortions and gyrations, mouths the heavens and its blasphemies about having the sanction of a just and holy God, dodges behind the national compact and grins and chatters out its senile puerilities about constitutional sanction, and then like a very fantastic ape, jumps upon the bench, puts on ermine and wig, and pronounces the dictum that a certain class of human beings have no rights which another certain class are bound to regard." He went on to say that slavery, having polluted the territories, had invaded the free states, hampered a free press, degraded free labor, and forced itself into Kansas while the president and the chief justice called on the nation in the name of Democracy to worship in its temple. As to constitutional sanction, if it were admitted in the face of the well known intention of Madison and Jefferson, that the Constitution authorized slave tenure, a state had no more right than a territory to forbid it. His concluding argument was that slavery lay in the way of the glorious destiny of the United States. It made mockery of the Declaration of Independence and "What is to reward us for all this shame? ... Will the clank of human fetters on the plains of Kansas and the wail of man's despair on the Pacific shore, compensate us for this sacrifice?"

When the Senate bill for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution came up for discussion in the House, the Douglas Democrats combined with the Republicans to oppose it. The Montgomery amendment, providing for the submission of the constitution to the popular vote in Kansas and the admission of territory as a state by presidential proclamation in the event either of acceptance or rejection (in the latter case a new constitution and state government were to be formed) passed the House by the combined vote of the Republicans and twenty-two Democrats. This was a virtual recognition of the Douglas principle of popular

1. April 1, 1858.
sovereignty and the radicals probably voted for it with reluctance; but the Kansas struggle had loomed so large in all eyes that to get the Lecompton constitution fairly submitted to a popular vote may have seemed a triumph in the certainty of what that vote would be.

If the agreement to the Montgomery substitute was an abandonment of principle it was a useless sacrifice. The Senate refused to accept the modification and the result of a committee of conference was the English bill which offered to the people of Kansas an opportunity to vote on the Lecompton constitution, but with the provision that if this were rejected they should not be admitted until the population of the territory reached the number required for a representative. This bill was passed in the House in spite of the opposition of all the Republicans, and also in the Senate, where Douglas denounced it as unfair and refused to vote for it. Late in the summer the vote took place and the people of Kansas rejected the proposition by an enormous majority.

Congress adjourned June 14. On June 2 Lovejoy announced to the House that he had intended to make a speech on the slavery question but in view of the impatience of all to get away from Washington he would defer that speech until the next session. There is little doubt that his impatience to get away was due to his anxiety to reach the field of battle in Illinois where congressional nominations and the contest for United States Senator were imminent. Lovejoy's renomination was practically assured before he left Washington but he was keenly interested in the senatorial issue. Many eastern Republicans urged their friends in Illinois to allow Douglas to return to the Senate unopposed in recognition of his stand on the Lecompton issue; but the Illinois Republicans knew how irreconcilable were Douglas and they on all vital questions save the one on which they

3. Ibid. 2644.
had just taken common ground, and in a convention at Springfield June 16 they unanimously nominated Lincoln as their candidate. It was on this occasion that he delivered his famous house-divided-against-theself speech which must have gone far to convince the most radical anti-slavery men that Lovejoy had not erred in 1854 when he so earnestly endorsed Lincoln's position on the slavery question.

The conservative Republican leaders, still distrusted Lovejoy, however. There was again some discussion of the feasibility of putting up an independent candidate, but Lincoln, although it appears that he would have preferred a less radical man, strongly advised against such a course. "There is no safe way but a convention," he wrote to W. H. Lamon, June 11, "and if in that convention, upon a common platform which all are willing to stand upon, one who has been known as an abolitionist, but who is now occupying none but common ground, can get the majority of the votes to which we all look for an election, there is no safe way but to submit." 1

The first of the series of Lincoln-Douglas debates was held at Ottawa in Lovejoy's own district, and here Douglas began his attempt to fasten on Lincoln the opprobrium of abolitionism by making the charge that Lincoln and Trumbull had agreed in 1854 to abolitionize the Whig and Democratic parties and to turn them over to Giddings, Chase, and "Parson Lovejoy." 2 As a proof of the alleged wicked compact the Senator read, as the platform of the Springfield convention of October 1854, the set of resolutions falsely reported in the Illinois State Register as the work of that convention. 3 Lincoln disclaimed any connection with the resolutions or their framers but he did not recognize the inaccuracy of the statement as to their origin. Lovejoy, who was on the platform, 4 must have detected the error into which Douglas had fallen, and may have set Lincoln right on the subject
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for at the next debate Douglas was forced to acknowledge his mistake. He did not however, abandon the attempt to associate Lincoln with Lovejoy and radicalism—a sound bit of tactics, for the audiences in central and southern Illinois were very sensitive to the charge of abolitionism. At Jonesboro he cited the resolutions introduced by Lovejoy in the state legislature just before the election of Senator in 1856 as evidence of the abolition sentiments of the man who voted for Lincoln on that occasion. Throughout the series of speeches occur frequent allusions to "Parson Lovejoy" and the blackness of his Republicanism. Lovejoy did not relish these sneers. Benjamin F. Shaw describes a chance meeting with him on the train en route to Freeport to attend the second debate: he was in a bad humor because Douglas had used his name at Ottawa as the personification of abolitionism.

However damaging to the candidacy of Lincoln these tactics of Douglas may have been, Lovejoy himself was not injured by them, for his district returned him to Congress by a majority of 7325. Lincoln was defeated but his part in the debates had won the admiration and respect of thoughtful men throughout the North as well as in Illinois.

The second session of the thirty-fifth Congress (December 3, 1858—March 3, 1859) continued the work of the first session and is chiefly interesting for its indication of a growing sectionalism in legislation and in sentiment. The Cuba bill occasioned bitter controversy between northern and southern members; the northern Democrats, following the lead of Douglas, repudiated the new pretension of Davis and his supporters, that the general government owed protection to slavery in the territories. The Pacific Railroad bill which meant much to the North
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was killed by the indifference of the southern Senators and the homestead bill suffered a like fate.

Lovejoy's abundant intellectual energy did not exhaust itself on the slavery issue. The congressional debates are full of evidence of his keen interest in every subject that was discussed in the House. No question was too insignificant for him to try to understand it, no measure so popular that he did not record his protest if convinced of its unsoundness. He opposed most of the legislation of the thirty-fifth Congress. He was not slow to charge the administration with extravagance, corruption, and discrimination, but partisan opposition by no means explains his action in all cases. In political theory he was a Jeffersonian Democrat: he held that the true function of government was to guarantee protection in person and property and in lawful pursuits while it left the individual to work out his own destiny. Hence he deplored any tendency to centralization, he was opposed to the national bank idea, he would reduce military and naval armament to a minimum, and for a protective tariff policy he had little respect. A proper adherence to the legitimate functions of government would, he argued, obviate much extravagant expenditure. So he voted against the army appropriation bill because he believed the army should be "cut down to a skeleton" instead of increased. An appropriation for the construction of new gun-boats for the navy seemed to him even more unnecessary. In the discussion of the diplomatic and consular bill he moved to strike out the entire clause providing for the salaries of the envoys extraordinary, ministers, and commissioners of the United States at the various foreign courts, insistina that the consuls could take charge of all the important
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functions of the service. He was not unsupported in this contention and the all
House finally adopted an amendment striking out, but the more important names on the list.

His opposition to the treasury note bill which authorized an issue of non-interest-bearing legal-tender paper currency, he explained as follows: "I object in the first place that it is pressed with such hot and indecent haste... It proposes to do a certain thing under concealment and disguise... It will be called a loan but in reality it is converting the government into a great shin-plaster machine, to flood the country with an irredeemable paper currency... Do the honest... thing; say the government has failed and we must borrow money and go into New York and pledge the faith of the Government. If that will not do... pledge the impeccable and inviolate faith of the Democratic party and the gold will begin to move toward you." When later his own party embarked on the same dangerous policy he was one of the few who opposed it vigorously.

A bill providing pensions for the surviving soldiers of the war of 1812 passed the House by a large majority December 22, 1858. After the vote Lovejoy, who was among the nays, declared that if members had voted by ballot and according to their honest convictions the measure could not have commanded fifty votes. Laughter and approval greeted this statement. The policy of pensioning soldiers who had suffered no injury or disability would prove, he predicted, a ruinous one to the government; once inaugurated, it would have to be extended to include every war that had been fought or that might be fought in the future.

An account of Lovejoy's first term in Congress would scarcely be com-
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plete without including an incident that his admirers recount with pride. During the first session Davis of Mississippi made an unprovoked personal attack on the "abolition" member from Illinois, sending to the Clerk's desk a letter from one E. H. Lombard accusing Lovejoy of enticing away one of his slaves.¹ Lovejoy made no answer at the time but a year later when Singleton of Mississippi interrupted a speech of Lovejoy's with an offensive repetition of the charge, the latter answered indignantly, "I never stole away any of the gentleman's negroes — he never rightfully owned a negro . . . . And, sir, if this committee wish to know — as my attention has several times been called to this, and as scurrilous letters have been read here — whether I keep fugitive slaves, I march right up to the confessional and tell them that I do. There is no human being, black or white, that ever comes to my door and asks for food when hungry, or shelter when houseless, but receives it; and if the invisible spirit of slavery expects to cross my humble threshold and forbid me to feed the hungry or shelter the houseless, I bid that demon defiance in the name of my God."²

1. January 27, 1858.

Chapter IV

The Eve of the Conflict

The summer and fall of 1859 brought a number of events which indicated the approach of the irrepressible conflict: the sympathy and enthusiasm of the North was aroused by the violation of the fugitive slave law in the Oberlin - Wellington rescue; Jefferson Davis in a speech before a convention in Mississippi, urging the repeal of the piracy laws, contended that the slave trade was a matter rightfully belonging to the states to decide, and declared that the moral status of slavery was no longer questioned save by fanatics; Douglas wrote for Harper's Magazine an article directed against the position of the southern Democrats; and in California the bitterness between Lecompton and anti-Lecompton Democrats culminated in the tragedy of Broderick's death. The October elections were favorable to the Republicans, but before the excitement died away John Brown's raid filled the North with dismay not unmixed with admiration and aroused the rage and fear of the South. The Democrats tried to make capital for the November elections by charging the Republican leaders with complicity in the plot, but the returns show that the Harper's Ferry raid did not seriously injure the Republican cause.1

Congress assembled in the excitement attending the trial and execution of John Brown, and the first days of the session brought to the surface the sectional antagonism that grew more bitter year by year. The prolonged contest over the speakership was characterized by acrimony and ill-feeling. The House consisted of 109 Republicans, 101 Democrats, and 27 Americans; 13 of the Democrats were anti-Lecompton.2 Sherman of Ohio was the choice of the Republicans for speaker, but early in the balloting the Democrats charged him with having recommended an in-

1. Rhodes, Hist. U. S. II., Chap. X.
oendiary publication — Helper's "Impending Crisis". Sherman was indeed one of the large number of congressmen including Grow and Giddings and Lovejoy who had allowed their names to be used in recommendation of the book as campaign material. Millson of Virginia denounced the signers of such a book as "not only not fit to be speaker but . . . not fit to live." 2

Unrestricted by the formalities of a regularly organized body the House was for more than eight weeks the scene of violent debate and bitter recrimination.

The southern members did most of the talking while the Republicans were moderate on the whole, and observed a "studied silence." 2 To their opponents, however, this restraint seemed "a sullen and most contemptuous silence." 2 Lovejoy kept entirely out of the discussion save for an occasional demand for yeas and nays. The contest was brought to an end by the withdrawal of Sherman's name and Pennington, a conservative Republican from New Jersey, was chosen on February 1 by a combination of the Republicans and several anti-Lecompton Democrats and Americans. The amenities of Parliamentary procedure were restored and for a time the ominous passions of sectionalism smouldered under a thin crust of forbearance and courtesy.

The storm broke forth again, however, when on April 5 the House in committee of the whole was addressed by Owen Lovejoy on the slavery question. It was the speech he had promised at the close of a former session 3 and he was not a man to be deterred by the promptings of political caution or personal prudence from entering his protest against the arguments and threats of the slavery leaders. The bill for the suppresion of polygamy in Utah was under consideration and he announced that he intended to discuss slavery as the second of the "twin relics of barbarism." After some objection he was allowed to proceed. 4 He began by conceding that congressional control of the problem was limited to a right to
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keep slavery within its present limits; but when it was proposed to remove those restrictions it was proper to inquire into the nature and influences of the system. Slavery, he declared, was the sum of all villainies -- violent as robbery, blood-thirsty as piracy, brutal as polygamy. Its advocates justified it on three grounds: the inferiority of the negro race, the Christianizing influence of the system, and the guarantee of the Constitution. As to the first argument, he went on to say, "The principle of enslaving human beings because they were inferior is this: If a man is a cripple, trip him up; if he is old and weak and bowed with the weight of years, strike him, for he cannot strike back; if idiotic take advantage of him; and if a child, deceive him . . . . there is no place in the universe outside the five points of hell and the Democratic party where the practice and prevalence of such doctrines would not be a disgrace." As he spoke, Lovejoy advanced into the open space fronting the Democratic benches and with vehement gesture flung the words into the faces of his opponents. Pryor, one of the fiercest of the southerners came toward him shouting, "The gentleman from Illinois shall not approach this side of the House shaking his fists and talking in the way he has talked. It is bad enough to be compelled to sit here and hear him utter his treasonable and insulting language; but he shall not, sir, come upon this side of the House, shaking his fist in our faces."

Lovejoy's friends came to his support. "We listened to gentlemen upon the other side for eight weeks," cried Potter of Wisconsin, "when they denounced the members on this side with violent and offensive language. We listened to them through quietly and heard them . And now, sir, this side shall be heard, let the consequences be what they may." At this point the chair ordered all members to resume their seats but the disorder was not to be quelled. Cox and Barksdale threatened Lovejoy. Adrain attempted conciliation; but the confusion increased. Washburne, Kellogg and Potter insisted that the speech be heard while more prudent Republicans moved that the committee rise. The speaker took the chair and
requested all members to take their seats. Barksdale shouted "Order that black-hearted scoundrel and nigger-stealing thief to take his seat and this side of the House will do it."

Order was at length restored and Lovejoy resumed his speech. Taking up the second ground on which slavery was wont to be defended, he proceeded, not without interruption, to demolish the contention that slavery was a Christianizing and civilizing agency, presenting two instances of extreme and revolting cruelty with the passionate earnestness which that phase of the subject always aroused in him. The derisive laughter and the flippant comment which greeted the recital of these incidents must have seemed to some of his hearers a striking reinforcement of his argument. The alleged constitutional sanction of slavery he denied utterly, but he repeated the statement that as a federal law-maker the system in the states was beyond his reach. Then why discuss it? For the sake, he answered, of creating a public sentiment that should at length bring the abolition of slaveholding in the only proper way, "by the action of the slave states themselves." He took the opportunity to comment on the speakership contest and declared that he had endorsed the Helper book deliberately and intelligently. Its greatest offence, he maintained, was that it urged practically the formation of a Republican party in the slave states. Such a party, he thought, as did many Republican leaders until disillusioned by actual events, the future was sure to bring: "You may kill Cassius M. Clay as you threaten to do . . . . You may shed his blood as you shed the blood of my brother on the banks of the Mississippi twenty years ago -- and what then? . . . A Republican party will spring up . . . . in all the slave states ere long and these disunionists . . . will be displaced by more moderate and . . . more sensible men."

Although constantly interrupted by taunts and sneers which provoked retort from the Republican benches, not once during the speech did he descend to the sort of personality he encountered; but his violent denunciation must have
irritating in the extreme to the "Hotspurs" of the South.

The press reports of this scene delighted northern men, who had felt keenly the repeated charges of cowardice made against them for their avoidance of personal encounter. Lovejoy himself described the affair and the excitement it caused at the capitol in a letter to his wife the next day. He felt that the Republicans had supported him nobly and thought they would have beaten their opponents badly if it had come to blows. He had never, he told her, said anything more savage in the pulpit or on the stump, adding naively -- "I supposed it seemed worse to them than to me as I am more used to it."

That the consequences of this expression might have been more serious if the attention of the country had not turned at once to the approaching Democratic convention, is the opinion expressed by a conservative Southerner. At Charleston, May 23, the adoption of a Douglas platform caused the secession of the southern Democrats and the second convention which met in Baltimore June 18, made clear the impossibility of reconciliation. The Douglas Democrats nominated their chief and the seceders chose Breckenridge to head their ticket. The Republicans, meanwhile, at their convention in Chicago in May nominated Abraham Lincoln on a platform containing, in deference to radicals like Giddings and Lovejoy, the opening sentences of the Declaration of Independence.

1. The letter, dated April 6, 1860 is as follows:

\[...\]

You will see before this reaches you by the papers that I made my Speech yesterday. I was so fatigued last night that I could not write. I do not know what the account in the papers will be but probably correct. I had spoken about 10 minutes when Pryor of Va. got up and came down and said I should not speak on their side of the House. Soon others came up on his side and then quite a large number of our side came up. I stood perfectly still and was self-possessed. Barksdale of Miss. was among others especially exercised. He had a cane and was fidgeting it nervously as though he would like but dare not use it. I stood and looked him calmly and steadfastly in the eye.

The Republicans were on hand and behaved nobly. I think we should have whipped them badly if they began it.

I poured on a rain-storm of fire and brimstone as hot as I could, and you know something of what that is. I believe I never said anything more savage in the pulpit or on the stump.

It made quite a sensation through the city. It was all abuzz like a hive of bees when struck. I suppose it seemed worse to them than it did to me as
While public interest was focused on the national conventions Congress was diligently at work. Notwithstanding the long delay in getting at the business of legislation the House passed several measures of considerable importance, all of which, however, were blocked by the obstructionist policy of the Senate. The measure in which Lovejoy was most actively interested was the homestead bill. Such a bill had passed the House in the preceding session but had been denied a hearing in the Senate. As a member of the committee on public lands Lovejoy reported a new bill March 6 and it was passed March 12 by a vote of 115 to 65. On March he called the attention of the House to a speech on the measure which he did not care to deliver, but wished to have printed. His argument in brief was that in a representative government nothing advantageous to the people can prove harmful to the government, that the measure would be a blessing to the nation in the stimulus it would give to immigration and to settlement, and that the class of small land-holders thus produced would never be disloyal to the Union. The Senate amended the bill, making it less liberal and on May 21 Lovejoy secured a vote of 102 to 63 on adhering to the original measure. A deadlock was threat-
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I am more used to it. Tell Deacon Reeves and Allen that I preached the gospel pure and simple. It is the common topic this morning. They threatened to bring in a resolution to expel me but I think they will not be fools enough for that. It seems like old times to be in a storm.

O. Lovejoy.

This letter is in the possession of Mr. E. P. Lovejoy of Princeton, Illinois.

1. Ante. 22.
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ened but at last the House yielded to what was substantially the Senate amendment, on the principle that half a loaf is better than none. Colfax's declaration that the measure would be regarded as simply a step toward a more liberal one reflected the spirit of the Republican convention which had declared in its Chicago platform for the homestead bill as drafted in the House. During this controversy both sides recognized the issue as between slave labor and free. The southerners could have little sympathy with a policy avowedly designed to give the territories to free labor and the Republicans realized the value of making a party issue of so popular a measure.

Before the adjournment of Congress the campaign in Illinois was under way and Lovejoy's faithful friends in the third district were working for him in his absence. Congress adjourned June 25 and on June 27 Lovejoy was at Albany where he wrote his friend Jesse Fell: "Your dispatch reached me here today while at dinner with Mr. Weed & Gov. Morgan. . . . This is the second time you have sent me virtually the news of my nomination. I only hope that I may prove worthy of such friends & such a constituency. I am making a few speeches at some of the cities & speaking a word for 'Old Abe' & the good cause. Audiences good and enthusiastic but I need rest & almost regret my engagements." Throwing himself with characteristic ardor into the presidential campaign, he began a vigorous canvass of the state when he reached home. In the radical districts he urged the anti-slavery men to give their cordial support to Lincoln and the Republican party.

In the southern part of the state, where the majority of the voters opposed the
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extension of slavery but hated "niggers" and "abolitionists" alike, it was a question whether a radical like Lovejoy might not do more harm than good. But Jesse Fell advised him to go, and if we may accept the reminiscent accounts of his speeches to hostile and wavering audiences, his ready wit and his unmistakable sincerity never served him better than in this Egyptian tour.¹ Lovejoy himself felt jubilant over its success: he wrote to Fell ² "No one will doubt the wisdom of your councils hereafter in regard to my going to Egypt. I was as glad for you as for me."

Seward spoke in Chicago on October 3. An enthusiastic audience gathered to hear him in an open square and when it became evident that a large part of the crowd were beyond the reach of his voice, overflow meetings were announced and Lovejoy made a speech in the Republican Wigwam. One who stayed to hear Seward reports that while the audience in the square was quiet for the most part, attentive to the forcible logic of the great New Yorker's address, ringing cheers came from the crowd in the Wigwam, stirred to loud enthusiasm by the impassioned oratory of Lovejoy.³ Seward paid him a high compliment on this occasion as a man of moral courage all too rare in Congress, as one of the few who never wavered at "the clangor of the slavery bugle." ⁴

The presidential election November 6 resulted in 180 electoral votes for Lincoln against 123 for the other three candidates combined; but of the popular vote Douglas had 1,291,574 while Lincoln had only 1,857,610. The Republican party was thus to assume the guidance of the nation with the support of only a little more than half of the voters of the North and with the slave states solidly hostile and determined to regard the election as a challenge to the South. The

1. Philip Atkinson, in newspaper article.
Republicans were not even to have a majority in the thirty-seventh Congress, while the Supreme Court consisted of seven Democrats and one Republican. But the prospect of control in the legislative and judicial branches of government weighed lightly against the election of a Chief Executive who stood for uncompromising opposition to the extension of slavery and the southern states made ready to carry out their threats. South Carolina's call on November 16 for a convention to consider secession from the Union was the signal for similar action in the other cotton states.

The North was appalled at the immediate consequences of the election and shrunk from facing the inevitable conflict. The second session of the thirty-sixth congress opened on December 3 and many northern Senators and Representatives returned to the capitol with a heavy sense of the need for conciliation and compromise if such were possible without betraying the principles for which they stood. The border states, drawn one way by political considerations and another by social ties, led in the attempt to reach a compromise. The radical Republicans showed themselves willing to conciliate but any concession on the subject of slavery extension they refused to consider. Lincoln himself was firm on this point.¹

Buchanan's message was characteristic of the man. Having denied utterly the right of secession as a constitutional remedy for the grievances of a state, he proceeded to deny also that Congress had any constitutional right to coerce a state into submission. The first step toward compromise was made when it was voted on December 4 to refer the president's message to a committee of thirty-three. Lovejoy voted with Sherman, Grow, Stevens, and other radical Republicans against such a reference,² which was, however, secured by the combined votes of Democrats and conservative Republicans. On December 17 a large majority of the House adopted a resolution recommending the repeal by the states of the personal

liberty laws. Lovejoy voted with the majority, but immediately after the vote he rose to offer a resolution similar in wording to the one just adopted but substituting the phrase "nullification laws" in place of "personal liberty laws." The resolution was adopted without a dissenting vote but some of the Democrats answered yea with wry faces if we may judge by their remarks during the call of the roll; several declined to vote at all, and Barksdale indulged in personality that angered Lovejoy's friends.

As the winter wore on, the progress of secession made compromise proposals useless so far as the cotton states were concerned but the conservative Republicans and the northern and border-state men continued to devise plans for healing the breach — the Crittenden Compromise being the most popular of these proposals. In the prospect of the failure of the Senate and House committees to offer any acceptable plan, the state of Virginia took the initiative in calling together a Peace Convention at Washington, which met on the very day (February 4) of the Montgomery convention to form the Southern Confederacy. The radical Republicans from the first were disposed to ridicule the Peace Convention and Lovejoy's attitude was especially hostile: he objected to allowing the commissioners the privilege of admission to the floor of the House and on another occasion he said of them: "I consider them as busybodies, having no business upon this floor."

The House refused on February 27 to submit the Crittenden compromise proposals to the popular vote, but on the next day the necessary two-thirds vote was secured to recommend to the states the adoption of a constitutional amendment to the effect that no amendment should be made "which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any state, with the domestic
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institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the
laws of said state." ¹ In urging the Republicans to vote for this resolution,
Kilgore of Indiana appealed especially to Lovejoy — who, he said, had maintained
a thousand times that he did not believe Congress had power to interfere with the
domestic institutions of the states — to manifest his sincerity by agreeing to the
proposed amendment.² Lovejoy voted against the proposition, however, as did the
rest of the radicals,³ and although it was commended by Lincoln in his inaugural
address as an express recognition merely, of a principle implied in the Constitu-
tion,⁴ their position is quite comprehensible. It seemed to them a gratuitous
and humiliating introduction into the Constitution of a statement that had never
been denied by their party, and that, moreover, could scarcely by the most san-
guine be expected to serve any other purpose than to show the conciliating spirit
of those who adopted it.

¹ Cong. Globe, 36 - 2, pp. 1284, 1285.
² Ibid., 1283.
³ The resolution was adopted by the Senate by vote of 24 to 12 but it received
the approval of Ohio and Maryland only.
⁴ Lincoln, Works, (1894 ed.) II., 6.
Chapter V

Congress and the War

The bombardment of Fort Sumter aroused an enthusiastic unanimity of feeling that for the time swept away all partisan differences at the North. The president took the measures he deemed necessary to meet the situation and convened the thirty-seventh Congress in special session July 4. The House decided on July 8 that during the session only such measures would be considered as concerned the military and naval operations of the government and the financial questions connected therewith;\(^1\) and soon after, on a resolution pledging the House to vote "any amount of money and any number of men" necessary for a speedy suppression of the rebellion, only five members voted in the negative.\(^2\) The Democrats were disposed, however, to censure the president for his extra-constitutional acts in the interval between his inauguration and the assembling of Congress. When on July 15 Vallandigham introduced resolutions to that effect it was Lovejoy who moved to table them.\(^3\) It need scarcely be said that he stood for a vigorous prosecution of the war and for generous legislation to provide men and money. But he was not inclined to give unquestioning support to measures framed in committee if they ran counter to his convictions. Opposed as he was to large military establishments he favored the creation of a large volunteer force rather than an increase in the regular army, and he was successful in securing a modification of the clause in the army appropriation bill which proposed an increase in the regular army: the House agreed to volunteers for regulars \(^4\) but the Senate insisted on the original bill and finally won the point.
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Among the important financial measures of the session was an additional revenue bill providing for a direct tax and for certain internal duties. Lovejoy objected to the bill in that the tax was levied on real estate alone and not on personal property. Other members supported him and the bill was recommitted but finally passed without the modification he urged. His name and the names of Blair and Colfax and other able Republicans appear among the nays with the Democrats. Another characteristic objection of Lovejoy's was his protest against levying the tax upon slaves as property; the House supported him in this, to the disgust of Bingham and Stevens, who were urging the clause. A few days later Lovejoy came again into collision with Stevens in a discussion of the same bill. A disposition on the part of the ways and means committee to cut off debate drew protest from Lovejoy and sarcasm, in turn, from Stevens, whereupon Lovejoy remarked — "If the Committee of Ways and Means expect to drive this thing through with a tandem team, I reckon they will find some obstacles in the way." "I would say to the gentleman from Illinois," retorted Stevens, "that we do not expect to drive the bill through with a tandem team. There are too many mules here." But the "gentleman from Illinois" had the last word: "Mules are very obstinate," said he, "when they have long-eared drivers." All of which was very diverting to the House.

Secession was never anything less, in Lovejoy's eyes, than traitorous rebellion, and any proposition to negotiate for a peaceful settlement and a return of the southern states met his deepest contempt. "I think we have talked with those men long enough", he remarked when such a proposition was introduced in the House early in the session, "and we should talk to them with a musket." A few days later he said—"I am willing to carry on this war until, if it is necessary, some future historian shall write of us as Tacitus wrote of the Romans: Solitudo—
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On the day after the battle of Bull Run, the venerable Crittenden introduced a resolution declaring that the war was not being waged for conquest or subjugation or to interfere with the rights or institutions of the states. Lovejoy moved to lay the matter on the table, but the House refused to do so and the resolution was passed by a very large majority. Lovejoy's name does not appear in the record of the vote.

Having passed the necessary measures for the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of the armies, Congress adjourned early in August. During the next few months English public sentiment, influenced by the battle of Bull Run and by the cotton famine grew more hostile, and the North was already bitter with disappointment and resentment when the news of the Trent affair reached New York shortly before the reassembling of Congress. A burst of joy greeted the capture of two of the detested leaders of the Confederacy while the grave results that might follow the indignity to the English flag were unheeded by all save a very few of the clearer-sighted leaders of the nation.

Lovejoy was not one of those few. He uttered the sentiments of the great majority when he introduced in the House on the first day of the second session (December 2, 1861) a resolution of thanks to Captain Wilkes, which was adopted without debate. Several weeks later he brought up the affair in a jingoistic speech of vehement protest against sending representatives to a world's fair to be held in London. It is enough, he declared, to have been insulted by England and to have submitted, without now appropriating money to send representatives there. When the news came of the surrender of Mason and Slidell — he continued — "I literally wept tears of vexation. I hate it and I hate the British government... I mean to cherish it (that hatred) while I live and bequeath it to my
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children when I die." When the time comesto avenge the insult "We will stir up Ireland . . . appeal to the chartists . . . go to the old French habitans of Canada . . . join hands with France and Russia to take away the eastern possessions of that proud empire, and will darken every jewel that glitters in her diadem . . . ."¹

Throughout the session, which lasted until July 17, 1862, Congress was a critical observer of military affairs. Lovejoy was convinced of the propriety of congressional investigation and criticism of the conduct of the war.² Of the dilatory policy of McClellan he said on January 6: "It is no wonder that the people are growing impatient . . . . The whole nation is waiting for the Army to move forward. They have furnished the men and the money and why does not the Army move?" He went on to argue that the real cause of the failure to win victories was failure to interpret rightly the purposes of God. "We must repent and proclaim liberty to the enslaved of the land." He proceeded to make a characteristic application of a Biblical story to the political situation. The leaders of the North were, he said, like the crew of the vessel which carried Jonah: they could not bring themselves to throw him overboard because he had paid his fare. So with this "slaveholding Jonah," — "he has paid his fare, has got some some sort of constitutional guarantied right . . . and we are here today with this old national vessel drifting wildly amid the maddened waves . . . and still men say, 'For God's sake, do not touch this old slaveholding Jonah!' " In reply to a reminder that Congress had a year before declared that it had no right to interfere with slavery in the states he answered that war was not then declared — that the original purpose was not an anti-slavery war, but the suppression of the rebellion. But to suppress the rebellion a new spirit must be given to the Union armies. A grand opportunity, he averred, was vouchsafed to the president: "To be
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President, to be king, to be victor, has happened to many; . . . to be embalmed in the hearts of mankind as liberator, emancipator, to few."

This was the utterance of a radical; but the sentiment of the North on the question of interference with slavery had made rapid progress in the months since the outbreak of the war. Lincoln was giving the subject earnest consideration during the winter of 1861 – 2, and his plan for compensated emancipation was laid before Congress in his message of March 6. He recommended that an offer of pecuniary aid be made to any state which should adopt a plan for the gradual abolition of slavery. Lovejoy abstained from the debate on this question but his interest is manifest and on one occasion he could not refrain from rising to the defence of the negro when it was contended that freedom was not conducive to his development. The resolution was adopted by the House and the Senate but the border-state men refused to accept the plan and that meant its failure. Lincoln was deeply disappointed. To Isaac Arnold and Lovejoy he said one day: "Oh, how I wish the Border States would accept my proposition, . . . then you, Lovejoy, and you, Arnold, and all of us would not have lived in vain."

Several acts of the thirty-seventh Congress were concerned with the subject of slavery and in the discussion of these measures Lovejoy took a prominent part. On April 11 the House passed a Senate bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia in the discussion of which Lovejoy participated with ardor. May 1, as a member of the committee on territories, he reported a bill which proposed to "render freedom national and slavery sectional" by prohibiting slavery in all the existing territories and in any that might be acquired in the future. The bill was of course unconstitutional according to the Dred Scott de-
cision and Wickliffe of Kentucky attacked it on that ground. Cox of Ohio, in a speech against the bill, indulged in personality, accusing Lovejoy of Pharisaism in affecting zeal for the cause of the Union while he endangered it by "damnable and dangerous iteration" of the negro question. After protracted discussion the measure passed on May 12 and after slight modification in the Senate, it became a law.

A bill passed at the close of the special session (August 6, 1861) was the first step in a series of confiscation acts. With regard to slaves it went only so far as to declare forfeit such slaves as were actually employed in "hostile service against the Government." December 20, 1861, Lovejoy introduced a resolution looking toward a more drastic measure. He proposed a law to confiscate the property of all citizens who should engage in, or aid and abet, the rebellion against the government, and to provide for the unconditional liberation of their slaves and for the protection of those slaves from recapture. The resolution was tabled by a small majority and it failed of reconsideration by a vote of sixty to sixty-two. Six months later, however, at the close of the session (July 11, 1862) an act was passed which provided for confiscating the property and slaves of all who should aid or abet the rebellion hereafter.

Early in the session an issue of legal tender notes was proposed. The financial necessities of the administration were pressing and the difficulties in the way of negotiating a loan were deemed insuperable. Secretary Chase reluctantly assented to the measure and Stevens urged it as a necessary evil. The policy was not inaugurated without vigorous protest from a small minority among the Republicans — a minority which contained some of the ablest men in the party.

The two Conklings, Morrill and Horton of the ways and means committee and Lovejoy

2. Ibid., p. 2042.
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were prominent in the opposition. Lovejoy argued as he had done in 1857, that the measure was unjustifiable, and that adequate taxation and the issue of interest paying bonds would meet the situation in an honorable and businesslike way. 2

Roscoe Conkling rose to "concur in every word of Lovejoy's remarks and Horton proposed a substitute eliminating the legal tender feature. But Stevens overbore all opposition and the bill was passed. Later in the session a second issue was necessary; as Lovejoy had said, Facilis deocensus Averni. 2 He no longer opposed the policy for although, as he explained, he had not changed his views since the "revenue cutter was launched on the ocean of paper currency," he did not care to persist in factious opposition to what is a foregone conclusion." He begged only that the banks of the country be forbidden to issue irredeemable paper so that the government might have "the privilege exclusively, of not paying its debts." 3

The Pacific Railroad bill was passed in this session after a great deal of debate, in which Lovejoy took an active part. 4 He objected to the measure as proposed, chiefly on the ground that certain companies of capitalists were unduly favored while the interests of the government were not sufficiently safe-guarded. He finally withdrew his objections so as not to embarrass the measure but voted with the Democrats against its passage. 5 It was so amended in the Senate as more nearly to satisfy him. 6

Throughout his congressional career Lovejoy manifested his interest in the farmers of the country by attempting to secure or increase appropriations for agricultural purposes. 7 It was in this session that he introduced a bill to establish an agricultural and statistical bureau which was passed by the House and

1. Ante. 23
3. Ibid., 2885. See also Ibid., 37 - 3, pp. 487-490 for an effort on his part to secure a tax on the circulation of banks.
4. Ibid., 37 - 2, pp. 1578, 1698, 1907.
5. Ibid., 1908.
6. Ibid., 2905.
became a law after slight modification in the Senate.\textsuperscript{1}

The House adjourned July 17 and the Representatives from Illinois hastened home where a congressional campaign was again under way. The state had been redistricted in 1861 and Lovejoy's district was now the fifth. Of the old third district his enemies had left him only Bureau and Putnam counties.\textsuperscript{2} The conservative reaction of 1862 combined with the uncertain attitude of a new constituency made the situation a serious one, but he took the stump and saved the day by a very narrow margin. The extent of the reaction may be estimated by a comparison of the election returns with those of former years. Lovejoy's majority in the third district had increased substantially with each successive election; in 1856 it was 6061, in 1858, 7325, and in 1860, 9857. In 1862 it was reduced to 663.\textsuperscript{3} In his own county (Bureau) his majority of 1938 in 1860 dwindled to 192 in 1862.\textsuperscript{3} The other Republican Representatives in Illinois suffered in like manner, though none of them so severely as Lovejoy.

The reaction was indeed general. Corruption in the war department, the arbitrary acts of the administration, the preliminary proclamation of emancipation, above all, the failure of the armies to win a great victory combined to lessen confidence in the government.\textsuperscript{4} Congress reassembled December 1 and in the face of the depressing situation pursued an increasingly radical policy. Lovejoy's chief activity in this short session was as a champion of the administration. Loyal to Lincoln from the first, he now became one of the staunchest supporters of all administration policies. In these darkest days of the war he no longer insisted that Congress had a right to call to account all the executive and military officials of the nation — he was now quick to rise in defence of the men at the helm of affairs. "They are all loyal, honest, and earnest", he said on one occasion, and then in his droll way -- "I am weary of this constant censoriousness
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and I am going to issue an order that it shall cease. A resolution looking toward investigation of the charges against citizens subjected to arbitrary arrests he managed to table and when on another occasion the president was being criticized for urging legislation, he indignantly declared that Lincoln was the last man in the world who should be charged with any attempt at arbitrary power.

It goes without saying that Lovejoy was an enthusiastic supporter of the policy embodied in the Emancipation Proclamation. An attempt was made to induce the House to declare it unwarranted by the Constitution and it was he again who took the initiative in tabling the resolution. The charge of the Democrats that by the proclamation of September 22 the war had become manifestly an abolition crusade he denied in the course of the discussion on the negro soldiers bill. He accused the Democrats of a disloyal and obstructionist attitude toward the prosecution of the war: they opposed the draft act and they would deny the government the right to recruit the armies with negroes; they misrepresented, moreover, the Republican war policy and maligned the Republican leaders. "I am thought tolerably radical . . ." said he, "and yet I have never pleaded for the war with that (abolition) as an ultimate object in view . . . . When the President declared that if he could better save the Union without liberating a slave, he would do it, I responded 'Amen'. I said, 'if you can do so, Mr, President, in God's name, do it.' " But now, he continued, it appeared that slavery must go to save the Union and no loyal man could hesitate between the two. Recurring to the question of employing negro soldiers, he said: 'Would I arm negroes?' Ay, sir, not only would I arm negroes but I would arm mules and make them shooting machines to kill rebels, if I could." This speech on the negro soldiers bill is a characteristic one. It is full of intense loyalty to the administration, earnest defense
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of the negro, and forcible denunciation of the Democratic opposition. Frequent interruptions from the border-state men, notably Wickliffe of Kentucky, with whom he had clashed more than once before, brought quick and often witty retort from Lovejoy, who seldom spoke without furnishing entertainment for his hearers. He defended Generals Hunter and Butler warmly from the sneers of Wickliffe and answered the latter's charge that Butler was demoralized by the military command of negroes with a pertinent inquiry as to whether authority over negroes were granted as always demoralizing.1

Late in February, a few days before adjournment, Lovejoy was attacked by a sudden and severe illness which kept him in Washington for some time after the general exodus. During the summer and autumn on his farm near Princeton he won back some of his former vigor,2 but when he left home to return to the capital it was his last leave-taking, and at a Thanksgiving service he offered his last public prayer in the town where he had spent so many years as a pastor. He thanked the God of battles for victories won and prayed for the triumph of freedom.3

In the organization of the thirty-eighth Congress he took a leading part,4 and during the early weeks of the session he manifested his wonted energy in meeting the attacks of the opposition. He denounced as an "outrage" a peace proposition introduced by Fernando Wood;5 he succeeded in modifying resolutions of censure so as to make them express, instead, commendation of the administration;6 and he moved the House to laughter when he proposed to refer a resolution criticising the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, to the "Committee on Buncombe."7 When Cox accused the administration of repeated violations of the Constitution Lovejoy made indignant protest. Never, he declared, was an administration "so cautious and
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sensitive in regard to the obligations of the Constitution and laws of the United States." 1

The problems of reconstruction became serious during the winter of 1863 - 1864, and Congress saw fit to disagree with the policy of the president. The radical Republicans refused to accept his scheme and adopted that of Henry Winter Davis. 2 Lovejoy did not live to take part in the controversy at its height, but it is clear that his course would have been that of loyalty to the president. In the preceding Congress he had clashed with Stevens on his "conquered province" theory 3 and had defended the presidential policy when the question of the Louisiana elections was debated. 4 In discussing the president's message on this subject Lovejoy upheld Lincoln's theory of the situation: "I do not believe, strictly speaking, that there are any rebel States;" he said, "I know that there are States which rebels have taken possession of and overthrown the legitimate governments for the time being . . . that those governments still remain . . . and that as soon as we can get possession of them we will breathe into them the spirit of Republican life." 5

A measure he had much at heart was a bill of his own for the entire extinction of slavery. On December 14 he introduced a bill "to give effect to the Declaration of Independence", declaring free all slaves in the United States and making it a crime to seize or hold in servitude any human being freed by the act. 6 The bill was referred to the committee on judiciary and Lovejoy never got a vote on it. 7

4. Ibid., pp. 837, 860, 863.
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7. After his death Sumner in the Senate and Grinnell in the House testified to his solicitude for this measure during his illness. Grinnell in his sickroom expressed fears for his recovery. With tears on his cheeks, Lovejoy replied: "Ah, God's will be done, but I have been laboring, voting, and praying for twenty years that I might see the great day of freedom which is so
The whiskey tax was the last important measure in the discussion of which Lovejoy took an active part. It was proposed to raise the tax on spirits and the moot point was whether the increase of forty cents a gallon should be levied on all whiskey on hand or simply on that distilled after the passage of the act. It was finally decided in February to exempt that already on hand, although a previous vote in January had given a majority for the other policy. The New York Tribune charged that the change of vote had been brought about by the free use of money by distillers and speculators but a careful examination of the debates convinced James Ford Rhodes that such a charge is untenable. Fernando Wood who urged the taxation of whiskey on hand was a corrupt politician while many of the men who opposed it were of unassailable integrity. Lovejoy argued from the first that to tax whiskey on hand would work injustice to the distillers; the large distilleries of Peoria County were now in his district and he was anxious to protect them from loss. He was so interested in the matter that he wrote a letter from his sick-bed which was read to the House on the day before the final vote and in which he urged a reconsideration of the former vote and said of Fernando Wood's amendment purporting to be devised to secure greater revenue: "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."  

near and which I hope God will let me live to rejoice in. I want a vote on my bill for the destruction of slavery root and branch." Ibid., 1330.
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Chapter VI

Conclusion

Notwithstanding his active interest in the legislation of the winter Lovejoy's friends found him much altered by his illness and from the first felt the gravest apprehensions for him. During the holiday recess he visited his native state and at Portland delivered his last public address. In January the malady which had attacked him eleven months before became severe again and he was very ill for several weeks, but rallied toward the end of February and was supposed to be convalescent. On March 4 he appeared in the House and as chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia got several bills passed. For a week he was at his post but March 11 seems to have been his last day in the House. The effort to resume his duties was disastrous and it was decided to take him away from the excitement of the capital. He went to New York intending to go on from there to some warmer climate but the fatigue of travel proved fatal and he died at the home of a friend in Brooklyn on March 25, 1864, a little more than fifty-three years of age.

After a funeral service at Plymouth Church at which Doctor Cheever and Henry Ward Beecher officiated, the body was taken to Princeton and interred in Oakland cemetery where his only monument is one reared by his family, bearing the inscription: "Owen Lovejoy, Born January 6, 1811. Died March 25, 1864."

Generous was the tribute paid to his memory in the House and Senate. Sumner and Pomeroy, Pike and Grinnell spoke from the point of personal friendship.
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Trumbull and Washburne acknowledged the debt of Illinois; Pendleton and Odell — political opponents — bore witness to his courage and courtesy, while Democrats and Republicans alike testified to his honesty, his ability in debate, his power to dispel personal prejudice and his devotion to the cause he served.1 Pendleton's estimate of him is perhaps one of the keenest for it was tinged with no prejudice of political or personal friendship: "He was a prompt and ready debater. He was an active and vigorous thinker. He was a brave and bold apostle of the faith which he held. What he said, he thought; what he thought, he seemed to believe in the innermost recesses of his soul . . . . He was too intense to be always fair; he was too ardent to be always just; he was too thoroughly convinced of his own opinions to be always correct; but it was the very strength of his convictions which made him self-reliant . . . and it was his entire self-reliance which made him always logical in his positions . . . and constant in their defence."

His support of the administration and his loyalty to the president has been apparent from his political action but the congressional debates do not reveal the close personal friendship which existed between Lovejoy and Lincoln. F. B. Carpenter, the artist who spent six months at the White House painting a portrait of the president and who became rather intimately acquainted with Lincoln, himself, describes the friendship between the two men. Lovejoy learned of Carpenter's desire to paint a portrait of the president on a visit to his studio in New York and when the artist went to Washington in February 1864, Lovejoy sat up in bed to write a note of introduction which secured for him a cordial reception by the president and the desired permission. He was not surprised to find Lincoln and Lovejoy "bosom friends" for although "Lovejoy had much more of the agitator,

the reformer, in his nature . . . both drew the inspiration of their lives from the same source . . . . Their modes of thought and illustration were remarkably alike." ¹ Carpenter called upon Lovejoy late in February, when he was supposed to be convalescent and was in high spirits. He spoke indignantly of the indications that Fremont was to be brought forward in opposition to Lincoln's renomination: any attempt to divide the party was, he said, criminal. When Carpenter remarked that many extreme anti-slavery men seemed to distrust the president Lovejoy answered earnestly, "I tell you . . . Mr. Lincoln is at heart as strong an anti-slavery man as any of them, but he is compelled to feel his way. He has a responsibility in this matter which many men do not seem to be able to comprehend. . . . His mind acts slowly, but when he moves, it is forward . . . It is of no use talking, or getting up conventions against him. He is sure to be reelected . . . . I have no sympathy or patience with those who are trying to manufacture issues against him; but they will not succeed; he is too strong with the masses. For my part . . . I am not only willing to take Mr. Lincoln for another term, but the same cabinet, right straight through." ²

On March 9 Lovejoy was well enough to be present at the simple ceremony in which Grant was commissioned Lieutenant-General of the armies. Beside the president and Lovejoy only the cabinet and a few officers of the army were present.³ A few days later the relapse came and Lovejoy left Washington forever. Carpenter heard of his imminent death through a friend before the news reached the capital, and was the first to tell the president, who said simply "Lovejoy was the best friend I had in Congress." ⁴

Two months later in response to a letter from J. H. Bryant of Princeton, Illinois, inviting him to be present at a meeting contemplating the erection
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of a monument to the memory of the Republican congressman, Lincoln wrote: "As you anticipate it will be out of my power to attend. Many of you have known Mr. Lovejoy longer than I have, and are better able than I to do his memory complete justice. My personal acquaintance with him commenced only about ten years ago, since when it has been quite intimate, and every step in it has been one of increasing respect and esteem, ending, with his life, in no less than affection on my part. It can be truly said of him that while he was personally ambitious he bravely endured the obscurity which the unpopularity of his principles imposed, and never accepted official honors until those honors were ready to admit his principles with him. Throughout very heavy and perplexing responsibilities here to the day of his death, it would scarcely wrong any other to say he was my most generous friend.

Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty unselfishly for all men."¹

¹ Lincoln, Complete Works, (1894 ed.) II, 526.
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