EDITORIAL SHEET.

The Chicago Daily Tribune.

Pages 9 to 16.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1897—SIXTEEN PAGES.

ON CIVIL WAR.

Review of Prof. John Bach McMaster's Much Criticised School History.

OLD AND NEW VIEWS JAR.

Excerpts Showing Treatment of Matters Leading Up to the Struggle.

SKETCHES OF THE CONFLICT.

After Appomattox Through the Reconstruction Period to the Impeachment.

STATISTICS AND CONCLUSIONS.

THE TRIBUNE is able to lay before its readers this morning a complete synopsis, with copious extracts, of the much discussed McMaster's school history of the United States.

Probably no other school book—certainly none in recent years—has been the subject of such bitter controversy as this latest product of John Bach McMaster, Professor of American History in the University of Pennsylvania.

The controversy has centered about the book's treatment of the war of the rebellion, which, from the influences which inspired it and have thoroughly approved it, it has been charged in advance would reflect an extremely Northern view of the causes leading up to the war as well as of the incidents of the war itself.

Censure and Defense.

It has been denounced as the product of a bigoted spirit of sectionalism, and it has been charged that it would revive and tend to perpetuate the old and fast disappearing sentiment of animosity between the North and the South. Many Southern newspapers and not a few Northern journals of stalwart Democratic faith have inveighed in the bitterest terms against the book and have denounced it and its sponsors as enemies of a united land.

In defense of the book it has been urged that it is to be a truthful and impartial history of the events surrounding the war, and has been written in response to the demand that such a text book be placed in the hands of the school children of the land.

Influence of the G. A. R.

It is probably the fact that most of the adverse criticism which has been directed against the book has been due to the conspicuous part which the G. A. R. has played in its production. The fact that it was written in accordance with suggestions made by this organization, and after a careful review has been heartily indorsed by it, has been seized upon by those not in sympathy with the organization as proof positive that it is to be of an essentially sectional character.

It was the feeling for a long time among the members of the G. A. R., as well as others imbued with strong union sentiments, that no school history then in use set forth in their proper and in strong enough lights the causes underlying the war, as well as the influences and sentiments which dominated the opposing forces during the war. It was felt that the war had been fought at too fearful a cost to the country not to have its true lessons impressed upon the minds of the school children of today, and an agitation was begun looking to the writing of a history along these lines.

A committee was appointed for the furthering of this object, and through its cooperation with Mr. McMaster this purpose has been carried through to a successful conclusion.

As to the Public Schools.

An effort was made to introduce the history in the curriculum of the public schools of Chicago, and but for the fact that it was not in readiness for a thorough examination at the close of the last school year, when the books for the ensuing year have to be decided upon, it would probably have been so included. The purpose was to include it in an optional list along with histories of Barnes and Fiske.

It had its enemies here, however, and while no formal protests were made against it before the School board, many of its members were given to understand that the history was not what it should be.

Proof sheets of the civil war parts of the book were, however, submitted to Assistant Superintendent Ella F. Young, who expressed herself as greatly pleased with the general tone and scope of the work. She expressed herself as being agreeably surprised at not finding the objectionable features charged against it.

Superintendent Lane said yesterday that while he had not yet had an opportunity of examining the book he felt favorably disposed toward it from such examination as he had been able to make.

The book contains 476 pages of matter, throughout which maps and pictures are freely interspersed.

The actual history of the war is embraced in about fifty pages, while considerable space is given to a history of the causes leading up to the war, as well as the period of reconstruction at its close.

The Missouri Compromise.

The "Missouri Compromise," which marked the first conflict over the slavery question, is given about a page.

After referring to the petition of the people of Missouri to have that State admitted in 1820, and the understanding that it meant another slave State, the history says:

To this the free States were opposed. If the tobacco-growing, cotton-raising, and sugar-making States wanted slaves, that was their affair; but slavery must not be extended, must not be allowed in States beyond the Mississippi, because it was wrong. No man, it was said, had any right to buy and sell a human being, even if he was black.

The Southern people were equally determined that slavery should cross the Mississippi. We cannot, said they, abolish slavery; because if our slaves were set free, they would not work, and as they are very ignorant, they would take our property and perhaps our lives. Neither can we stop the increase of negro slave population. We must, then, have some place to send our surplus slaves, or the present slave States will become a black America.

Each side was so determined, and it was so clear that neither would yield, that a compromise was suggested. The country east of the Mississippi, it was said, is partly slave, partly free soil. Why not divide the country west of the great river in the same way? At first the North refused. But it so happened that just at this moment Maine, having secured the consent of Massachusetts, applied to Congress for admission to the union as a free State. The South, which had control of the Senate, thereupon said to the North, which controlled the House of Representatives, if you will not admit Missouri as a slave State, we will not admit Maine as a free State. The two propositions were, after a bitter and angry discussion it was agreed:

1. That Maine should come in as a free and Missouri as a slave State.

2. That the Louisiana purchase should be cut in two by the parallel of 36° 30' (the south boundary of Missouri), and that all north of the line except Missouri should be free soil. This parallel was thereafter known as the "Missouri compromise line."

Compares North and South.

Just preceding Jackson's first administration, in 1828, the history draws the following comparison between the people of the North and South:

The North and the South Two Different Peoples.—Before entering upon Jackson's administration it is necessary to call attention to the effect produced on our country by the industrial revolution discussed in chapters 19 and 22. In the first place, it produced two distinct and utterly different peoples; the one in the North and the other in the South. In the North, where there were no great plantations, no great farms, and where the labor was free, the marvelous inventions, discoveries, and improvements mentioned were eagerly seized on and used. There cities grew up, manufactures flourished, canals were dug, railroads were built, and industries of every sort established. Some towns, as Lynn, Lowell, Lawrence, Fall River, Cohoes, Paterson, Newark, and Pittsburg, were almost entirely given up to mills and factories. No such towns existed in the South. In the South men lived on plantations, raised cotton, tobacco, and rice, owned slaves, built few large towns, cared nothing for internal improvements, and established no industries of any sort.

This difference of occupation led of course to difference of interests and opinions, so that on three matters—the extension of slavery, internal improvements, and tariff for protection—the North and the South were opposed to each other.

Anti-Slavery Movement.

Speaking of the anti-slavery movement the history says:

The Anti-Slavery Movement.—The appearance of the Anti-slavery or Liberty party marks the beginning in national affairs of an anti-slavery movement which had long been going on in the States. When the Missouri compromise was made in 1820 many people believed that the troublesome matter of slavery was settled. This was a mistake, and the compromise really made matters worse. In the first place, it encouraged the men in Illinois who favored slavery to attempt to make it a slave State by amending the State Constitution, an attempt which failed in 1824 after a long struggle. In the second place, it aroused certain men who had been agitating for freeing the slaves to redoubled energy. Among these were Benjamin Lundy, James Gillespie Birney, and William Lloyd Garrison, who in 1831 established an abolition newspaper so called the Liberator, which became very famous. In the third place, it led to the formation all over the North, and in many places in the South, of new abolition societies, and stirred up the old ones and made them more active.

For a time these societies carried on their work, each independent of the others. But in 1833, a convention of delegates from them met at Philadelphia and formed a national society called the American Anti-slavery society.

Then, after referring to the demands of the South that abolition literature and abolition societies be suppressed and the rioting and destruction of newspaper offices, which followed in some of the Northern cities, the history states:

The Gag Rule.—Not content with attacking the liberty of the press, the proslavery men attacked the right of petition. The constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people . . . to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Under this right the anti-slavery people had long been petitioning Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and the petitions had been received; but of course not granted. Now, in 1836, when John Quincy Adams presented one to the House of Representatives, a member moved that it be not received. A fierce debate followed, and out of it grew a rule which forbade any petition, resolution, or paper relating in any way to slavery, or the abolition of slavery, to be received. This famous "gag rule" was adopted by Congress after Congress until 1844.

The effect of these extreme measures was greatly to increase the anti-slavery sentiment.

Situation in 1849.

The situation in 1849 is described as follows:

When Congress met in 1849 there were therefore a great many things connected with slavery to be settled:

Southern men complained that the existing fugitive slave law was not enforced in the free States and that runaway slaves were not returned.

The Northern men insisted that slavery should be abolished in the District of Columbia.

Southern men demanded the right to go into any Territory of the United States, as New Mexico or Utah, or even California, and take their slaves with them.

The Free-Soilers demanded that there should be no more slave States, no more slave Territories.

The North wanted California admitted as a free-soil State. The South would not consent.

So violent and bitter was the feeling aroused by these questions, that it seemed in 1850 as if the union was about to be broken up, and that there were to be two republics—a Northern one made up of free States and a Southern one made up of slave States.

Happily this was not to be; for at this crisis Henry Clay, the "compromiser," the "pacificator," the "peacemaker," as he was fondly called, came forward with a plan of settlement.

After referring to the passage of the fugitive slave law the feeling aroused in the North is commented on as follows:

The North was now becoming strongly anti-slavery. It had long been opposed to the extension of slavery. It was now opposed to the very existence of slavery. How deep this feeling was beneath the surface appeared in the summer of 1852, when Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe published her story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." It was not so much a picture of what slavery was as what it might be, and was so powerfully written that it stirred and aroused thousands of people in the North who, till then, had been quite indifferent. In a few months everybody was laughing and crying over Topsy, and Eva, and Uncle Tom; and of those who read it great numbers became abolitionists.

Laws and Raids.

Speaking of the Kansas-Nebraska law which opened those Territories to slavery the history says:

The Struggle for Kansas.—Thus was it ordained that Kansas and Nebraska, once expressly set apart as free soil, should become free or slave States according as they were settled while Territories by anti-slavery or pro-slavery men. And now began a seven years' struggle for Kansas. "Come on, then," said Seward of New York in a speech against the Kansas bill; "Come on, then, gentlemen of the slave States. Since there is no escaping your challenge, I accept it on behalf of freedom. We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas, and God give the victory to the side that is stronger in numbers as it is in the right."

This described the situation exactly. The free-State men of the North and the slave-State men of the South were to rush into Kansas and struggle for its possession.

Of the effect of the Dred Scott decision the history says:

The effect was to fill the Southern people with delight and make them more reckless than ever, to split the Democratic party in the North, to increase the number of Republicans in the North, and make them more determined than ever to stop the spread of slavery into the Territories.

Of John Brown's raid the history says:

As slavery had become the great political issue of the day, it is not surprising that it excited a lifelong and bitter enemy of slavery to do a foolish act. John Brown was a man of intense convictions and a deep-seated hatred of slavery.

Secession of South Carolina.

Coming to the "War for the Union," as it is headed, the history proceeds as follows:

South Carolina Secedes.—The only State where in 1860 Presidential Electors were chosen by the Legislature was South Carolina. When the Legislature met for this purpose, Nov. 6, 1860, the Governor asked it not to adjourn, but to remain in session till the result of the election was known. If Lincoln is elected, said he, the "secession of South Carolina from the union" will be necessary. Lincoln was elected, and on Dec. 20, 1860, a convention of delegates, called by the Legislature to consider the question of secession, formally declared that South Carolina was no longer one of the United States.

The "Confederate States of America."—The meaning of this act of secession was that South Carolina now claimed to be a "sovereign, free, and independent" nation. But she was not the only State to take this step. Before Feb. 1, 1861, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas also left the union. Three days later, Feb. 4, 1861, delegates from six of these seven States met at Montgomery, Ala., formed a constitution, established a provisional government, which they called the "Confederate States of America," and elected Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens provisional President and Vice President.

Toward preventing or stopping this, Buchanan did nothing. No State had a right to secede. But a State having seceded, he had no power to make it come back, because he could not make war on a State; that is, he could not preserve the union.

On one matter, however, he was forced to act, the history says, and that was to yield to the demands of the people of the North and Congress and send the steamer Star of the West with food and men to relieve Major Anderson at Fort Sumter, whither he had gone with eighty men after he had dismantled Fort Moultrie. Buchanan did this reluctantly, however. The history says:

Arguments of the South.

In reply to the query, "Why did the Southern slave States secede?" the history says:

To be fair with them, we must seek the answer in the speeches of their leaders. "Your votes," said Jefferson Davis, "refuse to recognize our domestic institution [slavery], which preëxisted the formation of the union, our property [slaves], which was guaranteed by the constitution. You refuse us that equality without which we should be degraded if we remained in the union. You elect a candidate upon the basis of sectional hostility; one who in his speeches, now thrown broadcast over the country, made a distinct declaration of war upon our institutions."

"There is," said Howell Cobb of Georgia, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, "no other remedy for the existing state of things except immediate secession."

"Our position," said the Mississippi secession convention, "is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery. A blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and civilization. There was no choice left us but submission to the mandates of abolition, or a dissolution of the union."

[illegible] H. Stephens, the Vice President of the Confederacy, asserted that the personal liberty laws of some of the free States "constitute the only cause, in my opinion, which can justify secession."

The South seceded, then, according to its own statements, because the people believed that the election of Lincoln meant the abolition of slavery.

Attempt at Compromise.

Compromise Attempted.—The Republican party in 1861 had no intention of abolishing slavery. Its purpose was to stop the spread of slavery into the Territories, to stop the admission of more slave States, but not to abolish slavery in States where it already existed. A strong wish, therefore, existed in the North to compromise the sectional differences. Many plans for a compromise were offered, but only one, that of Crittenden of Kentucky, need be mentioned. He proposed that the constitution should be amended as to provide:

That all territory of the United States north of 36° 30' should be free, and all south of it slave soil.

That slaves should be protected as property by all the departments of the Territorial government.

That States should be admitted with or without slavery, as their constitutions provided, whether the States were north or south of 36° 30'.

That Congress should have no power to shut slavery out of the Territories.

That the United States should pay owners for rescued fugitive slaves.

As these propositions recognized the right of property in slaves—that is, put the black man on a level with horses and cattle. The Republicans rejected them, and the attempt to compromise ended in failure.

A Proposed Thirteenth Amendment.—One act of great significance was done. A proposition to add a thirteenth amendment to the constitution was submitted to the States. It read:

"No amendment shall be made to the constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said States."

Even Lincoln approved of this, and two States, Maryland and Ohio, accepted it. But the issue was at hand. It was too late to compromise.

Attitude of Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln, Sixteenth President.—Lincoln and Hamlin were inaugurated on March 4, 1861, and his speech from the Capitol steps Lincoln was very careful to state just what he wanted to do.

"I have no purpose," said he, "directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists."

"I consider the union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care . . . that the laws of the union be faithfully executed in all the States."

"In doing this there need be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority."

"I consider the union will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government and collect the duties and imposts."

Opening of Hostilities.

Then follows the actual beginning of the war, wherewith is described the attack on and fall of Fort Sumter. Then the history proceeds:

The Life of the Republic at Stake.—Thus was begun the greatest war in modern history. It was no vulgar struggle for territory, or for maritime or military supremacy. The life of the union was at stake. The questions to be decided were: Shall there be one or two republics on the soil of the United States? Shall the great principle of all democratic-republican government, the principle that the will of the majority shall rule, be maintained or abandoned? Shall State sovereignty be recognized? Shall States be suffered to leave the union at will, or shall the United States continue to exist as "an indestructible union of indestructible States"? As Mr. Lincoln said: "Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish."

The South Better Prepared.—For the struggle which was to decide these questions neither side was ready, but the South was better prepared than the North. The South was united as one man. The North was divided and full of Southern sympathizers. She knew not whom to trust. Officers of the army, officers of the navy, were resigning every day. The great departments of government at Washington contained many men who furnished information to Southern officials. Seventeen steam war vessels (two-thirds of all that were not laid up or unfit for service) were in foreign parts. Large quantities of military supplies had been stored in Southern forts. All the great powers of Europe save Russia were hostile to our republic, and would gladly have seen it rent in twain. The South, again, had the advantage in that she was to act on the defensive.

Effects of Fall of Sumter.

Results of Firing on the Flag.—Not a man was killed on either side during the bombardment of Sumter. Yet the battle was a famous one, and led to greater consequences:

Lincoln at once called for 75,000 volunteers to serve for three months.

Four "border States," as they were called, thus forced to choose their side, seceded. They were Arkansas, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee.

The Congress of the United States was called to meet at Washington July 4, 1861.

As soon as Virginia seceded, the capital of the Confederacy, at the request of the Virginia secession convention, was moved from Montgomery to Richmond, and the Confederate Congress was ordered to meet there July 20, 1861.

West Virginia.—The act of secession by Virginia was promptly repudiated by the people of forty-eight counties west of the mountains, who refused to secede, formed a constitution, and asked admittance into the Union as the State of Kenahwa. They were finally admitted in 1863 as the State of West Virginia.

Call to Arms.

The Call to Arms.—Lincoln held that no State could ever leave the union, and that therefore no State had left the union. Those which had passed ordinances of secession were to his mind States whose machinery of government had been seized on by persons in insurrection against the government of the United States. When, therefore, he made his call for 75,000 volunteers to defend the union he apportioned the number among all the States, slave and free, north and south, east and west, according to their population. Those forming the Confederacy paid no attention to the call. The Governors of the border slave States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri) returned evasive or insulting answers.

But the people of the loyal States responded instantly and tens of thousands of troops were soon on their way to Washington.

Then is described the mobbing of the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment while passing through Baltimore.

As the result of Lincoln's call 75,000 men volunteered, and on May 3, 1861, the President issued another proclamation, asking for 42,034 volunteers for three years, unless sooner discharged. The history says:

On July 1, '61, there were 183,588 "boys in blue" under arms and present for duty.

The line was naturally divided into the following three parts:

That in Virginia and along the Potomac.

That across Kentucky.

That west of the Mississippi.

Battle of Bull Run.

Then follows the battle of Bull Run, or Manassas, in which the union forces were commanded by General Scott.

Under him, in command of the troops about Washington, was General Irwin McDowell. Further to the west, near Harper's Ferry, was a union force under General Patterson. In western Virginia, with an army raised largely in Ohio, was General George B. McClellan. In Missouri was General Lyon, aided by all the union people in the State, who were engaged in a desperate struggle to keep her in the union.

In northern Virginia and opposed to the union forces under General McDowell, was a Confederate army under General Beauregard, and these troops the people of the North demanded should be attacked. "The Confederate Congress must not meet at Richmond!" "On to Richmond! On to Richmond!" became the cries of the hour. To please the North, therefore, General McDowell, with 30,000 men, was ordered to attack Beauregard. McDowell found him at Manassas Junction, some thirty miles south of Washington, and there, on the field of "Bull Run," on Sunday, July 21, 1861, was fought the famous battle which ended with the defeat and flight of the union army.

General George B. McClellan was now placed in command of the troops east of the Ohio, and spent the rest of 1861 and part of 1862 in drilling and organizing his army. Bull Run had taught the people two things: 1. That the war was not to end in three months. 2. That an army without discipline is not much better than a mob.

Fort Donelson and Fort Henry.—While McClellan was drilling his men along the Potomac, the union forces drove back the Confederates in the West. Their line extended as shown by the heavy line on the map. This line General Halleck, who commanded in the West, determined to break. First he sent General Thomas, who in January, 1862, attacked Mill Springs and drove the Confederates out of eastern Kentucky. Next, in February, he sent General U. S. Grant and Commodore Foote against Fort Henry on the Tennessee. But Foote arrived first and captured the fort, whereupon Grant marched to Fort Donelson on the Cumberland, eleven miles away, and after three days of sharp fighting was asked by General Buckner what terms he would offer.

"No terms except unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted. I propose to move immediately upon your works. I am, sir, very respectfully your obedient servant.

"U. S. GRANT, Brigadier General."

Buckner at once surrendered.

Then follows the battle of Shiloh:

The third part of Halleck's army under Grant had followed the retreating confederates to Pittsburg Landing, where (April 6) he was suddenly attacked by General A. S. Johnston and driven back. But General Buell coming up with fresh troops, the battle was resumed the next day (April 7), when Grant won his second great victory, and the confederates fell back to Corinth.

At this point General Henry Halleck arrived and took command, and at the end of May captured Corinth. Memphis then fell, and the Mississippi River was opened as far south as Vicksburg. After the capture of Memphis, Halleck went to Washington to take command of the armies of the United States.

Bragg's Raid Into Kentucky.—The confederate line which in January, 1862, had passed across Kentucky had thus by June been driven southward to Chattanooga, Iuka, and Holly Springs. The union line ran from near Chattanooga to Corinth and Memphis. Against this the confederates now moved, with the hope of breaking through and driving it back. Gathering his forces at Chattanooga, General Bragg ran through Tennessee and Kentucky toward Louisville. But General Buell, perceiving his purpose, outran him, reached the Ohio one day ahead, and forced Bragg to fall back to Perryville, where Oct. 8, 1862, a desperate battle was fought and Bragg was beaten.

Then follows a description of the battles of Iuka, Corinth, and Murfreesboro, and then a description of the campaign in Arkansas.

Capture of New Orleans.

Farragut's capture of New Orleans is next referred to as follows:

While Grant and Foote were opening the upper part of the Mississippi an expedition led by Butler and Farragut began the lower part of the river. They had been sent from Fortress Monroe by sea to capture New Orleans. The defenses of the city consisted of two strong forts almost directly opposite each other on the banks of the river, about seventy-five miles south of the city; of two great chain cables stretched across the river below the forts to prevent ships coming up, and of fifteen armed vessels above the forts. New Orleans was thought to be safe. But Farragut was not dismayed. Sailing up the river till he came to the chains, he bombarded the forts for six days and nights, while the forts did their best to destroy him. Then, finding he could do nothing in this way, he cut the chains, ran his ships past the forts in spite of the dreadful fire (April 24, 1862), destroyed the confederate fleet (April 25), and took the city. General Butler, who had been waiting at Ship Island with 15,000 men, then entered and held New Orleans.

The Peninsular Campaign Against Richmond.—The signal success of Grant and Farragut in the West was more than offset by the signal failure of McClellan in the East. The wish of the administration, and indeed of the whole North, was that Richmond should be captured. Against it, therefore, the Army of the Potomac was to move. But by what route? The government wanted McClellan to march across Virginia, so that his army should always be between the confederate forces and Washington. McClellan insisted on moving up the James River. The result was a compromise.

A small force under Fremont and Banks was sent to hold the Shenandoah Valley and prevent a confederate force coming down it and attacking Washington from the west.

An army under McDowell was to march from Washington to Richmond by way of Fredericksburg.

McClellan was to take an army from Washington to Yorktown in Virginia, and then march up the peninsula to Richmond and join McDowell.

Then follows a description of McClellan's seige of Yorktown and Williamsburg and his subsequent march southward to the Chickahominy River. A part of the army was sent over the river to Seven Pines and Fair Oaks. The rest was stationed along the north bank as far as Mechanicsville.

McClellan expected McDowell would hurry across Virginia and join him, but was disappointed, the history states, and then is described Stonewall Jackson's famous thirty-five-day campaign in the Shenandoah Valley, during which he won four desperate battles.

Jackson's success in the valley alarmed the government at Washington, and McDowell was recalled to protect the city. This left McClellan to contend with Johnson, who attacked him at Seven Pines and Gaines Mill, checked his advance, and forced him to fall back, fighting for seven days (June 25 to July 1, 1862) as he retreated to Harrison's Landing, on the James River, twenty-five miles below Richmond. There the army remained till August, when it returned to the Potomac.

Lee Raids Maryland.

Lee's Raid into Maryland; Battle of Antietam, or Sharpsburg.—While the Army of the Potomac was at Harrison's Landing a new force called the Army of Virginia was organized, and General John Pope placed in command. At the same time General Halleck was recalled from the West and made general in chief of the union armies. Pope intended to move straight against Richmond. But when McClellan, in obedience to orders, left Harrison's Landing and took his army by water to the Potomac, near Washington, the Confederate army was left free to act as it pleased. It was in command of R. E. Lee, the greatest soldier the South produced. Seeing his opportunity, Lee moved at once against Pope's army, whose line stretched along the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers to the Shenandoah Valley in West Virginia. At the west end at Cedar Mountain was General Banks. He was first attacked and beaten; after which Lee fell upon Pope on the old field of Bull Run, and put the army to flight. Pope fell back to Washington, where his forces were united with those of McClellan at Antietam Creek, near Sharpsburg, where, Sept. 17, 1862, a great battle was fought, after which Lee went back to Virginia.

McClellan was now removed and the command of the army given to General Burnside. He was as reckless as McClellan was cautious, and on Dec. 13 threw his army against the Confederates posted at Fredericksburg Heights and was beaten with dreadful slaughter. Thus at the end of 1862 each army was back in its old position: the one in front of Washington, the other in front of Richmond.

Emancipation of Slaves.

Emancipation of the Slaves.—More than two years had now passed since South Carolina had seceded, and during this time a great change had taken place in the feeling of the North toward slavery. When Lincoln was inaugurated, very few people wanted the slaves emancipated. But two years of bloody fighting had convinced the North that the union could not exist part slave, part free. As Lincoln said in his speech at Springfield in 1858, "It must be all one thing, or all the other." Seeing that the people now felt as he did, Lincoln, in his 1862 (March 6), asked Congress to agree to buy the slaves of the loyal slave States, and urged the members of Congress from those States to advise their constituents to set free their slaves and receive $300 apiece for them. This they would not do; whereupon he decided to act upon his own authority, and declared all slaves within the Confederate States to be free men.

For this he had two good reasons: 1. So far the war had been one for the preservation of the union. By making it a war for union and freedom the North would become more earnest than ever. 2. The rulers of England, who wanted Southern cotton, were only waiting for a pretext to acknowledge the independence of the South. If, however, the North engaged in a war for the abolition of slavery, the people of England would not allow the independence of the Confederacy to be acknowledged by their rulers.

The First Proclamation.

The time to make such a declaration was after some victory gained by the union army. When McClellan and Lee stood face to face at Antietam Lincoln therefore "vowed to God" that if Lee were defeated he would issue the proclamation. Lee was defeated, and on Sept. 22, 1862, the proclamation came forth declaring that if the Confederate States did not return to their allegiance before Jan. 1, 1863, "all persons held as slaves" within the Confederate lines "shall be then, thenceforth, and forever free." The States of course did not return to their allegiance, and on Jan. 1, 1863, a second proclamation was issued setting the slaves free.

Now, there are three things in connection with the emancipation proclamation which must be remembered:

Lincoln did not abolish slavery anywhere. He emancipated and set free the slaves of certain persons engaged in waging war against the United States government.

The emancipation proclamation did not apply to any of the loyal slave States nor to such territory as the union army had reconquered. In none of these places did it free slaves.

Lincoln freed slaves by virtue of his power as Commander-in-Chief of the army of the United States, "and as a fit and necessary war measure."

Gettysburg and Vicksburg.

Then follows a description of the battle of Gettysburg, of which the history says:

The contest was a dreadful one; no field was ever more stubbornly fought over. Almost one-

(Continued on sixteenth page.)

THE TYPE THAT WISHED A REVOLUTION IN '76 AND THE TYPE THAT WISHES ONE IN '97.

HOW HAWAII IS NOW GOVERNED

Political and Industrial Conditions in the Islands Under the Provisional Republic Which Seems Destined to Pass Out of Existence.

PRESIDENT DOLE A MAN OF RARE TACT AND FORCE.

Entire Fabric of the Present System Is Built Upon the Anticipated Annexation to the United States, Which May Come Sooner than Expected.

PEOPLE IMPATIENT TO BECOME PART OF UNITED STATES.

Only Criticism of President Dole Is That He Does Not Push the Matter to an Issue as Rapidly as the Public Sentiment Demands Under the Circumstances.

HONOLULU IS ONE OF THE BEST GOVERNED CITIES IN THE WORLD

(Special by Charles M. Pepper.)

Honolulu, Aug. 19, via San Francisco, Cal., Sept. 2.—The passing of a nation is worth a moment's pause in the midst of current events. Hawaiian sovereignty is passing away. The causes need not be analyzed now. The fact exists and must be recognized whether the national life of these Pacific outposts be merged into the vigorous life of the American Republic or whether the extinction of sovereignty come through the adjustment of other countries permitting the triumph of Asiatic colonization. While the present conditions last the government that is claims attention. It helps to an understanding of the government that will be if the hope of annexation is fulfilled. That is a swelling hope. It expands with every breath of the ocean breezes that sweep across the islands. Tested by the experience of nearly five years this Hawaiian government that is commands respect. Studied carefully it evokes admiration. Analyzed it seems to lack no real element of assimilation with American political institutions. After a brief period of observation I have been struck with its flexibility.

The characteristics of clime, soil, and skies are blended in the system of government. The gentleness and openness of the native people are respected. The rigor of Puritan principles is softened in non-essentials. Honolulu, for instance, has a Sunday closing law, and it is enforced. But on Sunday afternoons a public concert is given by the government band at Kapiolani Park, and everybody is usually to be found there. The band is as much an institution as the Marine Band in Washington, with a difference that in Hawaii it contributes more to the popular enjoyment. In other respects also liberality is shown by the authorities in making provision for the entertainment of the people. For a small country there is no lack of outward form with which to dignify the government. The tropical fondness for display is cultivated in moderation. Guards in uniform and with arms pace the grounds of the palace. They are relieved at intervals with military precision and under military orders. Not an hour out of the twenty-four finds the palace without sentries on duty. Hardly a night have I failed to hear the sentries cry: "Twelve o'clock, and all's well." All this is not empty form. When in 1895 the partisans of the overturned monarchy sought to overthrow the provisional republic their plan was to seize the palace. The basement of the building is used as an arsenal and the barracks of the Hawaiian National Guard are only a few hundred feet away.

PRIDE OF KING KALAKAUA.

The palace was the pride of King Kalakaua. It is a well built structure. The grounds surrounding it are quite handsome. The portraits of Kalakaua, of Liliuokalani, and other members of the royal family—made royal by election instead of inheritance—still adorn the interior walls. The throneroom is pretentious and imposing. It is now used for the Legislature when that body is in session. The former Queen's bedroom is the office of one of the Cabinet Ministers.

No one wonders that Liliuokalani is loath to give up what was more than the trappings of royalty. Her income and emoluments were equal to $70,000 a year, considerably more than what the President of the United States receives. There are philosophers and moralizers in Hawaii as in other parts of the world. They moralize over what they call one woman's folly. The monarchy was bound to fall. It was eaten by parasites within and was already crumbling. Yet it would have lasted Liliuokalani's lifetime but for her eagerness to overturn the safeguards which had been set up and restore autocratic rule. She would not be turned from her purpose, and the throne went down in the revolution which established the provisional republic.

However, my purpose is not to philosophize on woman's folly, but to tell something of the government which now exercises its functions in the halls that were not so long ago the abode of a reactionary monarchy. The executive powers are centered in the President and cabinet or executive council. This council consists at present of Sanford B. Dole, President of republic; Henry E. Cooper, Minister of Foreign Affairs; James A. King, Minister of Interior; Samuel M. Damon, Minister of Finance, and William O. Smith, Attorney General. They are all men of force and, with one or two exceptions, were born on the islands or have lived here many years.

PERSONALITY OF PRESIDENT DOLE.

The personality of President Dole is felt everywhere in the government. I do not intend to write of him at length. It is enough that by common consent he is the one man who was able to harmonize all the jarring elements and mold them into a government fitted for an emergency covering a period of years. He commands the respect of royalists and the full confidence of the party of annexation.

My first call on President Dole was made in company of a former member of Congress from Ohio, who has himself had wide experience in public affairs. During half an hour the talk covered a broad range of topics from Japan's diplomacy and its use as an Asiatic power to the minutest information about a remote corner in one of the islands. He spoke with the utmost freedom and frankness in discussing the conditions and the problems of annexation. The phases of the subject which might present difficulties to the American people were thoroughly understood by him. When the call was ended the former Congressman remarked:

"There is a man capable of meeting any situation."

I fully agree with him.

WHAT THE REPUBLIC IS DOING.

The story of what the provisional republic has done and is doing for the people of the islands tells itself. From the beginning it has sought to develop the material resources. A well defined plan of public improvements has been carried out. Careful study has been made of the agricultural possibilities. At present coffee is the promising staple, and intelligent effort has been directed towards increasing its production. A land system has been devised which offers every aid and encouragement to the natives to keep the soil of their fathers and cultivate it. If they are slow in taking advantage of the opportunity the fault is not of the government, which aims to protect the native owners from alienating their heritage somewhat as the United States has done in preventing the Indians from losing title to their lands.

Aside from material development the government has neglected nothing which will help to educate its citizens. A public school system patterned after the United States hardly admits of improvement. One point of it is compulsory attendance for every child born on the islands. The administration of the laws is fearless and impartial. Testimony to this is borne on all sides. Though the sugar planters have the heaviest stake in the stability of the government and are its main supporters, they enjoy no favoritism. I have heard several of them complain that the authorities strain a point against them whenever trouble arises with the natives on the plantations. A similar grievance is held in controversies with the contract laborers from China and Japan. A disinterested observer simply gathers from this that if the government has a leaning it is to the weaker classes and that it protects them in all their rights.

A midocean port has more difficulties than are usually found on the coast. "Sailors' rights" are apt to be construed very poorly by the sailors. The mixture of nationalities which a variety of causes has combined to produce is another source of disquiet.

Yet in spite of the difficulties it would be hard to find anywhere a municipality than Honolulu. The regulations regarding [illegible]

[illegible]ntinued on thirteenth page.)