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In this paper, I have attempted to show that William G. Brown is deserving of recognition as an outstanding figure of American historical literature. At the beginning of this century, the South was in dire need of a fair judge, "a Lord Chancellor on the Woolsack". This is what Brown attempted to be, and in which direction he progressed so far. That death stopped his pen in his early maturity is lamentable. There can be no doubt that he went very far in the time allotted him. Had he been given a longer opportunity, he would without question have gone very much farther. He was a unique example of the Southern Gentleman "of the old school", in that he had all the culture and refinement of the old South, and at the same time had the broad outlook of a cosmopolitan. It is well that the type be not forgotten.

I am indebted to Dr. W. P. Few, Dr. R. L. Flowers, and Judge Francis G. Caffey for their personal recollections of Mr. Brown. I am also indebted to those from whose correspondence much information has been gleaned. The late Dr. John Spencer Bassett collected and copied a great number of the Brown manuscripts and made various notes of his own. I gladly acknowledge the use of these. I am especially indebted to Dr. W. K. Boyd for his encouragement in the work, for direction of the research, and for the correction of the manuscript.
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Chapter I
From Marion to MacMillan

Now and then among men of letters, one finds a person who did not bother himself or others with exhaustive and scholarly research, but merely contented himself - and others - with such conclusions as he cared to draw from his observation. Not that his thinking was not profound, but that history is more than footnotes, and the story of civilization more than quotation marks. To observe, investigate, meditate and conclude was the method of William Garrott Brown. By his own admission, very slight inaccuracies are of less importance than those large and more lasting qualities of history. Not that he extolled the virtues of inaccuracies - far from that - but he made himself the exponent of simple straight truth-telling, and spent very much time in acquiring the accurate truth.

Such in brief was the creative nature of this William Garrott Brown. He was born in the midst of the hey-day of the carpet-bag period, geographically and chronologically. Marion, Alabama was the home of the descendants of many of the sturdiest families of Tennessee, Georgia, and the Carolinas. In Brown's day, it was known for its educational institutions, and
its general atmosphere of culture. It is in the Black Belt, which is the aristocratic part of Alabama, and corresponds in this respect to South Carolina's low country. But Marion had not always been such a gentle community.

Away back in its early history, this little town in west-central Alabama had the reputation of being one of the toughest towns in the state. Brown says of his contemporaries in 1888:

They are in no way ashamed of their pioneer fathers. They are, on the contrary, proud of the manly and sterling qualities of character they so generally gave evidence of possessing; but our present reputation for culture need not blind us to the fact that the earlier settlers of this region were not representative of the refinement to which the old South, justly or not, laid claim.

Let us count it a ground of self gratulation that in so short a time we have gained distinction for qualities of an entirely opposite sort.

There are many amusing stories relative to those rollicking, frolicking, but whole-souled inhabitants of early Marion. The town itself was originally called Muckle's Ridge. This peculiar name was taken from a pioneer gentleman, who in 1817 cleared an acre of land and for one year enjoyed almost complete solitude. In the same vicinity - a radius of perhaps twenty miles - there were scattered Indian settlements and some pioneer whites from South Carolina and Tennessee. Perhaps

the man Muckle grew tired of his own company in the forest, or perhaps his food ran out; none the less, he sold out in 1818 to a newcomer named Anderson West, who had developments on his mind. Came the admission of the state to the union in 1819, and Perry county was organized along with six others, its name being taken from that of Oliver Hazard Perry. Muckle's Ridge happened to be the center of the county, so in 1822, the county seat was allocated there. What was at that time little more than a few scattered houses now became known as "Marion", seat of Perry county. The town had been given this name in honor of the famous "Swamp Fox", Francis Marion, who had died twenty-seven years before in his native South Carolina. Some of the older settlers had doubtless fought in his band, and thus were they remembering their old leader.

The same year which saw the naming of this village witnessed also the establishment there of its first religious institution: Siloam Baptist church. In 1823, the first court house was erected, a large log cabin where curious backwoods justice was meted out. One peculiar device for punishment of miscreants was "Chandler's Coach", run by a certain "Captain Slick" Chandler, sheriff in the early days. The "coach" was a large hogshead with a moveable head at one end through which the culprit entered and was then shut up tightly. There were large pegs driven through the sides of this container to which the passenger might hold while enjoying his ride. Thus incarcerated, the prisoner was rolled merrily down the town's longest hill. Often a man received more than one ride.
If the objectionable character lived east of Marion, the coach was brought up before Gains Johnson's store and the offender headed up and rolled to the stable, then required to walk back to the starting point, and given another ride, and as many as the crowd thought his wickedness deserved. 3

A tramp, found asleep and drunk on the street was nailed up in a box made after the fashion of a chicken coop, and exhibited like a wild beast in a cage. Drunkards were frequently ducked in mud pools to the point of suffocation. A man detected in the act of taking money from a merchant's cash drawer was first given several rides in the coach, then carried off on a sharp rail, followed by half the adult population of the village and thrown into a mud pool to repent.

Liquor, good and bad, was drunk freely and joyfully in Marion. But even then, the long-standing custom of "drink like a gentleman" prevailed. One must not make a nuisance of himself when intoxicated.

Nor were the pranks of the villagers confined to the administration of their justice. At one time a circus came to Marion and put on a performance. As it fell out, the circus camped at Marion for a night. The good-natured townsmen took charge of the menagerie and so manipulated it that there were monkeys, baboons, and other wild animals circulating in the woods of Perry county for many months afterward. 4

The only reason I can give for referring so plainly to a period whose true history is so generally palliated, or left unwritten by admirers of the old order is that Marion's present claim to preeminence in culture among Alabama communities is so generally admitted that she need not fear a revalation of the extremely different state which was formerly hers. 5

So as time passed, Marion was not all buffoonery. The sturdy pioneer realized that his children must have education and training in some of the arts and science. Accordingly, in 1836, there was established, through the cooperation of the four leading denominations: Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian, a school for girls, called the Marion Female Seminary.

For three years the denominations succeeded in giving training to the daughters of Marion and other towns in perfect harmony. 1839, however, saw the disaffection of the Baptists, who withdrew and established Judson College for girls. The first principal of this school was Milo P. Jewett, afterwards famous as the first president of Vassar College.

Encouraged by the remarkable success of this institution, the Baptists in 1844 decided to establish Howard College, which was attended by the same success as Judson. Soon after, the War, the Lincoln Normal School for Negroes was established at Marion, making the town now quite a center of education. Public schools also flourished here, and the inhabitants became proud

of its many establishments. In 1887, the Baptists of Alabama moved Howard to East Lake, Birmingham to the bitter disappointment of the Marionites, who felt themselves betrayed. In this same year, the Lincoln Normal school was moved to Montgomery, there having been some unpleasantness between its students and those of Howard. This same year saw the establishment of Marion Military Institute under the direction of Dr. J. T. Murfee, the president of Howard who had resigned upon its removal.

Such in brief is the history of the little town to which Wilson Richard Brown moved in 1836. He was a young man, just turned twenty-one. Young Brown had come from Mathews county, Virginia, where he was born in 1815. His grandfather was the oldest justice of the peace in Mathews county, and his father had been a Revolutionary soldier. The Brown family was of Scotch descent, having come to Virginia in the early eighteenth century. The exact lineage of the family was lost when the courthouse of Brinton parish burned early in the eighteen hundreds.

W. R. Brown's young wife was Mary Cogsdale Parrish, of Hillsboro, North Carolina. Her mother was Elizabeth Hunting-

6. Northern Alabama, says he came to Marion county and resided there the rest of his life, but this obviously incorrect as W. G. Brown and all his brothers were born in the town of Marion which certainly is in Perry county, p. 422.

don, who was a daughter of Plummer Huntingdon of the Connecticut branch of Huntingdons. The Parrish family was from Virginia. The Huntingdon strain was all pure English, having come to America during the colonial period.

When W. R. Brown first settled in Marion, he became a merchant. Soon after, he became also a planter, gaining considerable wealth before the war from cotton culture. He lost his fortune in support of the Confederacy. He had at least one son in the service of the Confederacy, Charles Gayle Brown. He was educated at Howard and was in the University of Alabama during the term 1862-63. He served in the War of Secession as first sergeant, company F. of the 20th Alabama infantry regiment, Pettus' division, Hardee's corps. Following the War, he practiced law and held various public offices until 1898 when he became Attorney General, serving until 1902.

There were seven sons and one daughter of W. R. Brown. The oldest son, Charles Gayle, was twenty-four years older than the youngest, William Garrott, if the records are to be believed. The other sons of the house were Wilbur, Henry P., Wilson Richard Jr., David H., and Eugene L. The name of the daughter is not given in any of the records of the Brown family. There are in two places, however, the records of one Cyrus D. Hogue of Marion who was married in 1872 to one "Mary A. Brown, daughter of the late Gen. W. R. Brown of Marion." 8

This is probably a daughter of the same family. The writer is informed by a letter from Marion⁹ that W. G. Brown had a nephew who brought his body back to Marion for burial. This nephew's name was Reverend Richard Hogue, and he was Episcopal rector of the Church of the Ascension in Baltimore. It is also true that the names of Brown and Hogue are linked together in much of the former's correspondence. The title of "General" prefixed to the name of W. G. Brown's father does not occur in any other instance than that relative to Hogue's father-in-law. The title may have been earned or bestowed during the Civil War. There is a dearth of material regarding any W. R. Brown except the junior of that name. No other W. R. Brown than the father is mentioned in any Alabama history or biography available to the writer. It would seem, however, that if there were a ranking general from Alabama in any army, there would have been some mention of him in any comprehensive work on Alabama biography. It is more than likely that the title is merely one bestowed upon a venerable citizen by the admiring populace of his community. Such occurrences are not at all rare in Southern society.

There is another slight discrepancy among the chronicles of this family. One work gives the middle name of W. R. Brown's wife as Gogsdell,¹⁰ the same one in another place gives it as

---

⁹ Dr. S. A. Gordon of Marion, a friend of the family.
¹⁰ Owen, op. cit., III, 228.
Cogswell,\textsuperscript{11} and a letter from Marion gives the name as Cogsdale.\textsuperscript{12} Chroniclers also disagree regarding her maiden name - whether it is Parrish or Parish. The first is probably correct, however.

Having lost his fortune in support of the Confederacy, the elder W. R. Brown set about recouping his means, and in his declining years - about 1878, found himself at the head of one of Marion's best financial institutions, the Perry Insurance and Trust Company. He was fairly successful at this venture, because seven years after his death, there still remained enough of the family fortunes to send William to Harvard, even though there were eight children of the family. True, there were practically none of the others dependent, but a college course at Harvard in 1889 was a hazardous and expensive affair, especially for a Southerner.

William Garrott Brown first saw the light of day in April, 1868. Here again there is a disagreement as to the exact date of his birth.\textsuperscript{13} Some references give April 24th and others give

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{11. Ibid,} p.237
\item \textbf{12. Dr. S. A. Gordon.}
\item \textbf{13. Those which record the 10th are:}
\begin{enumerate}
\item E. S. Martin, Obituary, in Harvard Graduates Magazine, xxii, 255, December, 1913.
\item Northern Alabama, p.719.
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}
the 10th, as the correct one. The greater weight of evidence seems, however, to point to the former one as correct. It is very likely that Brown himself often gave it as at two different dates. Two of his closest friends and workers, F. G. Caffey and E. S. Martin, were given different dates by Brown. The date of the 24th has been investigated by Judge Caffey of New York, who wrote one account of Brown's life. Brown had a sister-in-law in Cleburne, Texas, Mrs Henry P. Brown to whom he wrote on his birthday for many years. She says the letters were invariably dated the 24th.14 The origin of the 10th as Brown's birthday, the writer has been unable to discover.15

The year 1868 was the third of the Reconstruction period, and one can easily imagine young William, or Bill as he was called, hearing of the troubles of that disastrous era as a young man in later years. Treasury agents, Ku Klux, the Freedmen's Bureau, the Union League, and martial law were in existence while he was a very young child. Though he himself probably did not see much excitement, the stories told him later must have remained vividly impressed upon his mind.

He was educated at various dame schools in Marion, and later in the boy's department of the Marion Female Seminary, of which board of trustees, his father was at the time a member. The war had interrupted the operation of Alabama's public

14. The writer in conversation with Judge F. G. Caffey.
15. The record of the 10th given by E.S. Martin was evidently given him by Brown in a careless moment. See note p.9, no.13.
In the context of analyzing the forces and moments acting on a structure, it is important to consider the effects of external forces and moments applied to the system. The analysis should include the determination of the internal forces, such as stresses and strains, and the moments, which are essential for understanding the structural integrity and stability of the system.

In essence, the key steps in the analysis include:

1. Identification of the external forces and moments acting on the structure.
2. Application of the principles of equilibrium to determine the internal forces and moments.
3. Evaluation of the structural response to the applied forces and moments.

By following these steps, one can accurately assess the structural behavior and make informed decisions regarding the design and implementation of the system.
schools, but they were being continued as pay schools. Moreover, Public schools were still looked upon more or less as the gathering place of the progeny of the "poor whites", and Brown's gentle forbears would not have allowed him in such dens of commonness. To this type of early training, one may partly attribute Brown's later manifest fairness in his view of national history. Not having been trained by Northern influences (as were other young Southerners), to any great extent, he was free from the things Fleming has reference to when he says:

For ten or fifteen years Northern histories were taught in white schools and had a decided influence on the readers. It resulted in the combination often seen in the late Southern writer, of Northern views of history with Southern prejudices; the fable of the "luxury of the aristocrats" and the numbers and wretchedness of the "mean whites" was now accepted by numerous young Southerners. On such questions as slavery the Northern view of the institution was accepted, but on the other hand the tu quoque answer was made to the North. Consequently, the task of the historian was not to explain the Southern civilization, but to accept it as rather bad and to prove that the North was partly responsible and equally guilty- a fruitless task. 16

So Brown did not go to the free schools held in so much scorn by the aristocratic element of the Black Belt. They believed in education, but not in education that was given away, at least not for the whites.

This tendency of late nineteenth century Southern writers to accept the South's civilization as "rather bad" is certainly

The text on the page is not legible due to the image quality. It appears to be a page from a document, possibly containing text in English, but the details are not discernible.
not followed by Brown; nothing could be farther from the truth. His *History of Alabama* and his *Lower South* are excellent attempts to explain the old Southern civilization and reveal it in a different light from that thrown upon it by other writers.

Following his elementary training, Brown next entered and studied in Major I. W. Vaiden's school for boys in Marion. This seems to have been the proper school for one of Brown's family to attend. He seems to have been quite a normal boy all through the school years there and during his preparation for Howard College. Late in 1883, he entered Howard College in his home town. His father had died the year before and left the family fairly well fixed.

Upon his entrance to college at the tender age of fifteen he became acquainted with Francis Gordon Caffey, otherwise known to intimates as "Frank." Caffey was from Gordonsville in Lowndes county, another of Alabama's aristocratic counties where "quality" folk lived. He was a member of an old Southern planter family just as was Brown. Frank was only six months younger than Bill and of the same studious and solemn nature. It was only natural then, that the two should form a friendship which was to last throughout their lives. Through their college years the two were constantly in each other's company. They both belonged to the Philomanthnic literary society, which type of activity was the most important of the Southern college of that day. Students gathered every Saturday evening and gave themselves up to that most colorful of Southern arts - oratory and debate. Brown and Caffey were not silent and retiring here,
Brown especially. Here he obtained the training which he used only a few years later in Massachusetts in real political campaign. During his schooling at Howard, Brown lived at home, while Caffey lived in the Barracks. The system at Howard was military, but due to his frail physique, Brown was excused from drill.

Brown graduated from Howard with highest honors, receiving the A. B. degree in 1886. His friend Caffey graduated with an M. A. the following year. During the latter part of 1886 and early 1887, Brown devoted his time to reading and he occasionally contributed to the Montgomery Advertiser, which was and still is one of Alabama's four or five leading newspapers.

It was in this year, 1887, that Howard was moved from Marion to East Lake, Birmingham, where it stands today. The land and buildings reverted to its original owners. Upon application from Dr. J. T. Murfee, ex-president of Howard, the properties were deeded to a board of trustees of seven men, the board to be self-perpetuating. With the assurance of a large patronage, Dr. Murfee started the present-day Marion Military Institute. He had had in mind for many years some of his own ideas about education and this was his chance to try them out. Brown was elected one of the first members of the faculty of this school immediately after it was decided to establish it. His scholastic record at Howard spoke for him, for
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•

•

mm
he had graduated summa cum laude. He was recognized as exceptionally brilliant and was extremely well liked wherever he was known.

During his professorship at Marion Military Institute, Brown taught English and some other studies. "Professor of Ancient and Modern Languages" was his high-sounding title. His career during his two years here seems to have been very successful but uneventful.

He had planned, so Judge Caffey says, to go to Johns Hopkins to pursue graduate studies in history. His friend Frank, however, had decided to go to Harvard and wanted Brown to go with him. All through the summer of 1889, Caffey presented arguments in favor of Harvard as the place for his graduate study. Finally Caffey won, and Brown agreed to go to Harvard with him. The two entered Harvard as juniors in the fall of 1889 and thus began Brown's residence on the North. Not again for thirteen years did he spend any considerable time in the South. Like his father, he was migrating to a new land at the age of twenty-one. But his destination was a much different one than that to which young W. R. Brown had come in 1836. Boston was no raw wilderness, but the center of New England culture, refinement, and also of its own brand of lorgnetted intolerance. The elder Brown had set out to conquer the wilderness and now his son was setting out to conquer the land of

18. In a letter to the writer, June 17, 1935.
Priscilla Alden, Cotton Mather and tea parties. It was an ambitious venture for any imppecunious young Southerner. "On account of his poverty, he did not wear good clothes, but neither did any of us Southerners of that day, so this item did not distinguish him from his fellows." Southerners were still somewhat of a novelty, and considered persons who had, and always would, persecute the inoffensive Negro. Harvard of that day must have been very much like the University Page sends young Nicholas Worth to. Brown's slow speech and leisurely manner, combined with his tall, spare, angular figure, must have marked him on the campus as somewhat alien to New England. He and Frank Caffey must have looked like the "long and the short of it" as they walked across the Harvard "yard". Caffey is a man of rather small statue, while Brown stood about six-feet-two. Strange that these two should room together for five of the Harvard years of Brown's life.

So Brown began his more than thirteen years at the university he soon grew to love as everyone who goes to Harvard grows to love it, so tradition says. Brown's love of culture and refinement, dignified by age, never found a better object above the Mason and Dixon line. Next to his own Southern civilization he loved that of Harvard and New England best. "I can never forget how many fine friends and enthusiasms one can get in New England."

19. William Luce, a classmate of Brown, to the writer, April 4, 1934.

England", he wrote in later years to John Spencer Bassett. He once wrote of Harvard:

Before one's eyes is the centre of the University's life, the oldest place of learning on the continent. It is the yard, and particularly the older quadrangle, which all the sons of Harvard see when they remember their alma mater and their youth.

Regarding intellectual life, Brown is reverent in the presence of Harvard's history. "I doubt if any other region in the world can match its high, unproffered intellectual entertainment of the spirit. Certainly no other coast of ours crowns with so rare a loveliness so harsh a strength. None other rivals its charm."23

Brown was extremely well liked at Harvard, and during the years he lived in Cambridge, he became just as well liked by a circle of intelligent men in that place and in Boston.24 Like most strangers in a strange land, those Southerners at Harvard tended to associate closely with one another. Brown was an active member of the Harvard Southern club, to which many of the most prominent Southerners belonged, such as John C. Breckinridge, Hugh McCulloch, Logan Walter Page, (cousin of Thomas Nelson), P. B. Thompson, Shaler Berry and Campbell King. "Like

most Southern gentlemen who belonged to the Harvard Southern club...Brown drank, though not often."25 This habit of drinking, unfortunately, in later years caused him some discomfort and his slight excess agravated the disease which was to carry him off.

Brown was slightly deaf, an affliction which had bothered him since youth, and this trouble made him "retiring in disposition, for he dreaded imposing on friends by asking for repetition of remarks.... He was, in spite of his deafness a good mixer. He rarely ever drank to excess, and then only among his closest friends. His roommate Caffey did not drink at all."26

He graduated in 1891 with the A. B. degree, with highest honors in history. One writer goes so far as to say, "with the highest honors in the history of the institution."27 The following year he took a master's degree, graduating in 1892, still in the company of F. G. Caffey, who received the M. A. degree at the same time. He had graduated A. B. with Brown in '91.28 Brown seems to have had no desire to study for the doctorate.29

25. Luce to the writer, Apr. 4, 1934.
26. Ibid.
27. Owen, op. cit.
28. Ibid.
In 1892, Brown was appointed to a position with the Harvard library, for a time being assistant librarian under Justin Winsor during the Eliot regime at that university. He seems to have become very well acquainted with Eliot during these years. He does not seem to admire one or two of Eliot's methods of later years. Brown had occasion to interview him afterwards when he was on a Southern trip. From 1896, he was Deputy Keeper of the University records at Harvard.

Eliot seems to have been indiscreet in one instance, according to Brown:

I'm afraid Prexy has been talking a little too much. He says now he is going back to Boston to make a speech directly to the Irish. I am thinking of running up to Baltimore to speak at the Eliot dinner March 31st.

Although Brown held a position under Eliot for some years he did not hesitate to express his disapproval of one of his methods. The occasion, however, did not arise until some years after he had left Harvard.

Harvard doesn't seem to bulk as big as it once did. Somehow, I don't seem to expect much to come out of it. I can't help feeling that Eliot's elective system and rule of thumb methods tended to keep men of the highest quality from coming forward there in the place of men like Abe Jewell, Shaler, Norton, and William James. Where is

30 Brown to E. S. Martin, Mar. 17, 1909. "The associated press seems to have rather botched his interview on the race question, I'll try to get the thing straight and send an article!"

31 Brown to E. S. Martin, Mar. 21. 1909.
there now a single great man in the place? Damned if I can see him.  

Caffey still remained at Harvard, attending the Law school from 1892 until 1894. He then left Harvard and returned to Montgomery, Alabama, where he practiced law until the Spanish-American War.

While Brown was librarian's assistant at Harvard, he was not idle. True to the Southern tradition, he was a Democrat, and all good Democrats in the campaign of 1892 supported Cleveland. Brown was elected president of the Harvard Democratic Club, and in this capacity he stumped the state for Cleveland, speaking many times a week for several weeks. He was a great admirer of Cleveland, and followed his movements till his death in June, 1908. Mrs. Cleveland refused Roosevelt's offer of troops for a military funeral, and the incident so struck Brown that he wrote a poem about it, the last stanza of which runs:

Silence, keep silence o'er this wasted frame,
Wreck of that burly strength which once he gave.
Better than drums, or outcry of his name,
Is silence — and the woman by his grave.

Brown was an ardent politician, and he could make a good appearance on any platform. "He was an exceedingly courteous

32. Brown to Jeremiah Smith, August 14, 1911.
33. Nation, lxxxvii, 9, July 2, 1908.
Southern gentleman of the old school, slender, smooth shaven, with very earnest eyes, tho always ready to twinkle at any suggestion of humor."34 "He had a long face with a high fine forehead, a good mouth set off with those full and long lips that one associates with an orator."35

During the years 1894, 1895 and 1896, he held offices on the state committees of the "National Democrats", supporters of the Gold Democrat movement. After the campaign of 1896, when Bryan, who had been nominated over their protests, was defeated, Brown became independent in politics. Bassett says of him in his notes: "Brown shifts from Democratic to Republican gear with the ease of a fine limousine."

Returning to the quietude of Harvard's library, Brown prepared and published two small works in the years 1898 and 1899. The first was A List of Portraits in the Various Buildings of Harvard University and the second, Official Guide to Harvard University, republished every year including 1903. Two other works appeared in 1900. They were: History of Alabama, a school text, and a Life of Andrew Jackson. The former was published by the University Publishing Company, and the latter by MacMillan, both of New York.

34. Luce to Writer, Apr. 4. 1934.
35. Bassett, loc. cit. p.100
Chapter II

Travel and Franklin Square

Brown always kept up a lively interest in his friends, whether they were in Cambridge or elsewhere. When war with Spain was declared, Frank Caffey volunteered for service. He rose shortly to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the third Alabama Volunteers, and he saw considerable action in Cuba. Brown wanted to go to Cuba himself, but was not accepted. He writes: "I am restless and unhappy that I am not considered fit to serve." He was extremely interested in the war, however, for at that time, he was busying himself with his History of Alabama. He asked Caffey to send him material on Alabama's share in the army organization so he could put it in the last chapter. He wanted Alabama to make a good showing. "You see," he added, "I haven't anybody in the world very close to me and some of the love I might have for parents or wife or children goes into my passion for the republic."2

In a study of the materials relative to Brown's life, it


2. Ibid.
is extremely rarely ever noticed that there are any of these softer expressions of emotion because one hardly thinks of him as possessing them. He had lost his father in 1882 when he himself was only fourteen, and that must have caused him great sorrow at that age. His mother had died about 1891 while he was in school at Harvard, and there is no record of his having been able to go to the funeral. He had been separated from the rest of his family many years and he had only two brothers whom he considered very close to him. They were Eugene and Wilson, both older than he, who, he said in dedicating his *Lower South* to them, "Stood aside to let me pass." These he saw only at rare intervals.

As for the possibility of matrimony, it at one time became quite likely. One of his friends writes: "He was delightfully courteous to the ladies but his deafness made him shy with them and I judge for that reason he never married." It is hard to believe, however, that such a slight barrier should deter Brown from something he really craved. After the writer of the above quoted statement left Harvard, Brown fell in love with a certain young lady in Cambridge. He was very earnest in the affair, but as it fell out, she seems not to have justified the trust he placed in her, and she left him with hardly a word to marry a rather ordinary person.

3. Judge Caffey to the writer, June 17, 1935.
4. Will Luce to the writer, April 4, 1934.
5. Names are omitted in deference to relatives and informants yet living.
Such an insult to Brown's sensitive nature depressed him and made him bitter against women in general. There is not any further record to be had concerning any other ventures in this direction until Brown's indisposition. Of course, after that, his proud nature would not allow him to force himself as a dependant on any person. Just as Brown never married, so his friend Caffey remains a bachelor to this day. Brown's bitterness against women probably shows itself in one of his best essays, "The Foe of Compromise". He was doubtless thinking of his own sadness when he wrote:

No flame of passion ever fused, no sacrament ever truly joined together, no long wandering hand in hand, through days and years, through joys and sorrows, ever cemented into a real union and oneness two differing natures. A man will as soon accomplish that other demoniac task of compassing and pervading the whole of life as this of breaking through the barriers of the flesh and then, with one great roar and plunge or silent mingling of the waters, compassing and pervading the soul of the woman on his bosom.

Convention, and the habit of constraint which comes of weakness, and the powerful and noble instinct of motherhood - itself the mother of all sacrifice - these things mercifully forbid that the foe of compromise shall rule in women's natures. 6

Her inability to fight down the desire to go with another served must have to crystallize his own feelings somewhat, regarding this fiend in a man's being which makes him strive for and require the best rather than take anything mediocre or short of his goal. This something sets up an unattainable ideal and

6. The Foe of Compromise and Other Essays, pp., 55-56.
drives a man on to try to reach it, wrecking friendship, reputation, love, and everything considered expedient. And for compensation? Brown sees little except the constant fight for peace which makes one "part of another order - unseen, vast, free.... This way I grope for God."7 One must feel that such a foe of compromise must have possessed all men who would not be satisfied with less than the best, be they military, social or academic crusaders.

Bliss Perry of the Atlantic Monthly once wrote Bassett:

I remember C. E. Norton's comment on Brown's Atlantic article, "The Foe of Compromise", into which he put so much of his real self. Norton thought it admirably written, - and his praise was hard to win. But he added, "you know Mr. Perry, there really isn't any Foe of Compromise!" 8

"To which I am inclined to demur", replies Dr. Bassett. "There may be, and again there may not be a real 'Foe of compromise'. I think it existed in William Garrott Brown; probably it exists in few men."9 A sensitive Englishwoman reading this essay was much impressed by it. She wrote Brown:

...The whole of it swayed me; I rose and fell with

7. Ibid, p.64.
its thought and feeling. I understood from beginning to end. It is to me like a supreme vision of the tragedy and the greatness of the seeing soul's passage through the immeasurable mystery of life.10

She at the same time asked him if the essay were a record of his own life. In a second letter to Brown from her, one learns that Brown told her it was the very outcome of a deep and genuine experience of his own inner life.11

Another compliment came to Brown on the same essay. It was not of as feeling a nature, but no less sincere of interesting:

Dear William Gotrox,
Permit me to extend you my most exalted and distinguished felicitations on the "Foe of Compromise". The paper on Golf was near the mark, God knows, but this rings the bell. Haven't liked anything so well since Virginibus fuerisque, (?) and there are places where you have Stevenson - but we shan't blaspheme. Please write some more like it.12

But even though Brown did not have a family upon which to shower his love, he did have friends. He learned of Caffey's resolve to go into the war from the papers, and writes:

My own feeling is hard to put in words. My love for my friends is of such a nature that, even to their risk and hurt, I always wish to see them do the admirable thing rather than the safe thing. I know you are controlled by a sense of duty, for you have never followed any other

12. Vincent Walsh to Brown, April 4, 1903.
In conclusion, I support our proposal. It offers a unique opportunity for our institution to expand its reach and enhance its reputation. It is essential that we seize this opportunity to foster collaboration and advancement in our field.
law; and I confidently commit you to the chances of battle or disease, knowing that whatever happens I shall have no cause to change my opinions of you, however others may have to learn of you from this. You mayn't be permitted to do anything worthy of you, but you will never do anything unworthy. 13

Brown greatly admired "Rich" Hobson, of whose exploits in Cuba he later wrote a most enthralling account.

At this time, Negroes were being somewhat discussed as soldiers for use in Cuba. When Caffey mentioned it to Brown, the answering letter shows how alert he was to the race question and how well he knew Negro nature:

Don't forget that to rule Negroes is very like ruling children. I am quite of the opinion that they will make as good soldiers as the Sepoys if properly officered; and who knows but these pestiferous islands may yet bring us away out of the perplexity the blacks have been to us. 14

Three months later he writes again: "Where are you? I've been watching the papers. These damned Boston papers are too much taken up with the Massachusetts troops.... After you are mustered out, Breck, Tow, you and myself will get together and have a hell of a time." 15

Following his resignation from the Harvard library, Brown was, in the fall of that year and until June of the next year a lecturer in American History since the Civil war in the Uni-

14. Ibid.
15. Brown to Caffey, August 23, 1898.
versity. Among his colleagues he was liked and respected, although Dr. Roger Marriman once remarked that "he was so thin he seemed as if he would blow away." 17

Just as his teaching career at Marion was a successful one, so was that at Harvard. Two hundred and fifty students filled the classroom for his lectures. Brown being very conscientious, as was always his wont, he was plunged into a mass of work which overwhelmed him. The assigning of topics, grading papers and preparation of lectures sapped his strength and he was forced to resign from the University staff at the end of the course in June of 1902.

But the tragedy in this instance was that his deafness was increasing to such a degree that it impaired his usefulness as an instructor. It had been his purpose in all those studious years at Howard and Harvard to prepare himself to be a writer and teacher of history. Now that he had become equipped at thirty-one to pursue his chosen profession, this disappointment depressed him greatly. 18 He probably brooded over this second disappointment of his life a great deal. But after a few weeks, he was busy at his desk again, and did a great deal of writing which was published the next year. It was during the latter part of this year that he published what proved to be his best single volume. This was the group of essays whose title one was, "The Lower South in American

17. In conversation with the writer.
History. Many persons wrote to him and of him concerning this work. Brown himself called it "thin and fragmentary", but Caffey wrote, "yet if ye had written nothing else, that alone should perpetuate his memory."19

Even as early as 1900, no less a person than Albert Bushnell Hart recognised his ability as a historian. Hart had not only been Brown's instructor in history, but also a close personal friend. Once when Brown read a paper at a historical meeting in Washington, Hart wrote him: "It always exasperates me that another man should have such a power of language and statement. Everywhere I hear the same story - that W. G. Brown is one of the few men in the country who can really write history."20

Brown visited Trinity College at Durham, North Carolian in January of 1903 where he delivered a lecture to the students on Andrew Jackson. While here he became acquainted with John Spencer Bassett who later wished to be his biographer, but was cut off by accident before the task was well begun. While at Trinity, Brown read his essay, the "Foe of Compromise" in the parlor of Benjamin N. Duke before an invited audience giving those present much material for reflection.

Dr. John Spencer Bassett in his article in the South Atlantic Quarterly on Brown seems to have allowed his memory to

slip. He mentions Brown's returning to Harvard in January, 1903 to give his course in Reconstruction history following his visit to Durham. It is true that Brown's letters show that he was in Cambridge from January to October of that year, with some travels out of town, but the Harvard University catalogue for 1902-03 does not contain Brown's name at all; but Brown is listed as a lecturer in American History since the Civil War in the academic year previous, as has been mentioned.

Brown was now recognized as one who could, with clear insight and authority speak on Southern questions. Charles Eliot Norton once wrote of him in this regard:

> He is a man of refined nature, sensitive, modest, of high character and a strong and cultivated intelligence. His studies of the South have special value from his intimate knowledge of the field, from his inherited sentiment for the old conditions, and his clear appreciation of the new. He is greatly hampered in social relations by his deafness, but he is so entirely a gentleman, that this disability stands little in his way. I commend him to you.

> "His 'inherited sentiment for the old' and "clear appreciation of the new' gave him an extraordinary fitness for writing about Southern History."23


In the case of the accuracy of the data on the preparation of the balance sheet and the annual report, it is
important to ensure that all relevant information is included and that the calculations are made correctly.

The annual report should provide a comprehensive overview of the financial results for the year, including
the income statement, balance sheet, and cash flow statement. It should also include any significant events
that occurred during the year, such as mergers or acquisitions, and any changes in accounting policies.

The report should be clear and easy to understand, with all financial data presented in a logical
sequence. It is important to ensure that the report is free from errors and that all necessary
disclosures are included.
Following his first visit to Durham in January, 1903, Brown returned to Cambridge to write. He here contributed articles to some of the nation's best periodicals. Many of his essays that were later published in book form were being written at this time. He was doubtless also working on a Life of Oliver Ellsworth which appeared in 1905. He traveled a good deal in the East, making lectures and reading papers at Buffalo, Washington, and New York. Several reviews of current books were among his writing of no small account. One of his very many articles of this year 1903 drew wide attention. It was his review of the Life of Gladstone by Morley. It provoked one especially complimentary letter.

If every monumental work could be judged with the poise, the dignity, and the sympathy which your article shows, our literary journals would contain vastly more that would be worthy of presentation. The delicacy of touch with which you handle an important work by an important man about an important man is, alas, too rare in these days when so many books must have attention...

Brown was now fully committed to writing, with only an occasional lecture here and there. He was offered a place with a modest salary as secretary to the Society for the Extension of University Teaching. This same institution offered to have him give a course of lectures, and were quite insistent. Brown refused the first offer because he thought it would interfere with his writing. Regarding the offer of the courses, Brown

24. S. E. Bradshaw to Brown, Nov. 20, 1903.
seems not to have been enthusiastic, but he did propose a course in American History since the Civil War, to which he received the following reply:

Your proposed course upon American History since the Civil War would, we think be a very acceptable one for our centres, and I think we could, even now, guarantee you two courses in Philadelphia next season upon that subject - that is for the same course delivered twice, not less than $250 to $300.... If you were once heard here, I have no doubt we could secure for you several courses of the same series of lectures.25

The course was to be given from October to April, 1903-04. A specimen lecture was arranged for December 15th at the Y. M. C. A. in Philadelphia at a fee of fifty dollars, but was never given because Brown was in poor health long before the time arrived. He continued living at number eleven Prescott Hall which had been his address for some time.

After enjoying the New England summer in Cambridge, he went to Trinity College in October where there was a library and where he could do his writing. His doctor had advised him to go west for his health, but Brown rebelled against the idea.

When Brown left Cambridge, certain of the members of the University staff seem to have felt a distinct loss. It is unusual to think of New Englanders as subject to a show of emotion. At least one, however, expressed deep feeling at Brown's leaving. That one was A. B. Hart. Brown had agreed to write a volume for the "American Nation" but was unable to do it be-

25. F. B. Miles to Brown, April 17, 1903.
cause of some other work. The volume was to be titled "Elements of the Civil War. Upon Brown's withdrawal, Hart wrote:

My dear Brown, your going away has deprived me of an opportunity which I meant to seek this year, to know more of your views and conclusions on many historical and public matters. The last ten years have been extremely crowded. Coming out at last into a broader and less concentrated life I meant to enjoy it in the pleasure of my friends. I wish you were with us and of us in the university. You are one of the few men in the country who has got something to say and can say it. Your reputation as a writer is steadily rising, and in my judgement, we cannot spare you from Harvard.

At Trinity, he threw himself into the life of the college, taking a lively interest in all the proceedings, especially the Bassett affair. He admired greatly the stand which the college took relative to this fracas. It seemed to do his heart good to see his own country coming out of the days of narrow intolerance into a plain of broad-minded freedom of expression. Writing to Dr. Few, president of the college, he remarks:

I was able to speak with sincere enthusiasm to Mr. Perry about the work you young fellows are doing at Trinity. It would command anybody's respect, and did command my admiration... Gradually my impressions of the Southern situation are taking form and it menaces a very dark thing indeed.... If I - if we - could only see plainly the goal, the duty! But how seldom that is vouchsafed us in any concern.

26. Probably his history of the U. S. or a life of Grant.
27. Harper's to Brown, Oct. 12, 1903
28. Hart to Brown, Sept 28, 1903
29. See below, p. 155-56
When Brown left Cambridge in the summer of 1903, in bad health, his physicians had advised that he go west and live on a ranch until his health was completely restored. He had not yet received any positive warning of the disease that was to carry him off. He refused to go at that time, choosing Durham instead. In February of 1904, however, an idea came to him and Mr. Robert L. O'Brien that a series of letters written from various stops on a trip through the South would be good material for a special feature in the Boston Transcript for which paper O'Brien was Washington correspondent. Thinking, perhaps, that the trip might do him good, since a stay in Texas would be included in the itinerary, he immediately got into touch with Frank B. Tracy of the special features staff. The idea was pronounced a good one, and Brown started his trip. It was successful from the first in the matter of the material for publication. Brown's writing was pronounced "good"; "tip-top" and other such compliments were paid it. After the second letter, Tracy wrote:

We are all glad to see you doing so well, and your trip is already an assured success. These little touches that you put in your letters in regard to shooting quail in this or that place are very attractive, and show that you are familiar with your surroundings. Too many writers fail in this particular; others amplify this personal touch to the point of offensive egotism. You are doing the thing just right.31

31. Tracy to Brown, March 8, 1904.
Later he wrote that he was getting letters and warmly commen-
datory articles about the series. 32

In the matter of payment for the service, however, some
unpleasantness arose. The articles were about two columns in
length and there were twenty letters. For them, the Transcript
was to pay four hundred dollars and railroad transportation
with Pullman accommodations. There were to be two letters a
week, printed Wednesdays and Saturdays, and they were not to
run into the summer.

Brown fell into the habit of drawing sight drafts on the
Transcript in payment for the articles. Now the business mana-
ger of the Transcript, George S. Mandell, had a peculiar anti-
pathy for sight drafts. He seems to have considered them a
sort of "dun". But when the first arrived, he made a wry face
and paid it. Tracy sent word to Brown that drafts were not
liked, and that checks would be sent when needed. Two days
later, two drafts for fifty dollars each arrived - and it was
Saturday too, a very busy day. The manager was disgusted. He
wrote out a check for a hundred dollars and handed it to an
assistant to be forwarded to Brown. As for the drafts, they
went to protest. A few days later, on March 26, Mandell tele-
graphed a hundred and fifty dollars to Brown, completing the
amount due; this was four hundred dollars plus fifty - one for
expenses. He was told that he would get no more money until

32. Tracy to Brown, March 12, 1904.
the service was completed.

As Brown was traveling on mileage furnished, and Pullman expenses paid by the Transcript, it seems he was spending rather recklessly. Tracy's letters in regard to the drafts were rather sharp, and he protested strongly Brown's continuance to draw sight drafts after he had been told that the manager had a strong dislike for them. He also opined that Brown was drawing rather heavily considering the small part of the contract fulfilled. Brown, however, did not understand that he was not allowed to make drafts, because he made some notes to that effect on the back of some of the letters he received relative to the affair. He says that he did not receive Tracy's letters in time to stop the drafts, and that the checks were so slow in coming, that he was compelled to draw drafts in order to continue the trip. When the Transcript refused to pay two of his sight drafts, he was sorely chagrinned over their protest. He demanded and obtained Mandell's promise to write Birmingham and Columbia to explain that the protest was not Brown's fault.

Brown did not, however take all this abuse lying down. After many such letters from Boston, near the end of the quarrel, Brown must have written a scathing letter, upbraiding Mandell for his ill humor and abuse of him while in the field. This letter of Brown's is not preserved, but the manager's apology is quite humble, and the affair seems to have ended amicably.

33. tracy to Brown, Mar. 29, 1904.
enough. Tracy wrote: "If I have said anything to give offense which has not been taken back, I withdraw it, and if I have failed to say the right thing, consider it said. We all act too hasty at times and I think that is a good thought for us all."  

While Brown was in Texas, he wrote one or two letters which are an interesting sidelight on his personality. Bassett, to whom Brown had promised a review of a certain book, wrote and chided him for not sending it. Brown replied that he had been much too busy, and that he had not even finished the book. He adds, "I'll promise to have it ready soon after I get to Washington but that probably won't appease you. Simply cuss me out. I'll get over it by the time you come to Washington, and I'll pay for drinks." Later, from Washington, Brown sent an article to Bassett with the following comment: "Send me a proof. I've got more respect for you in any other capacity than as a proof reader." 

At the end of this journey for the Transcript, and at the termination of his contract with that newspaper, Brown found himself at St. Louis, where he was visiting a friend. After staying here for a few days in the latter part of June, enjoying the St. Louis fair, he returned to Washington.

34. Tracy to Brown, Mar. 31, 1904.
35. Brown to Bassett, May 9, 1904.
It was during the following stay in that city that he became acquainted with Cushman, an employee of the government who investigated conditions and made reports relative to certain of the Indian reservations. It was from this person that Brown supposedly caught tuberculosis, though Cushman probably did not even know he had the disease. Brown's body, always thin, was a most suitable resting place for a tuberculosis germ, he being thin, and possessing not a great amount of physical resistance. A further treatment of the struggle Brown had with tuberculosis is given in another part of this paper.

Brown did not immediately discover he had the disease, and did not find it out until two years later. He had contracted with MacMillan to write a comprehensive life of General Grant. Brown resided in Cambridge, working on this book intermittently, together with his "History". About the middle of March, 1906, he moved to New York where he lived at the Harvard Club on Forty-fourth street for about two weeks. Then he moved up to fifty-seventh street with his friend, Caffey where he stayed during the rest of his time in New York. In May of 1905, he contributed the first of a series of six chapters of his projected history. The other five appeared in June, July, September and December of 1905, and April of 1906. They appeared in the issues of the Atlantic Monthly which came out in the


38. The impression received from the letters is that a thousand dollars was the price to be paid for the articles.
and so we are left to our grimy cell to ponder the consequences of our actions. Have we not learned our lesson? Have we not seen the price of our hubris? Must we continue to walk the path of destruction, or shall we seek a path of redemption and repentance? The choice is ours. It is a choice that will determine the course of our existence. Will we choose the path of destruction, or will we选择 the path of redemption? The answer lies within each of us. It is a choice that will determine the fate of our world.
months named. Bliss Perry was highly pleased with the articles and wrote Brown so:

I have not told you half as often as I should have done how sincere a gratification it has been to see these articles appearing in the Atlantic. If we could always count upon securing such writing as yours, we should never have any doubts about the future of the old magazine.

City life and overwork, however, seem to have taken its toll of Brown's vitality, which was not increased by the fact that he was unknowingly harboring tuberculosis germs. The first hint of the trouble that was impending is given by a letter from Bliss Perry, written August 2, 1905. "Pray go to bed early, play golf moderately, and let the great problems of the universe sag along without you for a while."

The latter part of 1905 saw Brown ready to consider the serial publication of his Life of General Grant. Whether or not the manuscript was finished or not is uncertain. It is extremely doubtful, however, that it was because had it been, Brown would almost certainly have given it to MacMillan for publication. Though money is seldom mentioned in his letters, he would have doubtless welcomed an advance from the publisher. His contract with them did not forbid serial publication, and it gave him the right to use their facilities to publish it in book form any time within ten years of its date. The American Illustrated Magazine offered to publish it in twelve or four-

teen installments beginning with November of 1906 and running monthly. The offer was made in December of 1905, so it seems Brown still wanted to put more time on it. The magazine had a "popular but intelligent" reading public, and the editors believed the work would be well received. "We believe that the publication of your "grant" would hold for us the readers we like best to keep, and secure others of like character." The publication was of course never started due to Brown's breakdown. He was to receive three hundred dollars per installment until the book was published.

Brown continued his contributions to various magazines as much as his health would permit for the first six months of the year 1906. He was never under the care of any one doctor, so his real trouble was not yet discovered. About the last of April, one of his physicians advised him to take a sea voyage. In May he wrote to Thayer, a college friend:

I expect to run abroad with one of my brothers for a month or so this summer. We expect to wander about as we choose, without any particular object, but I don't think I ought to let slip the chance to meet a few men. My hesitation in asking you for a letter of introduction arises from the belief that they are considered far more important there than they are here.

Thayer was at that time editor of the Harvard Graduate's Magazine. He had been prepared for college in Europe by pri-

vate tutors, so naturally Brown expected him to know several persons of note, hence the request for the letter of introduc-
tion. Thayer sent him a note to Henry Norman, a prominent
author, journalist, and a member of the House of Commons.
Norman had received his A. B. at Harvard, and Thayer probably knew him there.

The letters Brown wrote between his departure for Europe and his return are not preserved. It is likely that he did not write many. Several later letters to him mention his post cards, and that is doubtless the extent of his correspondence while he and his brother Eugene wandered about as they chose. He more than likely saw and studied Europe quite a bit, on this as well as later trips. One of his close friends once remarked "He knew his Europe quite well." 42

When Brown returned from abroad in the autumn, his health was no better, and he at last came to the conclusion that there was something seriously and radically wrong with his system. There followed the visit to Dr. Janeway, who immediately told him his trouble, and prescribed his subsequent confinement. Brown seems to have been dangerously ill at first, for one of the first letters from him comes on March 1, of 1907. He was at Asheville. The tone of the letter shows he had not written Thayer since his return. "I think I'll win: certainly I'm much better. One sign of my 'sitting up and taking notice'

42 Dr. W. P. Few in conversation with the writer.
is a revival of an old and many times put off design to learn Italian - enough, at least, to read my Dante for myself."  

Six days before this, he seems to have been optimistic about his disease. He writes Bassett:

I am better, decidedly, have gained a lot of flesh, cough less, and have been free from fever and pleurisy. Dr. Minor is confident that sooner or later I can go away and work, but he doubts if I ought ever again to try to live in a city. Few has been here once to see me; I am hoping he may come again if only that I may chuckle over his astonishment at finding me so well avoirdupoised. I am interested in the avocation of Johnny Rebeldom by your contact with New England civilization. If you keep on living up there you'll go through many oscillations of the scales. But if, after a while, you are shipped off as I have been, you will find Southern kindliness mighty agreeable.  

During all the rest of his life, Brown was suffering from some sort of indisposition resulting directly or indirectly from tuberculosis. He tried the climate at Asheville, and for a time at Liberty New York, spending the summer of 1910 at the latter place. Part of that year he spent at Lakewood, New Jersey where he could be near the editorial offices of Harper's Weekly. During a part of 1911 he was in Cambridge, but soon afterward returned to the North Carolina mountains. Nearly every letter to him mentions something about his illness - wishing him health, expressing regret at some renewal of his illness. His own letters are less verbose about his malady, and he seems rather reluctant to speak or write of it. He was resigned to his fate, and sought only to use what time

he had left. Although at times he must have had to blame some delinquency on his illness, the instances are rare.

The feature he disliked most about his trouble was that it shut him off from the rest of the world, and he seemed to lose connection with what was going on. To one so keenly interested in the national and local affairs as was Brown, this was quite a blow. He tried as best he could to keep in touch with the topics of the day and did a very good job of it.

He seems to have been very well informed on national politics. He read his newspapers and wrote his editorials with amazing fortitude. Martin, Brown's business associate, quotes a letter from him:

One thing, however for which there is no compensation is that illness is exile.... That's the worst of being on the side-lines; one can't communicate with the fellows who are in the game. But that doesn't mean that one loses interest in the game or loyalty to the team. You fellows who are allowed to play mustn't forget that we who are banished to the side-lines are with you all the same.45

As the years between 1907 and the end passed, Brown gradually grew deafer, living more and more to himself as concerned personal relations, but no less in contact with the world through newspapers and periodicals. He writes to another friend:

I am, I think, a good deal deafer, and haven't the vitality for any sustained effort to get at the strangers and semi-strangers about me. But from a child, I have foreboded precisely this closer and closer shutting off from the world. It does not seem to me really manly or honest to try to make believe that work and thought and books are enough. One must be candid with life—most of all with one's own life. It looks now as if it were going to be Saranac for the summer. I have tried to get into a sanatorium but they want me to drop work until they decide how much I can do, and that is out of the question. 46

All during the latter part of 1907 and early 1908, there is another gap in the record of Brown's life. Feeble beams of light are thrown by an occasional letter, but on the whole, he seems to have been occupying his time fighting the disease. By the end of 1908, he had made some headway against it, having visited Europe again during the summer of 1908. He became very hopeful, and his health was good enough to depend upon in order to take up steady work.

So Brown was as able as he would ever be to accept work when it came his way. In November, 1908, someone had mentioned to Colonel George Harvey, nominal editor of Harper's Weekly that Brown had been doing some magazine work, and had great potentialities as an editorial writer. E. S. Martin who was the mainstay of the editorial staff wrote Brown and asked him if he would like to contribute weekly political comment to the editorial page of the Weekly. Brown was apparently delighted. He was to be paid according to the amount of material he sent in that was used. He accepted the offer and added in his let-

ter to Martin, "Harper's Weekly is decidedly the kind of dry-goods box I should like to mount occasionally, if I am good enough. That a little offering may follow does not make the offer less attractive." 47

From December of 1908 until the end of July, 1913, when the Weekly passed under new management, Brown's connection with the magazine was practically his whole life and the sum total of his interests. He spent the rest of what remained to him of life on that "dry goods box". It was exactly the kind of work that suited him. As he once wrote to a friend:

It is my delight to help a little towards making things go right in public affairs, which have been my life-long passion, particularly when I can do so without being conspicuous myself or in any way profiting selfishly by my intent and activity. The thought of taking office or otherwise benefitting myself is positively distasteful to me; anything like that would spoil my pleasure in my hobby. 48

He sincerely wanted to make the Weekly a power in public life, and used all his energies in that direction. He was deeply grateful for the kindness shown him by those in charge. Martin and Colonel Harvey were most considerate of Brown when he was extremely ill at rare intervals, and Brown was not slow to recognize these favors. After he had been on the Weekly for about three years, he was placed on a salary of fifty dollars a week. This gave him more confidence in himself and his work,

47. Brown to Martin, Nov. 15, 1908.
and he felt that he was accomplishing something toward making something of the Weekly. Shortly after, he wrote to Martin:

I have more happiness in this work than I ever got from any other so long as it's plainly effective and strengthens the paper. It utilizes all my training, gratifies my life-long ruling passion. If I could neglect the money question, I'd rather do it for nothing than not at all. With good team work we should make the Weekly a power. 49

The part which Brown played in the various political arguments of the day are interesting and important. This was the period of the Insurgent Republican movement, and the renewing of the hopes of the oft-defeated Democrats. The part played by Brown in these movements is reserved for another chapter.

49. Brown to Martin, Nov. 6, 1911.
Chapter III
Brown vs Tuberculosis

For about nine years, Brown was a victim of tuberculosis. It is very probable that he contracted it during a stay in Washington for a few months in the year 1904. While there, he made the acquaintance of a man named Cushman who at that time was an employee of the government, a part of whose work was to visit and investigate conditions on Indian reservations. Brown was somewhat interested in Indian affairs. Cushman either had a mild case of tuberculosis, or was supposedly cured. Nevertheless, it is believed by Judge Caffey that it was at this time Brown contracted the disease. His constitution, due to his sedative nature was never one which could easily resist a contagious disease. Another fact doubtless contributed to his contraction of the disease, namely, his deafness. For some years, deafness in increasing severity had been his lot, as has been shown. His associations with Cushman at lunch, in libraries, sitting-rooms and various other places caused, together with his deafness, rather close personal contact with this man, which may be blamed for the transmission. Brown was, as has been said,
at all times a Southern gentleman, and his reluctance to impose himself upon others due to his deficiency doubtless caused him to come within range of germs constantly being thrown from the nose and throat of a consumptive through invisible discharge.

It was more than two years, however, before he discovered that he was a victim of tuberculosis. He tells of how he was accused of having many other ailments in the course of his search for the cause of his constant fatigue. Nervous exhaustion, overwork, and general run-down condition were successively blamed. Finally, a sea voyage and travel were prescribed as the panacea. He tells it himself in his own words:

Then there came the suggestion of sea and travel--I am not sure from what particular theory of my condition; indeed, I am not altogether sure that I did not myself contrive to suggest the suggestion. The sea and travel were accordingly tried, and not even the ultimate effect of them or rather the eager and reckless mood in which I essayed them, can ever make me quite regret that I did essay them or become ungrateful for the peculiar exaltations, the intense and overwhelming delights and depressions, which in that mood I won from them.

It was due to this suggestion that in the summer of 1906 he went abroad, traveling in England, where he visited

the historic spots of that delightful island. His specialty was to see all the places where the great writers had lived and worked. From England, he travelled on the continent through France, Switzerland and Italy. In Italy, it seems, he found especial enjoyment. Here he spent much time in "rapturous and feverish and exhausting exploration of hot Italian cities. For I had already begun to taste, unknowingly, the perilous delight of indulgence in certain kinds of excitement, with that peculiar and unequaled heightening which only the T. B. temperament can give them."2

Following his return to America, he continued his search for good health with rest and travel. He was gradually becoming convinced that something specific was wrong with him. He complained of having been positively unable to get up during the forenoon and go about his work. It could not have been overwork or nervous exhaustion, he reasoned, because he had had only rest for some time. Having undergone two more physical examinations, his case was diagnosed, in the first, as typhoid, then ptomaine poisoning and then as nothing serious, whatever it was.

The second examiner gave no definite assurance as to what the trouble was; but he learned that whatever the trouble

2. Ibid p. 750.
was, it was something serious.

Then on a sudden impulse came the visit to a great diagnostician—the second to bear a name now famous for two generations; and it was fascinating, weak and near indifference as I was, to watch at last a master-scientist explore my worn out body for the secret of my helplessness.

It may be pointed out here, that the expression "worn-out body" is an appropriate one. At this time, he was thirty-eight, and should have been in the prime of life. However, it seems that as much of intelligence as went into his work and writings, little seems to have been used to promote his own physical well-being. From the days at Marion he seems to have been one who seemed to care little for his own physical self. Always a most ardent student, he spent probably too much time indoors. He probably took too little exercise, which factor coupled with rather in-temperate drinking habits doubtless undermined his health. He smoked also, adding to the destroyers of bodily resistance. It is true that he played golf "rather well" as one of his associates at Harvard remarked, but it seems to have been insufficient to throw off the poisons accumulated from his other habits. It is likely that his deafness, which afflicted him from childhood, also had something to do with his lack of proper exercise, making him shy in the presence of partners

4. Dr. Roger B. Merriman in conversation with the writer.
and opponents in contests.

From all accounts, he was at times rather cruel to his body. It was not unusual for him to work all night and many hours into the following day, using cold cloths on his forehead to keep him awake. He seems to have utterly disregarded doctor's orders, in the matter of personal habits. Perhaps there were few, if any doctor's orders on this point. But it seems strange, that a tuberculosis patient should be allowed to use and smoke cigars while under treatment for tuberculosis. Also, on several visits to New York during the period in which he was experiencing varying degrees of illness he indulged his taste for alcohol. At one time during 1911, when he thought himself cured, he visited Caffey in New York. For about two weeks, he "sat around, played a few hands of bridge and drank a few highballs. At the end of that time, he was practically a wreck, and had to return to his bed shortly after." It was no doubt a short time after that he wrote his article, "Confessions of a T. B." It is mentioned in several letters to Martin of the Weekly, in which he offers it to them first. It is noteworthy, however, that it was not published until some months after

5. Dr. W. P. Few in conversation with the writer.
6. Under date of July 13, 1912 he mentions having received a pipe which W. R. Thayer had been good enough to send him.
7. Judge Caffey in conversation with the writer.
his death. 8

But to return to the discovery of his illness: The doctor who discovered his trouble, and of whom he speaks so highly, was Dr. Theodore Caldwell Janeway, one of the most outstanding diagnosticians of the day. At the time he saw Brown, he was teaching diagnosis at New York University. Brown was surprised, humiliated, and dreadfully frightened at the discovery of his real trouble. He had never once suspected that he was what he chose to call a "lunger". Upon this discovery, Brown says:

That was the worst--the very worst--those first few moments of terror and conviction and lightening-swift review and forecast of all my life. Much of suffering and sadness and almost despair was to come after, but nothing quite to be compared with what struck and chilled clear to the heart of me; nothing that has quite so profoundly stirred in me the love of life, the fear of death, the daunting and appalling and shameful sense of my own and all men's pitiful mortality... It had come upon me, of all men: and yet, until that moment, though youth was gone, or nearly gone, nothing had ever completely deprived me of youth's illusion of immortality, of immortality. 9

Brown then points out a crying need of society--some provision for those who are thus ill and segregated, yet too proud and too many to allow themselves to be completely indolent, and public charges.

He says that he needed good air and good food. A simple

8. Brown died in October of 1913, but the article was not published till June of 1914.

thing, perhaps to desire, but one exceptionally hard for a T. B. to find, was this necessity. He complains that those who board "lungers" are those whose diet did not even suit well people. Sometimes he finds good air, sometimes good food, but he says he almost despaired of finding the two together. He inveighs against those who mistreat and swindle the ones who can least bear it. He admits that the rich can easily have all they need to make them well, but not those of moderate means.

But the great majority of our order are not rich; they are cut off from their customary earnings; they are often forced to depend upon the sacrifice of others—sacrifices which they would not willingly increase. The fact of this dependence, indeed is the hardest part of their lot. They cannot escape the thoughts of it for a day...and nothing could be more trying and worrying than the constant necessity to pull and strain, to fight and nag, as they must do if they would have it at reasonable cost.

He was able to support himself through much the greater part of his illness by his writing, and on occasion absolutely refused to go to a sanitarium unless he be allowed to continue his work.\textsuperscript{11} During the summer of 1911, he was dreadfully sick, having spent much energy in the attempt to secure patronage to the proper Republican groups in the South. His brother, Wilson Brown stayed with him a great part of the time, and probably paid a large part of

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid p. 752.

\textsuperscript{11}
his expenses. Martin of the _Weekly_, with the agreement of Colonel Harvey, continued Brown's payments to Brown even though no material was coming in. Whenever he was able, he protested against this practice, saying he did not wish the _Weekly_ to keep him up. His brother received the payments, however, and deposited them, since Martin insisted on sending them.

Brown had been doing very well at supporting himself until this spell of sickness came. He writes, "I was even beginning to be hopeful of saving a little money and of living long enough to get at some old obligations; but this last setback seriously damaged that prospect." The "old obligations" were doubtless his contracts to write "Grant" and his "History of the United States Since the Civil War." Further reference to these works will be found in the last chapter.

The problem then, is not one of medicine, but one much more commonplace and sordid, one of food and air and dollars. He sees the problem as one the public will have to deal with. By its proscribing and shunning of them, it encourages them to deceive it and associate with it, and thus spread the scourge further.

Known and recognized and decently treated, we are not dangerous. Shunned and proscribed and forced to concealments, we are dangerous. Victims ourselves of this same regime of ignorant and self-

deceiving inhumanity, we are called on every hour of our lives for a magnanimous consideration of others.13

Small wonder it is, then, that a T. B. sometimes weakens and makes himself a danger to society by his circulations. Brown advocates better diagnosis, and better resorts for patients, where they will be given fair treatment and good fare. This censure of resorts and sanitariums may have been brought on by an altercation with a certain Dr. Minor, who was his physician while he was at Asheville.

It was for perhaps two or three years that Brown was intermittently associated with this physician. He seems to have been a likeable man in many ways. Brown spoke highly of him in some of his letters. But at one time, Minor refused to give Brown credit for a check he had given. Brown waited until his bank statement arrived, and in the envelope was the cancelled check with Minor's endorsement on it. Now convinced that Minor was crooked, he intended to associate with him no longer. Brown was always jealous of his integrity, and would let no insult pass without a vigorous protest. He wrote Minor a scathing letter, a part of which reads:

You cannot insinuate a doubt of my integrity and remain my friend. You have made attempts to injure me with information acquired in the relation of physician and patient. I have an inability to find

the friendship I expected in a Virginian of your antecedents; but I cannot any longer, even to keep what remains to me of life free from enmities, accept your friendship or return it without some convincing assurance of your confining yourself to the speech and the behavior due from one gentleman to another.14

The last two years of Brown's life were spent in bed, with but few exceptions. He worked as best he could on his editorials and articles. When the Weekly passed under new management, he seems to have regretted it very much, because it had become so much a part of him. This fact doubtless contributed much to his death which occurred only a few months later. His state of mind which refused to let himself admit he was a total loss due to his disease doubtless prolonged his life many years, and gave to the reading public of the first fifteen years of this century much food for thought which a feeling of complete discouragement would have doubtless deprived it.

Chapter IV

Taft and the Federal Patronage

It will be remembered that Brown's connection with Harper's Weekly started in the latter part of 1908, about the same time as the election of that year. He had been in Asheville fighting tuberculosis most of the time since he had returned from Europe in the summer of 1906. In the summer of 1908, he had again visited Europe; he came back to America to join the staff of the Weekly shortly after.

Brown, as has been said, had always been interested in politics, and had written the platform for the North Carolina Republicans for the 1908 convention. It was a very wise one, and gave great strength to those Southern Republicans who were industrialists and desiring protection. Democratic politics had disgusted a great many persons of intelligence in the state and they went over to the Republican party. Brown remarked of his 1908 platform, that it "came precious near breaking the solid South,
and incidentally Bryan's backbone as well."¹ It will be remembered that Brown never favored Bryan because he considered him unsteady on the money situation. Brown had been a supporter of the Gold Democrat movement while he was at Harvard. Brown remarked further concerning this 1908 platform that his "main purpose...was to break up the old system of political control by referees and little cliques of office holders, maintained by swapping delegates for the right to distribute the federal patronage."²

Brown had all his life wished to see the South prominent in national politics. She had hampered herself in this regard by her political solidarity. The two issues which are responsible for the solid South are the "nigger and Reconstruction" issue and Republican "pie counter" machines. The first one appeals to the ignorant and timid and bitterly prejudiced who allowed the negro question to keep them in constant fear of splitting the white vote, and the old idea that the Republican party is a "nigger" party. The second issue, the pie counter, "deters the intelligent and self-respecting from asserting independence. The only question is as to which is the most inexcusable, the more detestable, the more inimical to the south's own

². Brown to Martin, Nov. 27, 1911.
welfare and progress."

Consequently, many "intelligent and self-respect-ing" people had no way to turn, being disgusted with both parties. In most cases, they had done what they could to control the Democratic party so that at least they would have some voice in local affairs.

But there came a day when the "worm turned". Bad Democratic machinery and corruption in North Carolina became the object of some ridicule. Finally, many of the best people in North Carolina turned to the Republican machine for aid. Although ever since the Reconstruction "pie counter" activities had been controlling this party, certain of the new industrialists and protectionist Democrats now turned Republican. Chief among these was John M. Morehead, an advocate of protection for Southern as well as national industries, who stood for election to the House of Representatives in 1908. He with two other Republican candidates was elected. Taft polled over 113,000 votes in the state, only about 25,000 votes behind the Democratic presidential candidate.

The National Committee of the Republican party had not made a large appropriation for any Southern Republican campaign. Indeed, the higher-ups of that

party had made no effort to defeat the Democrats at the polls, the only function of the Southern Republican party being to furnish delegates in the National Convention who would support the machine candidate. Brown thinks that if the National Committee had made the North Carolina Republicans a reasonable appropriation, the state might have been carried for Taft, thus breaking the solid South, and making a decided step toward greater political importance for that section.

Another remarkable feature of the North Carolina Republican campaign was that whatever was accomplished was solely a white-man's movement. No negroes voted in North Carolina in 1908 because they had been disfranchised shortly before by constitutional amendment. The races had indeed seemed to get along better that way, there being less friction between them. Brown opines incidentally that the blacks would fare better if they devoted more time to industry and less time to politics. He writes further to Thayer:

I find that everybody down here is impressed with the showing made by the Republicans in the South. This state which has no Republicans in the present House will send three to the next; and Taft ran ahead of the Congressional candidates. It is clear that great numbers of Southerners have concluded that they are free to vote as they believe.

5. Ibid.

Before proceeding any further, however, perhaps a brief description of this much discussed "pie counter" system would not be amiss. It has long been a custom in both Republican and Democratic parties, for the political manager of the successful presidential campaign to become Postmaster-General on the new cabinet. The function of the new Postmaster-General is to hand out the patronage to those persons in the various state organizations who have been most active in electing the new chief. Because the campaign manager was most closely in contact with the president's supporters, he knows better than anyone else who deserves the patronage which, of course, is largely in the form of post office jobs.

Now due to the fact that the Democratic party, which is dominant in the South, is not nationally dominant, it very seldom has federal political plums to hand out to its supporters. A Republican president would hardly take the recommendation of a Democratic Senator or Representative from a Southern state, because they would be inclined to use such patronage to reward their own supporters.

This situation gives rise to a vicious machine called the "referee" system. In every state where the Democrats are overwhelmingly dominant there is always a small scattering of Republicans who are members of that party for expediency's sake, that is, to share in the patronage. Since it would be a physical impossibility for the
Postmaster-General or the President to know who should hold every cross-roads postmastership, there is named in every state, usually the state chairman of the Executive committee or a national committeeman, who acts as "referee" in the distribution of the patronage. He, in return for support is given this right, and in turn, he rewards the supporters of the Republican party with post office jobs.

It should not be supposed, however, that post office jobs are handed out merely for support at the polls in the national election. That is not the object at all. Southern Republicans are usually so greatly in the minority, that victory here would be a hopeless impossibility. It makes very little difference whether Republicans vote in the November elections at all. But the Southern states send delegates to the Republican national convention, and these delegates' votes are as good as any. Therefore, if the faction of the party which happens to be in power uses the patronage properly, it can virtually name the party candidate at the next national convention.

Senator Bacon of Georgia once called attention to the fact that the Southern third of our country does not have a single federal officer selected in obedience to the choice of the people among whom he is to serve. He said further that the men who superintend the distribution are "men elected by nobody, who represent nobody, who
could not be elected by any community in the state, are selected by the federal authorities to determine who shall be the officers to serve that people in their local needs". By "federal authorities" he meant the political manager, and that of course meant Hitchcock during the Taft administration. The Democrats do the same way when they are in power, except that the referee system holds in Northern states instead of Southern ones. But the number of Northern states in which the Democratic party is negligible is small, and it is also rare that the Democrats are nationally dominant. Hence they are not so much guilty of pie-counter tactics, not because their intentions are more honorable, but because conditions are not favorable for its propagation.

Hitchcock, who was Postmaster-General under the Taft administration was on this basis a very powerful man, potentially speaking, because through his control of the patronage, he could practically select the delegates from eleven southern states for the next Republican National convention, and through them the next Republican nominee would depend on him.

He holds in his hands the ends of a thousand political wires running to every part of the country. There is hardly a man or a cause in national politics that he cannot materially help or hurt. And the country knows no more about Mr. Hitchcock's own views and animus than it does about the obscurest postmaster under him. Mr. Hitchcock has never

been submitted to the country or any part of it for its approval. He is a product of the departmental life at Washington.

Brown gives one example of a Southern Republican machine. "A Southern Republican of the better class", he says, has written him about the Alabama "personal machine". Indications are that the other states are like it. There are forty-one members of the Republican state executive committee. The chairman is collector of the internal revenue, and "referee" for the state. Thirty other members of the committee are holding federal jobs, and three others on the committee are brothers to federal office-holders. The other seven are probably waiting for their appointments to be confirmed by the Senate. "One need not wonder at the skill which controlled a system which is so simple in principle, however widely extended it may be." 9

Brown also refers to the Birmingham Times, which tells of a Republican convention where there were gathered two hundred of the faithful few. Eighty of the delegates were federal office-holders, and they controlled the convention and all the committees, including those on contests and credentials. "It is not surprising that a Republican president who wishes to succeed himself, or to name his successor usually has little trouble with the Southern

Hitchcock had been Postmaster-General for a time under Roosevelt, and it seems that he had been lining up the Southern delegations to suit himself, and not Roosevelt. It seems that George B. Cortelyou had the presidential bee in his bonnet, and he wanted to be nominated instead of Taft in the convention of 1908. Hitchcock was engaged in lining up the Southern delegations in the South to support the Cortelyou boom. Cortelyou himself later denied to Harvey that this was true, however, and that no anti-Taft men had been appointed in 1908 or 1910, saying it was all a piece of misinformation, and that he would tell Harvey all about it "some day". He did add to Harvey though: "Allow me to compliment you on the general high character of the Weekly. During the past few months it has contained a number of very notable articles, and it is a pleasure to have it in the house. Naturally, some of us may not agree with all its opinions but that may be our fault and not yours".

This denial of Cortelyou followed a paragraph by Brown in the Weekly for May 21st, 1910, saying that Hitchcock

13. Ibid
had been taken out of the post office under Roosevelt and transferred to the Taft headquarters because of his nefarious activities in supporting the Cortelyou boom. It will be remembered that Roosevelt was sponsoring Taft for nomination in 1908, and naturally he would brook no opposition in his own household. Then after Taft was nominated and elected, Hitchcock, having successfully managed Taft's campaign after the change, was named Postmaster-General in order to better enable him to distribute the patronage to Taft supporters. His subsequent disregard for Taft supporters, and care of his former Cortelyou supporters, was the practice which caused so much consternation among especially the North Carolina Anti-machine Republicans.

At first Taft seemed to be doing nicely in the matter of appointments. Brown admired his performance very much. Roosevelt had been indiscreet in several appointments such as the reappointment of a Negro, Dr. Crum, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at Charleston. In North Carolina, Spencer Adams, Chairman of the State Executive Committee, had been brought forward for a district judgeship, but it was thought unwise to appoint him by virtue of his office. Another man, H. F. Seawell was appointed instead, but was not confirmed by the Senate. Such was the state of affairs when Roosevelt retired. Fortune now played into the hands of Taft. At Charleston, Crum obligingly resigned, giving the inspiration for a cartoon in the Weekly
depicting Taft with the resignation in his hand, a beatific smile on his face and the legend, "A Crum of Comfort". In Crum's place, Taft appointed Cabell, of Richmond, and in North Carolina, he appointed Judge Conner, a life-long Democrat "whose only recommendation was his being probably the fittest man in the state for the place." For a federal judgeship in Birmingham, he appointed a quiet lawyer, "not a politician, and it is doubtful whether he is a Republican, even though he did vote for Taft." Taft "fairly knocked the breath out of more than one of the Southern Republican machines by his anti-machine appointments". "We believe, of course," continues Brown in the Weekly, "that in all this President Taft is taking a statesman-like and patriotic course, and we greatly admire his courage." But during the next few months, things took on a new aspect, and Brown remarks in January of 1910:

Just now reports are coming from the South that the old Republican machines seem, notwithstanding the promising growth of a new and better kind of Republicanism in that quarter, to be having a good deal to say about appointments particularly to the post offices.

But this may be said: whatever the future holds for him [Mitchcock] the present offers him no more urgent duty than to keep the Taft administration from

15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
getting into trouble by blunders of a political sort.

And things soon appeared to be reversed still further, thanks to the tactics of Hitchcock. A. E. Holton, Federal District Attorney at Winston-Salem, North Carolina, wrote to Morehead: "Those who in the inception of Mr. Taft's candidacy were apparently opposed to him appear now to be in the saddle and his friends in the state seem to be getting it in the neck." Holton went on to relate further what had happened in 1908. It seems that when Hitchcock was organizing the South for Cortelyou, Cabell of Richmond went before the North Carolina Executive Committee, and had passed a resolution endorsing Cortelyou. When Roosevelt heard of it, he conferred with Holton, Harry Skinner, Taft supporter and office-holder, and Thomas L. Moore, District Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina. They there laid the plans which, as has been seen, brought Hitchcock into line by his transfer to the Taft headquarters. Spencer Adams, once mentioned, and "a good deal of a damned scoundrel", and E. C. Duncan, referee and National committeeman, were also anti-Taft men in 1908 and after. After repeated assurances that Mr. Taft knew who his friends were, Moore was displaced as district-attorney by Seawell, and

21. Mentioned above, whose appointment by Roosevelt the Senate failed to confirm.
Cabell was promoted to Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Skinner was ousted as district attorney, and his successor named by "referee" Duncan. Spencer Adams, Chairman of the machine committee, was put in the place of A. E. Holton at Winston-Salem.

Not only that, but D. K. Pope, Director of the Mint at Charlotte was told by Cowles, agent of Duncan and Adams, that it would be well for him to communicate with them with a view to coming under their banner. Pope, however, stood firm for Taft, and "by the first of June, 1908, he was displaced from the mint, and Mr. Pearson, Judge Adam's secretary took charge. Pearson was an anti-Taft man." 22

Perhaps "Uncle Joe" Cannon, Speaker of the House, was not idly jesting when he remarked to Morehead of Hitchcock about the middle of March, 1909: "That ______ (the unspeakable epithet!) in the post office will wreck this administration before it's twelve months old." "The present condition of the Republican party in the nation at large," adds Morehead, "evidences the old man's political acumen and power to recognize a copperhead by its tortuous trail." 23

The question might well arise here: Why did not Taft see that his own supporters were rewarded, and not those of Hitchcock and Cortelyou? Brown gave the answer

---

23. Morehead to Brown, August 20, 1912.
to the question when he wrote:

Taft is not interested in distributing patronage. He lets subordinates send in the appointments. Mr. Taft is apparently the kind of President who wishes there weren't any post-offices to distribute. He takes no delight in that part of his job. We sympathize with him, but we have read and pondered Naseby, and are bound to admit that, so long as there are post-offices to fill, filling them is going to remain a political function of very high importance. Presidential nominations may turn on the way they are handled.

Brown had always wished to see a healthy Republican party grow up in the South to replace the parasites that were the machines. He maintained that ever since the Reconstruction, the South had had a greater part in nominating presidents than had ever been accorded her. He blamed Hitchcock with being at the back of the whole post-office affair, and of trying to use it to control the Southern Republican machines. The growing protection sentiment in the South was causing new concern to his kind, however, due to substantial Republican gains. But Brown was never vitriolic in his published accusations of anyone - never as strong as Morehead wanted him to be. In merely a suggestive vein, he writes: "Washington has the impression that Mr. Hitchcock is using the Southern offices to get or keep control of the Southern Machine rather than to propagate Southern public opinion, and make the Southern Republican party stronger and more respectable." Though there were many other more important topics at the time, "Washington's

sense of values is a good deal like Naseby's,\textsuperscript{25} whose only measure of the value of an administration was the expedition with which it furnished him the job as postmaster at Confederity X roads.

Brown gives more definite information to the public in these words:

\begin{quote}
What is still more curious, is that the very men who were concerned with Hitchcock in organizing the Cortelyou boom have nevertheless been preferred by the Taft administration, through Hitchcock, to the original Taft men of the South. This naturally suggests that the Southern machine is a Hitchcock rather than a Taft machine. But the main thing is that here, in the broad national field, we have today machine politics played on a scale that makes Tammany Hall look Lilliputian.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

Brown laid down two courses which were open to Hitchcock. He wrote at the beginning of Taft's second year in office when it was discovered how powerful Hitchcock was: "There is the old opportunity open to him as a mere politician. There is the new opportunity equally open to him, if he wishes to be a patriot. We still forbear to judge him. But again if smoke keeps coming, one must finally admit that there is fire."\textsuperscript{27}

There is no doubt about which one Hitchcock followed.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Harper's \textit{Weekly}, \textit{liv}, April 16, 1910.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Harper's \textit{Weekly}, \textit{liv}, May 21, 1910.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Harper's \textit{Weekly}, \textit{liv}, Mar. 12, 1910.
\end{itemize}
Incidentally, Mr. Hitchcock was not idle in gaining public favor, but the Weekly was not lagging in calling attention to it. During Hitchcock's first year in office, the deficit of the post office dropped from $17,600,000 to $6,000,000. Says the Weekly regarding this incident: "Mr. Hitchcock seems to have a good prima facie support for the contention that he finds leisure from the cares of political management to do some work on his government job." 28

The question may now arise: What did Morehead, Republican Congressman from North Carolina think of all this? In answer, it is only natural to say that he did not care for it in the least. He did not fail to express many of his sentiments to Brown, and since he laid great store by the patronage, he held no love in his heart for "Gin'l" Hitchcock, as he chose to call him. Duncan being the referee and national committeeman, he and Hitchcock did not allow any of the cries of the new Republicans in the South to reach the ears of Taft. While always most courteous to Morehead, it seems that Hitchcock always completely disregarded his wishes. On rare occasions when he secured an appointment, Hitchcock would deprive him of another that was nearly in his grasp. As Morehead once expressed it: "After I had scaled the rampart and captured the flag, I was shot in the rear with a paper of tacks." 29

Brown and Morehead began their correspondence at the

instance of Thomas G. Settle, an old friend of the former, and a lawyer in Asheville. Brown fired the first shot, and received a courteous reply from Morehead, welcoming him into the fight.

I have heard so much of you through Settle and of your interest and potential activity in what I believe to be not only the right, but the only effective solution of the North Carolina situation, that it [your letter] does not come as from a stranger. Your prediction certainly has the true ring, and the only criticism, if criticism it could be, is that you soft pedal upon the gentlemen in the post office, in my opinion, a little too hard.30

For about a month or more, Brown occasionally remarked about Hitchcock and his machinations, and another letter came from Morehead:

Allow me to say that in these comments, both major key (Taft) and the minor note (the P. M. Gen.) are touched as by a master's hand. Adroitness in speech and composition is nothing short of a gift. Any man given brute strength, can wield a bludgeon, but a scimitar calls for alertness of intellect and physique, and as far as mind is above matter, so do these expressions impress me as superior to the usual public print strictures upon political functionaries upon whom is devolved the shaping of political policies.

Knowing as much as you do, I would (and so would the average man) have struck more broadly - especially at the post office incumbent; but upon second and third reading, your line of action is vastly better from every standpoint.31

This was written after Brown's mention of how powerful Hitchcock really was.

31. Morehead to Brown, Apr. 16, 1910...
Morehead did not fail to stir up the "old guard" Republicans in North Carolina. W. C. Mangum, one of those bon vivants, wrote Morehead censuring him for his deprecating language used relative to the "old guard", and condemned the tactics of the "new recruits". He launches into flowery eulogies about how valiant and long-suffering the "old guard" has been, and how ungrateful were the "new recruits" to come into the household of the "old guard" and turn it into a rough house. Morehead calls the letter a classic, probably with his tongue in his cheek. But he does not hesitate to accuse the "old guard", and justly, of using the party in North Carolina to get offices. He writes that he himself does not want any more offices other than the one he already has, and that he will not run for Congress again.

As one of the open-door recruits, and speaking for many more of my class, I assure you that it is in no wise desired or wished to occupy 'the high places' but to lend our feeble assistance to your efforts to see that these places are occupied by those whose selfishness does not dominate every action, and to follow and not to lead in this undertaking."33

Further evidence of Morehead's interest in the development of a healthy Southern Republican party is shown by a letter written about one week before the Republican state convention of 1910. It gives a view of the situation in the state at the time:

33. Morehead to Mangum, April 30, 1910.
The balance of power in the State is embodied in a class of men who are the cream of our citizenship—
from the mental, social and business standpoint. These men are disgusted with Democratic tendencies and will actively embrace Republicanism as soon as the Republicans demonstrate they place policy above pie. This being the case, it has been presented that if the progressive element cannot elect me they can elect nobody—and the net result of all the discussion and correspondence is that I am standing for the Chairmanship but not for Congress.

If the decision was left to the voters of the party it would carry by 90%, but we are antagonized by an active, alert and compact organization of office-holders, whose jobs are in the balance and who are working night and day, marshaled and commanded by Duncan, and what makes the result doubtful is the fact that we are an untrained host against a thoroughly trained and developed organization which is fighting for its political life.

According to Morehead, Hitchcock seemed to be everywhere at once, and to know everything. It is true that he did exercise his office in many cases to satisfy a personal grudge. He seems to have singled Morehead out for a great number of these small annoyances, much to the discomfiture of the latter. One case in point is interesting:

Hitchcock's versatility and ubiquity were shown to me on yesterday in a most striking manner.

Some months ago I had requested the transfer of Eugene Grissom, brother of my friend Grissom, from the Pension Bureau to the Department of Commerce and Labor where he could bring his legal education to bear for his betterment... Senator Dixon and I called on Secretary Nagle in behalf of the transfer.

On yesterday I was talking with Dixon and asking him to make a further call on Nagle. He told me that

34. Morehead to Brown, July 2, 1910.
35. Gilliam Grissom, Morehead's secretary.
36. Secretary of Commerce and Labor under Taft.
he had called there some days after our visit together and to his utter astonishment, Hitchcock had found out that I had requested the transfer of Nagle and had advised Nagle to, under no circumstances, grant the request as I was a stench in the nostrils of the Republican party of the state and was to be accorded absolutely no consideration and much more of like tenor.

Fortunately Dixon presented the other phase and cleared the atmosphere so far as Nagle was concerned. I only relate the incident to show Hitchcock's absolute knowledge of details and the extent to which his animosity is exercised.

The idea of his taking a hand in the transfer of a clerk under Civil Service from one department to another is preposterous and is a demonstration of such smallness of calibre and contemptibleness as to thoroughly disqualify any man possessed of such attributes from holding the position he does.

I knew he was a liar but this action presents him in the light of a damnable sneak, alongside of whom I reverence a chicken-thief.³⁷

About the last of May, 1910, with the aid of A. Platt Andrew, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, it was arranged that Brown and Hitchcock were to have lunch with Andrew. Brown expected Hitchcock to explain the situation in the post office then, since Brown had been rather sharply censuring the actions of the Postmaster-General. But as it fell out, Hitchcock made no explanations, and Brown asked no question about it all, feeling no doubt that he would be over-bold in broaching the subject. Having gone on to Loomis, New York, whither he had been bound when he stopped in Washington for the interview, he was then informed by Andrew that Hitchcock was "completely flabbergasted" that Brown did not ask about the Postoffice and the Southern policy. He further asked Brown down to Washington

³⁷ Morehead to Brown, May 25, 1910
again in order that the two may talk over the situation. Brown, however, was not favorable to the idea, feeling that it would be useless. "I have nothing whatever to expect from another interview. The value of it will of course depend on his candor and sincerity, and I am not myself...as yet willing to commit myself to that view."  

Another interview was arranged, however for late in June of 1910, and Brown went to New York to meet Hitchcock, "but he failed to keep his engagement and has made no explanation." Just what became of Hitchcock on this occasion was not revealed by the available correspondence.

Brown's keen interest in the Republican situation in North Carolina brought a request in July of 1910 to help build the platform for the 1910 campaign. He was urged by Thomas Settle to go easy on the sumptuary laws of prohibition. He hoped to draw the vote of the class of men who belonged to the social clubs and who opposed prohibition, and resented the invasion of their "rights, liberties, and freedom of action."

38. Andrew to Brown, June 10, 1910.
42. Thomas Settle to Brown, August 3, 1910.
Brown did write the platform. Settle pronounced it a "dandy, a corker, just the thing we need at this time." Morehead called it "a superb document." Settle and Morehead both had high hopes for the coming 1910 campaign. Brown's platform was adopted. A. Piatt Andrew complimented Brown highly on what he had done in North Carolina in helping raise Republican politics to a higher level. He asked Brown to Washington to have a talk with the Secretary of the Treasury and the President with a view to suggesting a course of action for the president to pursue in relation to the Southern policy. But Brown could not travel to Washington, so he met Taft and his private secretary, Norton, in New York on September 30th, 1910 for a short time. Brown promised to make some suggestions about the Southern situation which he did in a long letter two weeks later, dated October 13th, to Charles D. Norton.

In this letter, Brown pointed out that there was a growing Republican sentiment in the South, and he attributed it to (1) the growth of the demand for protection, occasioned by the growth of industries which "take" protection, particularly the Cotton and iron industries. Former southern protectionists have put their faith in protection Democrats, but good management may secure them to the Republican party. (2) Discontent with the Democratic party due to the revolt against old line Demo-

43. Settle to Brown, August 3, 1910.
44. Morehead to Brown, August 3, 1910.
cracy itself such as the Gold Democrats, a great number of whom became Republicans, and many more supported Taft in 1908. The general ineffectiveness and weakness and ill success of the Democrats in the nation has also caused many to become doubtful as to the benefits of remaining with the party. (3) The desire of Southern people generally for a bigger share in national affairs, and the growing feeling that the chief obstacle to their obtaining it is their own political solidarity. (4) The disfranchisement of the Negroes, and the practical acquiescence of the Republicans therein has led the whites to feel that they can now divide without danger that the Negroes will become important politically.

Brown believes that the best way to appeal to these various motives and promptings is by a fair treatment of the South on the tariff question by giving them free bagging paralleling free hides for New England. For the lowlanders, a sympathy for them on the race question would make them feel most friendly toward the Republican party. "Mr. Roosevelt did much in this direction, but the effect of it was largely marred by the Crum appointment, the Booker Washington dinner and the Indianola incident. The president has done much, and so far has made no such mistakes." He points out the friendly attitude of the South toward him. "His is decidedly the best

45. See Chapter VIII, p. 163 for mention of this incident.
personality to put forward as representative of the New Republican attitude toward the South."

He strongly urges that the "referee" machines be not tolerated, that those men tend to become dictators and degenerate to the practice of swapping delegates for jobs. To get the party so strong and hopeful of carrying elections that it cannot be controlled by the patronage is the most desirable condition, and that solution has been approached in North Carolina. Then he turns to the real trouble at hand. He states unequivocally that the referee game cannot be played on the local end only, that there must be someone playing the Washington end. In this case, he charges, it is the Postmaster-General, who is none other than Hitchcock.

I do not believe that the President would knowingly condone the continuance of a practice he has so admirably denounced. But I do believe it may be in his power, by firm supervision of what goes on at Washington to check and greatly diminish that practice, even if he cannot entirely destroy it. Surely it is possible to let everybody know that claims for patronage will not be honored, but that the only kind of party service which will henceforth be recognized is honest work in building up the party at home, with success at the polls as the goal in view.

Brown points out also, that in cases where a suitable Republican does not present himself, that a Democrat be named for a place, and in this way, a wider and freer constituency will be built up.

He urges, in closing, that the administration recognize the new Republican movements, especially in North Carolina and Tennessee, and names Morehead in the former state as
perfectly sincere in his desire for patronage to build up a good organization.

Taft replied to Brown’s letter saying: "I have never read an article that is so illuminating and satisfactory on the Southern situation." He says that he did not appoint any Negroes in the South because social barriers cause inefficient service, and it also "retards the growth of that race in its associations with the whites, and in the benefit that it is to derive from the friendship and protection of the Southern Whites." Norton wrote also to Andrew, saying the views "will have a real influence on the president. This would be a better governed country if more of the time of the governors could be spent with students of Brown’s type and less with the gangs that crowd the offices." Morehead was named chairman of the state committee in the 1910 North Carolina Republican convention. He seems rather hopeful of victory in the elections of the year on October 29th, although he admits: "one man’s judgment is as good as another, and, in the language of the Celt, "a damn sight better." The Democrats are exceedingly active and frightened, and, to my mind, that is a hopeful sign." But the factional divisions in the party still prevailed because Duncan was still national committeeman, and, as Morehead put it, "still beyond the range
of our guns." He was still a close friend of Hitchcock, and still played the "referee's" hand, though the committee had destroyed the last vestiges of the system except him.

In 1910, the Republicans lost the ground they had gained, and the Democrats were back again in the saddle. Morehead now set about trying to mend the differences within the party, so that they would be more successful in the 1912 campaign.

In May, 1911, Brown being still deeply interested in the situation, and having nearly collapsed from a sickness that caused his silence for some time, felt constrained to write Taft again relative to the Southern patronage, because several appointments had been made that were inimicable to the plan he had suggested to the President. He urged Taft to use the patronage so as to make it clear that he did not want to build up a "federal machine". "This perpetuates machine rule in the South, and prevents the growth of a healthy Republican party in that quarter...another effect is to give the administration which happens to be in power an unfair advantage against opposition within the party."49 The president should make it clear that no one is authorized in behalf of the administration to promise patronage in return for support in any convention...: and that if in any case such an agreement becomes

evident, it will not be honored and the applicant will be considered unfit.

He believes this will be politically expedient since his present danger is in the national election and not the convention.

An adherence to the old practices to control the convention will weaken your appeal to the country more than it has weakened any Republican appeal in the past; for never before has the Northern press been so keenly alive to the entire situation.

A breaking away will be taken as a great achievement of the administration.

Brown argues further that the step will round out Taft's southern policy and will be accounted a peculiarly happy feature of the administration, and it will destroy "those unfortunate conditions which you so fully understand."

You cannot have so long dealt with those conditions without being confirmed in your original view that the federal pie counter is the great obstacle towards a healthier political life. I sympathize with you heartily in the attrition of your patience as one Southern movement after another degenerates into a raid on that institution. Here, I am persuaded, is the only way open to you to strike effectively at its baneful influence.

The step would also aid greatly in civil service reform in the South and relatively serve to elevate national politics all over the country. And last but not least, it is demanded as it has been for years, by every consideration of fairness and square dealing. This final and main reason for it is, that it is right in itself, because the practices aimed at are wrong and mean and dangerous to our institutions.

This letter was sent also to A. Piatt Andrew, H. C. Lodge, and S. W. McCall for their opinions. All agreed that the suggestion was a just one, and that it should be followed. Andrew promised to have Charles Hilles urge the matter upon
the President. He promised to see that Taft gave the letter thorough consideration.

He seems not to have known Brown's part in the North Carolina convention for he called Andrew's attention to it with great praise for their "fervor and intelligence." Andrew let Hilles know the same day that Brown wrote the platform for that convention. Hilles added rather significantly, however:

"We are being deluged with letters from the South these days and while it is a hopeful sign, I have somewhat the fear that the line of least resistance may again be followed, which will result in a continuance of the old repressive measures. Of course this is confidential. It may be that the leaven will work sufficiently before the convention to produce a better result."

The trend of Taft's opinion is seen running through the letters, showing his apparent antipathy to change:

"Hilles" said the president had read your letter of ten days or so ago and had spoken as in agreement with your general policy, but they are apparently not willing at the present moment to commit themselves to a public declaration that in all of the Southern states a radical change of policy was to prevail.

50. Secretary to the President, appointed March, 1911, to succeed Charles D. Norton.

51. Hilles to Andrew, June 2, 1911.

52. Ibid.

53. Hilles to Andrew, June 3, 1911.

54. Andrew to Brown, June 18, 1911.
After a letter from Brown saying that he supposed his letter was to be ignored, the trend may be followed further through this letter from Hilles:

You are not correct in assuming that the president has now considered the matter and has decided to take no action. It is receiving his attention, but he will not act on it impulsively, for it contemplates a revolution in a venerable system which operates in fourteen or fifteen states.55

Brown's anger may only be imagined at the terming of the pie counter a "venerable system". It will be seen later how this "venerable system" nearly cost Taft the nomination at the next convention.

But it seems that Brown's letters and Morehead's thunderings were not entirely without effect. A notice in the Weekly for May 20th, 1911, informs a reader that the post office is to be investigated because of its being used to control national and state conventions. This of course means that Hitchcock is to be investigated since he is the post office. The charge states further:

that he has in this way taken a hand in the factional division of his party, rewarding his supporters and punishing his critics; that he has hindered instead of helping the movement for a real and decent Republican party in the South, and that the only logical goal of this course, if successfully pursued, would be to name the next Republican candidate for president.56

55. Hilles to Brown, June 17, 1911.

But the investigation proved to be a farce, and nothing conclusive was proven against the Hitchcock regime. Nothing could have piqued Morehead more than this. His patience was almost worn out. He wrote to Brown:

About the only thing I know positively is that, as a member of Congress and as chairman of the State committee, I have been up against Hitchcock, his system and the tactics of his henchmen in the State until I am sick, both on heart and at stomach. I feel be reason of the president's failure to take hold of facts and a thoroughly conclusive exhibition of the majority sentiment of the Republicans of the State, and his continuing to allow Hitchcock to shield and protect his friends and the president's antagonists, that our effort has been aborted by the very man to be most benefitted thereby...

- The impression universally prevails that the post office inspection bureau finds practically as he wills. If complaint is made against our incumbent, a request is forwarded forthwith for the name of a man to take his place; if adverse to a Duncan incumbent, an admonition that he devote more time and care to his office suffices the discipline of the department. Loaded dice? Far beyond, even to the reign of the black-jack. So much for my opinion and the respect I entertain for "Gin'l Hitchcock."

But Morehead's hatred of the resourceful Hitchcock did not reach the climax until the latter part of December, 1911. At a conference of leaders relative to the patronage, Taft apparently made a rule to reappoint all incumbents of one term, because the exasperations incident to the patronage had become so legion that he had to make some rule. Willis Briggs had been appointed postmaster at Raleigh. Morehead wanted him

57. Morehead to Brown, December 1, 1911.
ousted because he turned out to be a Duncan lieutenant, the latter being leader in the Anti-Taft cry. Morehead wanted an exception in this case because of Brigg's position. But Taft stood firm and the rule was accepted.

Morehead then was dumbfounded to discover that Taft had appointed Walser for a third term at Lexington notwithstanding the fact that he was a Duncan man. Morehead went to see Taft and called attention to the rule saying it was to apply only to one-term incumbents. Taft explained that Morehead misunderstood him, that it applied to all. Morehead lost his temper and shouted at Taft who in turn told him to moderate his voice, and that he had never said anything about one-term incumbents but meant all who had satisfactorily performed their work. Parenthetically Morehead remarks to Brown: 

"(I distinctly heard and felt Ananias turn over three times)"

He further states to Brown that he had letters from all the gentlemen who were at the conference and they all understood that the rule was as he had stated to Taft.

What doubtless happened was that when Taft appointed, over the protests of the machine, three excellent men to high federal offices in North Carolina, all for more than the third term, Hitchcock then suggested that the rule apply in that manner down the line into the lower offices. The three men who had been appointed were all endorsed by the State committee of which Morehead was chairman. It had been publicly announced that these reappointments had been made because of fine administration solely. Hitchcock's suggestion
was followed, according to Morehead, and Taft, it seems, instead of admitting this acquiescence, chose rather to say that Morehead misunderstood him. The latter added in his letter to Brown:

Can you wonder that I am nauseated?
However, after all is said and done, we are committed to Mr. Taft's administration and policies, working in my judgement, for the industrial growth and uplift of our section, and these details are to be kept under the lid in so far as they involve the president. I am perfectly willing to hit "Gin'l" Hitchcock just as I would a copperhead—(to say rattlesnake would be to malign a fair-fighting reptile)—whenever and wherever I find the opportunity. 58

So it seems that Morehead was able to swallow his personal feelings and subordinate himself for the good of the administration he was pledged to support. No wonder Brown recommended him to Taft as a reliable man.

Morehead now begins to fear for the Republican fortunes in the next campaign. The success of the life tenure policy both acted to nullify and make more or less empty the victory won by the new faction in 1908. This situation in turn operated to the "very decided detriment of the enthusiasm of our own supporters. And 'our own supporters' means 85% of the Republican voters of the State, in my opinion." 59

Morehead then proposes that Taft refuse to make any reappointments, except in cases of vacancy until the differences

58. The foregoing incident was all described in a letter to Brown December 1, 1911.

59. Morehead to Hilles, December 13, 1911.
in the state should be settled. He thinks this would strengthen the party greatly, and provide a rallying ground for the next campaign. "This will mean the continuance in office of at least 95% of the referee appointees, but we accept the handicap and will abide in perfect faith the verdict of the next expressed Republican sentiment in the state."\(^{60}\) Seven days later, Morehead writes that the Duncan-Hitchcock machine was striving to control the delegation from North Carolina-

for the deliberate purpose of delivering same to anyone against Mr. Taft in the event of a serious contestant being brought forward. The President may possibly recall that in 1909 at the beginning of the extra session, I told him this crowd 'would gut him' (inelegant but verbatim) 'in the twinkling of an eye'. His emphatic rejoinder was (also verbatim) 'By God, I know it, for I have seen them try it.'\(^{61}\)

Morehead predicts that if things are allowed to drift along under the present status and in the event of our inability to rally our forces at this convention, I wish to go on record as predicting that Mr. Taft will not secure the vote of North Carolina if any candidate other than Lafollette is presented. It gravels me beyond expression to see the President supinely submit to adroit political machinations that may mean his undoing so far as North Carolina is concerned.\(^{61}\)

So bitter became the fight between the two factions in North Carolina, that Taft at last decided to accept the proposal of Morehead, and not make any appointments until

\(^{60}\) Ibid.

\(^{61}\) Harper's Weekly, Mar. 11, 1912.
their differences were settled. Ten appointments which had been sent to the Senate were accordingly withdrawn until such a settlement should be effected. When this action became generally known, it was noised about among Taft's enemies that he was holding them up as a prize to the faction which would promise him delegates for the convention. Brown comes to Taft's rescue in print with:

From the beginning of his administration the war between these two factions has bothered him grievously. The old Fritchard-Duncan, or Referee machine, backed by office-broker Hitchcock has been trying to maintain itself, by office-holders' support, against the larger faction, fully endorsed by the State convention in 1910, and the President, anything but fond of such politics, has too often trusted his subordinate Hitchcock, bent on keeping his hold on the Southern States by keeping in power the man and machines which helped form the "steam roller" of 1908.

The President's incapacity for such manipulations and his distaste for it, notorious among politicians, is pitiable or admirable according to the point of view. Finally he lets the Republicans decide for themselves who shall be their leader, hence the withdrawals.

Now comes the redoubtable Colonel Roosevelt into the picture, with his eye on the presidency for 1912, and accuses Taft of perpetuating a machine so that he can get delegates to nominate him for the presidency in that same convention. Now Brown and Martin and Harvey on the Weekly have no sympathy at all for the Colonel, claiming him to be a demagogue who is trying to smash the two term tradition. Brown quite ably answers

Roosevelt's charges against Taft by showing that Hitchcock is really a Roosevelt man and that he is doubtless building up a southern delegation to hand over to the Colonel. Nearly all the post office incumbents in office in 1912 are original Roosevelt men having been kept there through the connivance of Hitchcock with the various state referees. Therefore there was no ground upon which the Colonel could stand to denounce machine tactics, since he himself had used them. "The fact is, by works and by acts, [Taft] has gone further in defying the Southern machines, and in denouncing pie counter rule than Roosevelt ever dared to go...But his more politically astute predecessor is the last man living to talk self-righteously about patronage and the presidency."63

Brown had always had his ideas about Roosevelt. He seems not to have come under the influence of his winning personality. He praised Roosevelt in one article in 1903 for his action and his powerful appeal. But he was not deluded into thinking all could go well with such a man at the helm of the ship of state. In comparing him to other great men, he finds something lacking in his character. He finds in his youth "more of lustiness than of sweetness, in his manhood more of power than of stateliness."64 He finds little likeness between him and other conquerors and


64. "The Personality of Theodore Roosevelt" in Independent, lv, 1550, July 2, 1903.
deliverers "who wrote their strength above a woman's tenderness, an artist's sensibility, whose career stirred their contemporaries to other things besides achievement." He believes that beyond the public works that Roosevelt constructed, Emerson will live longer than he will. According to Brown, it will probably seem to posterity that Roosevelt was in this respect representative of his time rather than the creator of new national ideals. American ideals will probably seem to have changed simultaneously with his rise. He thinks Roosevelt has not contributed as much to the change as the change has contributed to his good fortune.65 "Power spiritualized outlasts power incarnate," observes Brown.

While Roosevelt's comeback was hailed with great joy by many, it was the sign of much bitter opposition by the Weekly. One incident will suffice to show its editorial opinion. A small girl wrote to the editors and asked that something be done about the remains of John Paul Jones, which remained unburied in a leaden casket in the hall of the Naval academy at Annapolis. It was a matter of great concern to her that these should be decently interred and she appealed to the Weekly to write a letter to Congress to see about the matter. Immediately under the letter, there appeared another, addressing itself to Congress, and requesting in a rather timid and

65. Ibid. p. 1550.
mock-heroic style, that the matter be attended to immediately. Then to the correspondent, the Weekly adds these words:

There, Elizabeth. That is your message delivered the best we can. And thank you very much for sending it in. These unburied heroes need a lot of attention. There's Colonel Roosevelt, who has done even more for the country than Admiral Jones. We had him all decently dug in a couple of years ago, and he became disinterred again lately, and is around again, full of noise and energy as you must have noticed since you read the papers. Did you see that there was a third term resolution introduced in the House? That was meant to bury the Colonel.66

The wave of Republicanism in North Carolina seems to have gone for Roosevelt by a large majority, and Morehead viewed it with alarm. He felt that it was treasonous for the State Republican convention to endorse a man who had it in mind to destroy the Republican party. For this reason he favored the exclusion of the radicals from that body. "There is of course no procedure open for us," he writes, "except to nail the flag to the mast and abide the ship, preferring effacement based upon principle rather than even the appearance of temporizing with such archaic not to say anarchistic doctoring as they promulgated at Columbus."67

"You and I must stand by the two-term tradition of Washington, even if everybody else gives it up," wrote one correspondent to Brown,68 expressing their mutual sentiment.

67. Morehead to Brown, March 6, 1912.
Brown further jabs at the nefarious Republican Southern machine, now about to do its worst in supporting Roosevelt at the Republican National convention. It seems that delegates instructed to vote for Taft, went over, or were to go over to Roosevelt at the convention.

The mass of the Southern Republican delegates chosen this year are not merely products of the same old methods employed in 1908. They are, in many cases, the very same men. They are the same men or the same kind of men that have been coming up to Republican national conventions and naming Republican candidates for something like forty years. The scandal has been flagrant for decades, but this year it is so very flagrant that one can't help hoping something will, at last, be done about it.69

Brown blames the party managers for this, saying that they have all striven to profit by the nefarious system rather than having attempted to stop it. As a remedy for the situation, he advocates a reapportioning of the delegates to conventions, basing it on the number of Republican voters, and not on population. This would recognize a true Republican party in the South and in those states where there is none, there would be no rewarding of a referee system.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that Brown's former professor and his life-long friend, A. B. Hart was actively engaged in Roosevelt's support. He was a delegate from Massachusetts to the Roosevelt "Bull Moose" convention.

His letter to Brown of September 14, 1912 is interesting, as are all his letters:

I find the most humorous disposition on the part of many of my friends and kindred to ask for explanations and palliatives in my behalf. I find it rather hard to make them understand that I have neither apologies, regrets, nor explanations to offer for supporting Theodore Roosevelt and the progressive party. I would sooner apologize for eating my breakfast or not reading the New York Evening Post.

While Taft did not lose the nomination in 1912, there is doubtless some ground for the belief that he would have won it by a greater majority, had he not been so indifferent to the chicanery of the Southern Republican machines, and had considered them less "venerable".

Morehead felt that in view of the abuse of the patronage, there should be some rule in the platform forcing rotation after two terms. Brown however, considering the matter more coolly advised strongly against this course. He held that the first thing to consider in any appointment is the good of the service, and it was certainly inimicable to the good of the service to rule out a man who has demonstrated his fitness for a position. Frequent changes are demoralizing, because they offer no inducement to good behavior. The President is committed to Civil Service reform, and it is bad politics to go directly against the President. "I myself believe, and have some reason to, that Morehead's troubles with Taft have been largely due to the President's feeling that Morehead wanted him to adopt
the spoils principle."

The whole thing would be kept above that of office seeking. It is on a lower plane than the one we must live and fight on to win our great and supreme desire. "His [Morehead's] being so much occupied with the offices, even though he was drawn into the fight by the other crowd's attacks and sneaking performance, has undoubtedly obscured to the public his higher and more patriotic desire and design. The same thing will continue to keep him and our movement misrepresented and misunderstood unless we make plain our adherence to the only statesmanlike way of dealing with the patronage and also, now and always, emphasize most of all matters of policy and principle unrelated to the offices, and especially our desire to free the South from one-party rule by first freeing the Republican party from one-man rule, based, as that is, on the pie counter and the spoils system.

Morehead thought the letter fine. He remarked to his secretary, "Gris, the letter is superb, and we will adopt every suggestion in it." Thereupon, the secretary wrote Brown asking him to frame a circular letter suggesting a remedy for the situation.

Consequent upon the beginning of his engagement in this campaign, Brown wanted to conduct an investigation of the Republican machines of the South in an attempt to determine what had been the part of the South in nominating presidents. He was to write the introductory articles and draw the conclusions, while an investigator was to be sent to the various Southern states to talk with prominent Republicans.

70. Grissom to Brown, January 3, 1912.
71. Ibid.
He suggested the idea to the Weekly, the New York Times and the Independent, all of which were favorable to the project, but in the heat of the campaign were unwilling to spare a man or space for it. The project was consequently dropped until a later date, and the project was never revived.72

72. Bassett notes.
Chapter V

Wilson and the Weekly

As early as 1906, Harper's Weekly proposed Woodrow Wilson of Princeton as a possible candidate for the presidency of the United States. Two years later it mentioned him as a likely candidate for the governor's chair of the state of New Jersey. Wilson had made it plain that he was a man of action and clear vision. He was a close friend of Colonel George Harvey of the Weekly, and it was Harvey who gave him so much support during the gubernatorial campaign of 1910, and who was willing to lend the same support for his Democratic nomination.

Brown himself liked Wilson, but was not nearly as fond of him as was Harvey. At times, it almost seems as though he did not wish to support him. He writes to Martin, "Can't you coax the Colonel down off that moribund Wilson hobby. I know President Wilson and admire him, but ----? you and I are in the running if he is." Harvey often asked Martin to have Brown say something favorable to Wilson, which Brown did rather reluctantly at times. After Wilson's election as governor of New Jersey

and in the inception of his race for the presidency, it was evident that he did not know a great deal about the monetary system and how to reform it, which topic he had occasionally elected to discuss. This particularly annoyed Brown, who could never support someone he felt radical or incompetent on important public measures. But because Wilson was so earnest and progressive, Brown warmed toward him. He wrote to Wilson after a speech, "You have been a Godsend to all of us who take our political writings seriously."2

At this time the Aldrich monetary commission was investigating the system of this and other countries with a view to recommending a system of banking that would be better controlled from Washington without being a central bank. It was suspected that Aldrich was the tool of the "interests", and it was this commission that Wilson took so hardly to task. Brown urged that Wilson stand for monetary reform; there were certain things he wished to call to Wilson's attention regarding the commission. The two dangers, the special interests and political control, had been steadily kept in mind by the investigators. It was necessary to adapt any plan proposed to American usages and the existing machine, copying nothing outright; this necessity had been steadily felt by the commission. He further maintained that Aldrich was not the agent of special interests. "In Cleveland's day, our hopes were wrecked by the free silver

blunder, and we feel that the party's main weakness and danger is still its proneness to go wrong on questions of this nature."

Brown no doubt remembered while writing this, the defeats suffered by the Democratic party on the silver question under Bryan's leadership. "And don't, I beg, do as Taft did recently, after inviting my advice about his Southern policy, pat me on the back with a compliment and disregard my advice." Here can be seen just how Brown felt about the snubbing given him by Taft in the matter of the North Carolina appointments. "Make us sure," he concludes, "of your fairness and soundness on it. ...Frankly, your reported speeches seem to me not only dangerous but unfair and unworthy of you."³ At the time this letter was written, Wilson was away on business, but as soon as he returned, the letter was called to his attention and his answer to Brown's counsel was most courteous, and its sincerity and candor won Brown over at once. He agreed with Brown that the plan would free the banking system from political control, but doubted that it would still be free from private control. Wilson said that he so thoroughly distrusted Aldrich that he was inclined to believe it impossible for him to sign his name to anything of an unselfish nature.

I know perfectly well that I went off half cocked about the Aldrich matter. I so thoroughly distrust him that it was incredible to me that anything bearing his signature could be other than a scheme to put us more

³ Brown to Woodrow Wilson, Oct. 20, 1911.
completely in the hands of those from whose domination we are trying to escape. I had not had time to investigate the matter, and I was forced to base my utterances on impression rather than fact. 4

At the same time Brown wrote Wilson, he also wrote to A. Piatt Andrew, who was associated with Aldrich on the monetary commission:

Wilson could help or harm yours and Senator Aldrich's movement more than any other Democrat. He has the ear of the Democrats most likely to make trouble. I have risked a snubbing on this subject for that reason, and also because his ignorant outgivings on this subject make it hard for me to support him. Harper's Weekly really started him, but we have already remonstrated.

... I may soon again mount a dry goods box and raise a row over the Southern question... The recent modification of the Aldrich plan strengthens it. 5

But after Wilson's letter of November 7, Brown was from then on a Wilson man; he wrote Martin, "Tell Colonel Harvey he no longer needs to stir me up about Wilson. Wilson's own letter has made he his'n." 6 He also says to Andrew, "A more frank and manly letter you never saw." 7 The next month, Brown was strongly advocating Wilson for president. "I wish he would - or somebody would - at once get Wilson's boom into responsible hands for systematic management. That is imperatively need-

5. Brown to Andrew, Nov. 2, 1911.
7. Brown to Andrew, Nov. 10, 1911.
But Wilson, although he promised to investigate the Aldrich plan more closely and thoroughly, still was indiscreet in his utterances on the money and banking systems of the country. In Wall street he was considered somewhat of a monetary radical, and much money was raised there in the attempt to defeat him. After a small dinner at which E. S. Martin of the Weekly, Wilson, and Edward Mandell House, afterward noted as confidant of Democratic presidents, the latter wrote Brown:

I think it might be well for Governor Wilson to soon make a public announcement of his views on the monetary question showing that he holds a sound economic position.

No man and no party can ever be successful in this country that advocates anything less. I am sure that he will do this, for he knows it and believes it as we do, only he is a little shy of the Aldrich measure, largely, I think because he has not investigated it.

There is intense opposition to Governor Wilson in the Wall Street district and a great deal of money will be raised to defeat him, but this I think can be turned to his advantage.

Wilson's support of the initiative, referendum and recall, rather irrelevant matters at the time, caused some echoes to come from his native state, and resulted in some distrust in his policies. Bryan of the Richmond News-Leader writes that he feels Wilson unsafe because he has run off after false gods when he supports initiative, referendum and recall. "He has

9. E. M. House to Brown, Dec. 7, 1911
said enough to make people in this part of the world feel that he is probably an unsafe man." 10

Harvey came out for Wilson for the Democratic nomination for the presidency late in 1911. He gave the whole editorial section of the Weekly to a long article pointing out the merits of the man and showing why and how he should be elected. The same article had been printed in the Independent shortly before, and used again in the Weekly by permission of the former’s editors. Harvey thus continued his support of Wilson started in 1906. Wilson’s success in the New Jersey campaign and in the later presidential campaign is all the more remarkable because he was started on his career and constantly supported by Harvey who was notably conservative, while Wilson was admittedly a progressive. Also in the Governorship race, Wilson was supported by Boss James Smith of New Jersey. 11

Wilson now took a course which, while it may have possibly been expedient, certainly seems to have been unfair and ungentlemanly. In December of 1911, Wilson gave notice to Harvey that the Weekly’s advocacy of his candidacy was doing more harm than good and Wilson asked him to withdraw its support. "So for the present," wrote Martin to Brown, "we won’t talk about Wilson in the paper." Wilson had made a mistake. What had been hurting him, no doubt, was the impression, very prevalent


11. The article favoring Wilson was published in the Nov. 11, 1911 number of Harper’s Weekly.
in the West, that J. P. Morgan virtually edited the proof sheets of the *Weekly*, and that it was the organ of his desires. "So far as Wilson is concerned, this laughably untrue. Wilson knew this was untrue, and would have done better to say so publicly and with due emphasis, than to throw over so faithful a friend and backer as Harvey for fear he would sink the boat."12

Harvey was considerably shocked at this action on Wilson's part, but the *Weekly* does not contain a mention of Wilson for more than seven months after the request for silence. Though Harvey did not say much about the affair, Martin was highly indignant, writing further to Brown. "This case perfectly illustrates Wilson's weak point and the defect in his training. He has been a schoolmaster too long, and cannot deal successfully in crises with grown up men. I suspect it will finish Wilson, and without a word of complaint from Harvey."

The exact words which passed between Wilson and Harvey regarding their break and the cause for it were not revealed. The effect of the break on the *Weekly* itself and its public strength is uncertain. Brown writes:

"I think Wilson's failure to explain why he thought the *Weekly* was hurting him has done it harm. He ought to have done that, and said what he did say in his letter to Colonel Harvey at the earliest moment, and with the utmost publicity, when he saw how his works and acts were being interpreted. As it is, the Wilson papers have been talking as if Harvey had been caught in some conspiracy"

12. Martin to Brown, Jan. 5. 1912.
Having secured the Democratic nomination on the forty-sixth ballot and with the help of Bryan, Wilson now moved forward with his plans for a successful campaign. Brown still felt that Wilson was wrong on the money question. In the spring of 1912, Brown speaks of Wilson's having made some "very wild speeches". Bryan is again inserted into Brown's thoughts because of his part at the Baltimore convention in building the Democratic platform. But he was hopeful for the success of the Democratic party, especially after it became evident that Roosevelt was going to split the Republican party.

The political outlook is better than it promised to be, but I can't think much better of Bryan for it. The platform is pretty bad, and he is responsible. The financial plank is particularly silly and ignorant. I trust Wilson, now that he is nominated may not continue to conciliate ignorance on that subject as he has done. He has plenty of ability, but went on talking wild-eyed after he had admitted to me that he knew he had been going off half-cocked.

After the nominations of Taft, Wilson and Roosevelt, the Weekly supported Wilson again, even though there had been the break with Wilson before his nomination. It predicted that Wilson would be elected with more than three hundred electoral votes in his favor, which incidentally was true, the actual

vote being 397 for Wilson.

Brown's interest in politics did not abate after the election, however, although the strength in him was fast ebbing. He was interested in the appointments to be made in the cabinet, with a view to making the administration a highly successful one. His loyalty to Harvard and respect for its men and institutions again shows itself.

I am very modest and only want to name one cabinet officer. My deep design is merely to get Wilson, in case Bryan isn't going to be secretary of State, to name president Eliot, with a vigorous Assistant Secretary like John Basset Moore, to ease things for him and probably succeed him after a year or two. Think how the announcement would strike the country and "abroad", and what a figure Eliot would make in the approaching centenary of the Treaty of Ghent - and of Eliot and Bryce put in charge of the Panama Controversy:16.

Brown's rather cool attitude toward Bryan of more than twenty years standing is evidenced by his answer to Martin's letter about the cabinet appointments. Martin seems not to have liked the suggestion relative to Eliot, and told Brown so. But Brown answers in a rather jocular vein:

I'm highly indignant you didn't take my cabinet suggestion more seriously. It's going to be distasteful work defending the administration with a patent-medicine statesman at the head of the table. I'm going to keep right on being fool enough to believe that it's worth while to do what one can, the way one can - even though it usually turns out one can't.17

But few of Brown's suggestions were followed relative to appointments.

So far as it is announced [the cabinet] it is to me, extremely disappointing - the weakest in my recollection. I'd like to see old Colonel Herbert's face when he finds out Joe Daniels is to be Secretary of the Navy. There would have been some excuse for giving him Frank Hitchcock's job - one smart alec succeeding another. Wilson has a lot to learn, but maybe he'll learn it.19

I don't like the Page appointment; I know the man well. He has done some good work, but is not up to the place. He is an expert hatcher of other bird's eggs.18 Besides, Wilson is appointing too many Southerners. House writes as if it were as hard to find decent Democrats North as it is to find decent Republicans South. That simply isn't so. I've mentioned a few life-long Democrats in Massachusetts whom Wilson apparently hasn't considered.21

Unusual that such a remark should come from a Southerner. It merely shows his impartiality, and his earnestness in wishing the Republic well governed. His North-South sentiment is best expressed, one must feel, when he made one of his favorite remarks: "The South is my brother, but New England is my sweetheart."22


Chapter VI

Brown's Views on the Ante-Bellum South

Brown's viewpoint on the Ante-Bellum South is by far best expressed in the essay entitled "The Lower South in American History", and the other essays bound with it. In this paper, he pictures the Lower Southern states from 1820 to 1860 - that period during which they became important in national life. Prefacing the work, he expresses his opinion of what history ought to show.

It will be something, if these papers shall make it plain that my subject is a true body of human life, a thing and not a mass of facts, a topic in political science an object lesson in large moralities. To know the thing itself should be our study; and the right study of it is thought and passion, not research alone. 1

Here he is following his philosophy of history in general. He repeatedly maintained that a writer could not entirely keep himself out of his work, no matter how hard he may try. If he does not express his own ideas to begin with, then he

---

1. Brown, The Lower South in American History, New York, 1902, preface, p.viii, hereinafter referred to as The Lower South, the author's name being dropped.
To conclude.

Some preliminary data in support of my views.

It is clear that further research is needed in this area. However, the preliminary data presented here suggests that...

Please note that the conclusions drawn are preliminary and require further validation through additional research.

[Signature]
[Date]
will weave into his story his own feelings, prejudices, and temperaments from which no man is entirely free. By thus adulterating and presenting it as truth and fact, he tends to do an injustice to those who read after him. Following this idea then, Brown first explains his own feelings in the matter, and having got this "off his chest", then proceeds in a most remarkable manner to tell a story in a way which seems eminently fair and balanced.

These essays have called attention to one of the few unprejudiced students of past and present conditions in the South. In both his essays and lectures, Mr. Brown has shown an appreciation of the tragedy of the defeated ambitions and misplaced hopes, but he has never attempted to condone a fault or to explain away a mistake.

This play is followed scrupulously not only in this, but in all his writings. He does not say that he is come to set things right in Northern minds concerning Southern history, He merely says:

I wish to examine a civilization which many have looked upon as foreign to American ideas; to review a political enterprise which has often been condemned as contrary to American principles. My aim is neither to defend nor to arraign. I wish to inquire whether that civilization and that political enterprise were a natural outcome of material conditions and of what went before, not whether they were right or wrong. I wish to inquire whether the men and women of that time and region had the ordinary qualities of human nature, not whether they were better or worse than the men and women

2. E. E. Sparks, reviewing The Lower South in American Journal of Sociology, ix, 140. July, 1903.
of other lands and times. 3

And here is expressed the second cardinal feature of Brown's writing: that of naturalness. Not only naturalness in telling the story, but to show that people in history tend to do those things which are natural for them to do. He is like much of the older writers such as Rousseau, though he does not say it. He seems to think that as a whole, men are inherently good. He is not so foolish as to think that this is individually true. Indeed, he explains the downfall of so many utopian schemes by pointing out the selfishness of some individuals. But he attributes many disastrous things to the blindness and narrowness of men - the inability of men to see another person's viewpoint. This fault he lays to many persons ranging from Sumner and Stevens to the post-war Southern planter. One must, if he is to be fair, be acquainted with both sides of the question and understand them. Dunning pointed this out when he wrote:

Mr. Brown's collection of essays confirms the conviction now becoming general that the history of the Civil War can never be properly written until the conditions of life in the South shall have been set forth by students qualified not only by scientific training, but also by a personal contact or an inherited sympathy with Southern society. The post-bellum generation of Southerners, just now in their prime, must shoulder the responsibility of putting their section in a proper light on the record of history. Their immediate predecessors

3. The Lower South, p.4.
were too much under the sway of passion; their successors will be as remote as the Northerners themselves from any real insight into the civilization of the old South.  

Brown was eminently fitted to do just this sort of work by his training and antecedents.

He first shows that while the South has been the topic of much discussion in papers, and of much heated debate in legislative halls, this debate has always concerned itself with that part of the South of which Virginia is, and has always been representative. He shows a great difference between Virginia and the Cotton South; and this, he maintains should account for much of the misunderstanding which has grown up. The cotton kingdom is much larger and more fertile than the upper South, and occupied sparsely by those who were adventurous enough to better their fortunes by leaving the original thirteen colonies and making their way into the wilderness to carve out new homes. It is the story of these industrious people which has been left untold in national politics. They were overshadowed by the Virginia Dynasty, and by gentlemen from Tennessee. Attention was also drawn away from them by stories of the French Conquest of Canada and of the Indians in the middle West, even though the stories of the French at Mobile and in Louisiana and the Indians of these regions have much more affected the course of American History.

Bassett once remarked concerning this bit of writing:

A mere scholar would have begun his book in a more stilted manner. He might have said that the history of the Gulf states had been neglected or misunderstood and that it was worth while to set it straight. Brown never had the vernacular of the graduate school. He did not write about "forces", "institutions" or "social and political development". From his pen ran the plain and human narrative, as from the pen of Herodotus, of a man who knew and could talk. His task was to tell a simple tale.

"Neither the Southern boast nor the Eastern sneer" is justified in the matter of population of the two sections. Brown shows that the top and bottom of English society came to the South, while this is balanced by the greater homogeneity of the New Englanders in whose section the lowest class of Englishmen is comparatively unimportant. Brown feels that their thrusts,- New England against the South and vice versa - are merely more instances of the pot calling the kettle black.

After calling attention to the well-known religious, economic and industrial difference between North and South, he then points out the already mentioned differences between upper and lower South. Now as the Virginia Dynasty ended, and the Revolutionary group of Virginians passed into history, the torch was caught up by men of the Virginia strain and the power of the Lower South rose.

As the men of [The Old Dominion] and the border

5. Bassett, Atlantic Quarterly, loc. Cit. p. 100
6. The Lower South, p. 6.
states lost the first places in the national councils, the men of the Cotton States succeeded not, indeed, to such preeminence as the Revolutionary Virginians had won, but to such a clear leadership of the South, and to such an ascendancy in Congress and the courts, that for a quarter of a century they battled successfully with the men and the ideas of the East and West.7

Having followed those Virginians who had some adventurous restlessness about them into the fertile Black Belt and westward, Brown now passes on to the type of consideration their life and times has had at the hands of those who had occasion to study and write of it from the outside. It should be remembered that when Brown was writing, there had been published few, if any, of the many illuminating works concerning the Lower South which are now on library bookshelves. It was still a period when everyone visualized Virginia when the South was mentioned. As far as the Northern public opinion was concerned, Virginia seems to have been the South, and the South Virginia.

Such studies as have been made have been under the guidance of general economic and moral theories. Moral weaknesses of the slave and plantation system have been emphasised. Foreigners have travelled in and written about the South. Economists have surrounded the Southerner with such environment as could be reasoned out of the Southern institutions. Yet when persons in foreign lands have attempted to reproduce an idea of

7. The Lower South, p.17.
Southern life from these broad truths and reasonings, "The facts are true," says Brown, "but we do not recognize the picture." 8

A true picture of the South would show all these institutions and forces at work, but it would show others also. It would not belie nor contradict any of the observations, but would correlate them with fact. The result would be a light which would not be quite so pitiless and distorting. Then he plays what may be considered his trump card. "Surely, a true picture of Southern life half a century ago should not seem altogether strange to men and women still living, who were once a part of it." 9 Here Brown has an advantage. Having spent his boyhood and young manhood among men and women who had been a part of the old South, therefore he was able to gather information from original sources.

Before going further, however, Brown gives a brief picture of the society of the old South as seen from the outside: Slave labor being useless for manufactures, it could be used only in the production of staple Southern crops which were constantly exhausting land, making more land necessary. This system left no place for a free laborer, and only large holdings were profitable. Consequently an oligarchy of slaveholders grew up. Free labor, then, was "idle and lawless rabble" of

8. The Lower South, p. 28.
9. Ibid.
about 5,000,000 which was ruled by the oligarchy to whom they
delivered up their power. By alliance with weaklings the aristocracy
managed to dominate national politics. They used their power
at home cruelly,

for contact with slaves bred contempt for the weak,
and they used their power unscrupulously at Washington,
aimed always to protect themselves in their peculiar rights
of property, and to secure, by breaking old agreements
concerning territory already acquired, and by ruthless
conquests of other territory, those fresh lands which
slavery and the plantation system constantly demanded.

Brown admits that every one of these forces was at work,
but this does not present the true state of all affairs. "The
writer does not hesitate to show the faults of this oligarchy,
nor does he spare the Northern 'doughface' who bowed down to
them to curry political favor". Much inquiry, intimate con-
tact and free acquaintance with persons of the old regime were
made by Brown. After following closely from year to year the
history of Alabama -

and after long study of the remnants of that already an-
cient and outworn vesture of decay still hanging in
shreds and patches about the revivified South of today,
I cannot recognize the picture as a true likeness of
that which was.

12. E. E. Sparks, loc. cit. p.140
Brown now goes on to show that it was no mere "economic man" of desires, interests and selfishness in whom these tendencies worked. He shows their ancient and honorable lineage from Ireland to Normandy, to Virginia. The abasement of the slaves does not mean the master was degenerate. Brown shows also that the Negro was not a bundle of the qualities which servitude implies. He was a member of a race which has marked characteristics of its own. The Negro did not feel it any disgrace to be a servant, and he was capable, as his master would never have been, of loyalty and affection to the very hand that chained him. Slavery was not a wrong to the Negroes. Even though he was chattel, he was not robbed of incentives to right conduct. The differences between a master's approval or disapproval, between house and field work were the only incentives he knew how to understand.

And two centuries of Slavery in Virginia and half a century of it in the Black Belt were not enough to destroy the moral fibre of the master, to cheat him of his racial birthright or to ban him from the portals of civilization. 14

Then follows a description of Alabama life so real, so unchangeable and so picturesque, that one who knows and respects it can hardly keep from feeling that he is again there. The life has hardly changed in the three quarters of a century, so that a description of the small town life may as

14. The Lower South, p. 32.
easily be applied today as yesterday. The railroads, the dar-kies, the Saturdays during which the towns are larger by at least half, the country life, all combine to give a picture as charming as it is honest.

Neither does he neglect the people of the sand barrens to whom slavery was a thing apart. These people were the least industrious who were content to settle on the poorest land, and attempt to wrest from the hills a bare existence. Often from one year's end to the next, a Negro was not seen. Brown points out that if this is the idle and lawless rabble, -

and I can find nowhere else Alabama's share of five millions of such people which he [Cairnes] credits to the whole South - it is difficult to accept his theory that slavery produced them, since under freedom they have not changed or disappeared."15

As for the upper classes, Brown goes on to describe their home life and their "militant" life, showing the social qualities which made them intelligible and companionable with the English country gentleman. Such sentiment is shown by a letter from an Englishman to Brown himself:

Do you know, I am glad you are a Southerner. I always fancy there is a sort of bond between a Southerner and an Englishman. I don't think there is any sort of bond between a Northerner and an Englishman. (Whisper it not in Gath - or Gotham) But I am afraid the South does not reciprocate my sentiment.16

15. The Lower South, p. 40
The South, when fighting for its institutions in Congress, in newspapers, on battlefields, it is true, appeared harsh, and it is this side with which the strangers became most easily acquainted. The outward harshness, and the inner gentleness and charm are hard for the stranger to understand.

But to one who, in the gloomy years of the slow upbuilding of that overthrown and prostrate civilization, has sought to see it as it was before it fell, - to one who has studied men's faces which, however they hardened after laughter, were yet always quick to lighten up with kindliness and merriment, and women's faces which, however marked with the touch of sorrow and humiliation and an unfamiliar poverty, were yet sealed with a true seal of dignity and grace, - to such a student of the old Southern life, the inner side of it is more attractive than the outer.17

Southerners were able to rule in Congress for several reasons. They had fair numbers themselves; they were supported by New England because it wanted Southern cotton - the foundation of many Eastern fortunes. The West supported the South because she was the West's best customer, and this customer refused to make more than one appeal to the soil. Scatterings of state's righters all through the North also gave much support when the Southerners cried out against meddlers in their affairs. Then too, Southern society naturally produced statesmen either from the law or planter classes. The society tended to make weak men weaker, but strong men stronger.

In an attempt to show why the South stood as it did on so

17. The Lower South, p.48.
many national questions, Brown treats these questions from the viewpoint of the Southerner. The South would lose by high protective tariff because most of her trade was exporting, and what she imported would cost her more. She would be forced to sell in a cheap market and buy in a dear market. The South also, being rather remote from the great financial centers of the country earnestly desired cheap money that could be expanded and contracted at will. Internal improvements could not benefit the South, because they encouraged a dense population while the plantation system was built on the principle of sparseness of population. Internal improvements benefitted only large cities, and since the South paid a large part of the tax, it did not feel in the least obligated to help pay large sums for services from which it could receive no benefit.

So vigorously were Southern views put into action that with their followings from other parts of the nation the South was able to keep its feelings law for some time. Even Sumner in 1846 voted for a moderate tariff; and protection tariff, which was in effect an export tax so the Southerners claimed, was not used again until the South was no longer represented at Washington. The same thing happened regarding internal improvements and finance, and neither question was settled unfavorably to the Southerners until they had scornfully taken leave of the national legislature.

Brown now begins to uncover the real reason why the men of the Lower South were so fierce in defending their institutions. The same things were beginning to happen in the cotton
states that had happened in Virginia, that is, constant growth of one crop was exhausting the soil, and making life harder and slaves more expensive to keep. Virginians had already admitted they defended slavery only because they could sell their surplus to the cotton states, their own soil being worn out. Now the cotton states were feeling the pinch of the wasteful methods of the plantation system, and the Lower South people were becoming discontented. Having troubles of their own, naturally, they were becoming more and more suspicious of anyone who seemed likely to add to them. They were still the representatives of the strongest stocks on the continent. Not having intermarried with any inferior races as had the Spaniards, they had guarded themselves, by perpetuating an institution out of keeping with their times, from the possibility of anything like equality with the lesser tribes. In this course there lay no danger for them.

This one thought - that the South did not change its opinion concerning the desirability of slavery between the time of Thomas Jefferson and Jefferson Davis, but that the leadership shifted and brought new views - this alone is worth the volume. 18

The Virginians had begun to question the wisdom and righteousness of slavery, but the Gulf states did not go that far. The Northerners brought up the question before they could get

18. E. E. Sparks, loc. cit. p. 140.
to it. It is not at all preposterous to believe that slavery would have died out of itself, because it was unprofitable. But the abolitionists were more intent upon discharging their message, than upon the actual effect of it. Without the gentle sober-minded reasoning and insinuating, which even an average man would use in trying to help a friend out of trouble; without using a combination of "wisdom of serpents and harmlessness of doves," the abolitionists merely lifted up their voices and spared not.

That they were dealing with the proudest and most sensitive people in the world did not occur to them any more than it seems to occur to those well-meaning persons who, intent mainly on freeing their own minds and keeping their own skirts clean, stand afar off and tell the Southerners of our own day how very badly they are doing under the conditions left to them by defeat and war and the reconstruction of their government by alien hands. Making men the subject of withering editorials and fiercely denunciatory sermons is not a particularly wise way to help them.... But objugation from afar off, without any show of force behind it, could hardly accomplish anything with men like those of the Lower South. 19

Rather than turning the Southerners from slavery to abolition, it confirmed them in their adherence to things which they, like the Virginians would surely have come to question when convinced of the economic shortcomings of slavery. To the Southerner, abolition was the interference of an outsider, cruel and harsh and unjust -

19. The Lower South, p.92.
displaying constantly its ignorance of essential facts, and proceeding on lines contrary to the human nature of the master whom it attacked so bitterly, and of the slave himself, who would never have understood its appeal, and who never would have loved the foremost leaders in it any more than those leaders themselves would have relished the close personal relations with Africans which the Southern master did not find unpleasant. 20

Brown is not leaning too far one way in his attempt to defend the South. His sense of proportion and balance is apparent when he says that abolition as a force in Northern society was a valuable and admirable one, and was the right and natural way for the Northern revolt to begin. 21

Now the Southerners did not merely remain on the defensive, but rather took up the old Roman method of offensive-defensive - believing that the best defense was offense. Constantly defending slavery as an institution, they now tried every means possible to extend it. Showing that Northern economics would not work in the South, they stood on the theory that blacks are naturally mental inferiors to whites. Even Lincoln's diagnosis that the main trouble was merely the presence of the African in large numbers whether slave or free, was given credence and it has since proven true. What the men of the fifties were really trying to do was to find some way by which whites and blacks can live together in the same country without friction. The Southern plan was to put the blacks

20. The Lower South, p.93.
21. Ibid.
at the bottom and the whites at the top. This was opposed by the Northern plan of making them equal. Brown holds, in essence, the theory that the South was the last stand of the Nordic race, and it must keep itself pure. Such an idea seems to have been in the best of Southern minds.

Brown calls attention to the fact that there was a parallel to the abolition movement. This parallel in the South was secession. Just as abolition was a danger to the compromise men of the North, so secession was the principal danger to the moderate and union men in the South. For a time, the compromise of 1850, the Kansas Nebraska bill, and the Supreme Court decision reduced the secessionists to a very small number. But the Southern leaders were not so successful in dealing with the discontent at home. The Kansas affair was not the work of the Southern leaders, but of Douglas alone. It made hundreds of thousands of enemies in the North, and in the end was more dangerous to slavery than the Compromise of 1850. It served to awaken public opinion in the North, a force that was more powerful than Congress or the Supreme Court.

After Lincoln was nominated, he hastened to promise integrity for slavery then in existence, but he found no trust for himself in Southern opinion. The Southerners nominated their own candidate, John C. Breckinridge, committed to the Southern view.

By 1860, the majority of the people of the Lower South had convinced themselves that they had the right to secede.
One by one, the states passed their ordinances of secession over the earnest but vain protests of the union men. The Senators and Representatives then haughtily retired from Washington and hastened to set up a new government at Montgomery. A call to undecided Virginia being for the time unanswered, they fired upon Sumter, and forced her to join her sister states farther south. This was indeed a highly dramatic moment in Southern history, Brown feels, when Virginia, asleep for many years, awoke to find herself between two fires, hardly knowing which way to turn.

The power which ruled the union forty years and then tore it asunder was based on history, it was rooted in human nature, it was buttressed by ancient law and usage. It caught hold of our new continent and made headway against our new ideas because it found certain material conditions peculiarly adapted to sustain it... No American nowadays needs to be told how dangerous to our American experiment that old Southern civilization was. Nevertheless he is but half an American who can find no charm in it. 22

And the real test of the South's sincerity and valor came at the end when she put into the field at the head of a fine army a leader who has since been among the world's finest generals and gentlemen, and fought to the bitter end a losing fight. "If Americans content themselves with calling that army a band of rebels and Lee a traitor, they are in danger of glorifying rebellion and of making 'traitor' meaningless." 23

22. The Lower South, pp. 111-112.

23. Ibid.
In his discussion of Yancey, whom he aptly describes as the "Orator of Secession", Brown describes more intimately the characteristics of the Southern whites. Being far from the centers of learning, having few free schools, large cities, and almost no universities of account, their culture was not one of books and fine art, but one of manners and easy courtesy and grace. The newspapers, edited with ability, formed the only part the printed work played in the formation of public opinion. But it was the spoken word and not the printed one that aroused enthusiasm, guided thought, and made the history of the South. "It is doubtful if there ever has been a society in which the orator counted for more than he did in the Cotton Kingdom".24 His audiences were brought to him by such devices as camp meetings, courts and churches. People flocked to hear an orator at that time of the agricultural year when their occupation made them idle. The charm of voice, gesture, personality and repartee were the things which captured the fancy of the Southerners.

It is not to be supposed, however, that this ease with which an orator swayed them indicated instability, lightness and fickleness. Whatever changes had come over the English stock in the cotton states, it never lost its habit of fidelity to a cause once espoused, its sternly practical way of turning words into deeds. What many a Northern optimist considered mere bluster in the fifties took on the horrid front of war in the sixties. True, the North in general seems to
have considered the Southerners easily turned from a hastily chosen course. Even James Russell Lowell, writing about the November, 1960, elections opines:

Mr. W. L. Yancey, to be sure, threatens to secede; but the country can get along without him and we wish him a successful career.... To believe any organized attempt by the Republican party to disturb the existing internal policy of the Southern States presupposes a manifest absurdity. Before anything of the kind could take place, the country must be in a state of forcible revolution.... But there is no premonitory symptoms of any such convulsion, unless we except Mr. Yancey, and that gentleman's throwing a solitary somerset will hardly turn the continent head over heels.  

It was not until Yancey's withdrawal from the House of Representatives where his oratorical qualities won quite a name for him, that Yancey really began his life work. It was not until the controversy over the territory gained from the conquest of Mexico that he gave the name of secession to his only remedy. Beginning with the defeat of the Alabama platform at Baltimore in 1848 when Yancey in his exodus was followed by only one delegate, Yancey is followed through the next twelve years of defeat and exile; the defeat at the Nashville convention to the Charleston convention when the delegates of seven states followed him out when the same platform was rejected.

Yancey then went to the seceders convention at Baltimore where he favored the nomination of Breckinridge. He then

made a heated campaign of the North, and his return to Montgomery through the South was like a triumphal procession. In the center of his own section he saw a new government set up, himself sent to Europe at the head of a commission to secure recognition of the Confederacy among the great powers. Returned from that fruitless mission, he took his seat in the Confederate Senate. In the turbulent debates of the unhappy legislature, his last energies were consumed. He died in the summer of 1863. It is regrettable, thinks Brown, that such men as Garrison, Phillips and Lovejoy should be so well-remembered, while this greatest of all the advocates of the South's parallel to the abolition movement should be almost entirely forgotten in most histories of the period immediately preceding the war and of the war itself. It is astonishing that while the abolitionists took more than thirty years to fan the passion of their followers to white heat, the secessionists, led by Yancey, accomplished their aim, however unworthy and short-lived, in hardly a dozen years. Yet the latter are consigned to comparative obscurity while the former are mentioned in the textbooks of nearly every school child.

One reviewer says of Brown's Lower South:

The value of Mr. Brown's rather sketchy papers lies mainly in their suggestiveness. They do not make any considerable contribution of fact, but disclose some interesting points of view. Taken together they are stimulating and helpful attempts to deal fairly and broadly with a period and region which, in spite of all that has been written, we know little about. The observations are keen as well as sympathetic; critical and discriminating as well as broad. The style too, ... is entertaining and
very readable. Altogether, Mr. Brown's book is not only worth reading, but even more worth pondering.

In this connection, it is perhaps well to mention another of Brown's works. It is his only attempt at fiction: a novel published by MacMillan in 1903. The book is prefaced by a statement that the manuscript of the work was found among the effects of a certain late "Colonel Elmore" who died in London a few years ago." A Gentleman of the South, for such is the title, concerns the fortunes of one Henry Selden of the pre-war South. His father having killed his one-time best friend in a duel, the news so shocked Selden's mother who was in childbirth, that she died; but not before forcing Henry to promise never to fight a duel. Around this point the story centers. Hatred rankles in the heart of Robert, son of the slain Underwood, who feels that Selden has stolen from him his father's love, and that of Margaret, his step-sister. The latter, through grief at not being allowed to marry Selden because of the family feud, died young. Through the insistence of Robert's sister Eleanor, Selden goes to Washington to defend the elder Underwood's name from dishonor in connection with Indian claims. In clearing the elder Underwood's name, Selden is forced to prove Robert a murderer, and the latter challenges Selden to a duel and is refused the "satisfaction due from one gentleman to another," because of his vow. Fitzhugh, twenty-six year old brother to Henry Selden, is engaged to marry Eleanor and when Robert hears of this, he challenges Selden to fight again

[25: Nation lxv, 211, Sept. 11, 1902]
unless the engagement is broken. If Selden refused, Underwood threatened to challenge Fitzhugh. Selden then weakens and the duel is fought in the family cemetery near Margaret's grave. The duel is won by Selden, but Underwood treacherously kills Selden and himself.

The story is a most interesting one, although a little difficult in exposition. It is related in admirable English, and shows clearly the remarkable knowledge which Brown possessed concerning the life of the old South which was almost fantastic in its unreality. One must consider that the South was almost medieval in its customs and institutions.

Love, hate, courage, eloquence were the dominant characteristics of these people. And a man found his social level not so much according to the list of virtues as he did by his ability to demonstrate these attributes of a gentleman. There was no such thing as reality in the old South in these days. People imagined everything, and made life conform as much as possible to the exaggeration.

Any author, therefore, who wrote of the old South must do so in only the most romantic of terms. The work shows in some measure how the South lent its grandiloquence and charm to the life at Washington. In this, Brown shows his intimate understanding of the spirit of the time. Dueling being part of one's life in the South, it is not unnatural that it should come into the story. It was a product of an immense amount

of self-esteem enjoyed by all the Southern men.

Each one raised himself to the sixteenth power of importance in his own estimation, and therefore had more to defend from the challenging impudence of the world outside. And each conceived of himself as one under extraordinary obligations to sustain the sword arm dignity of his reputation. It was a part of the general hallucination which governed the South at that time and ultimately resulted in her defeat. And so Mr. Brown is historically accurate when his heroes end the tale with a duel. 27

But none of the reviewers admit that Brown is good as a novelist. "He interprets faithfully, but his dramatic ability is by no means extranodinary." 28 Another says:

There is a delicate distinction about the author's style that is grateful to the literary sense, but Mr. Brown may hardly be said to have the gift of the novelist, and his peculiar powers appear better advantage in the essay and the historical study. 29

The scene is laid in the Black Belt, presumably in Alabama, the state where Brown spent the first twenty years of his life. Hence the foundation of his knowledge of his subject is rooted in his own experience. One remarkable and commendable feature of the book is the Negro dialect. It is seldom that one finds a writer who can faithfully put Negro dialect on paper. As one has heard it often, Mr. Brown does a remarkably good job of

---

27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. W. M. Payne, review in Dial, xxxv, 67, August 1, 1903.
committing its intonations, accents and distinctiveness to print. This is so seldom done well that its accomplishment deserves no little praise.

On the other hand, the work was liked by many. For pure literature and beauty of expression, it left nothing to be desired. One correspondent remarks: "May I express to you my admiration for the literary beauty of the Gentleman of the South?" I have read a good many novels, but few where sentiment is so chaste and appealing."30

Another says: "The atmosphere and dialect of the story is so Southern that I half picture myself reveling in the hospitable Cedars."31

31. Susan H. Garrott to Brown, Jan. 9, 1904. "The Cedars" was the name of the Selden estate in the story.
Chapter VII

Brown's Views on the Reconstruction South

Brown doubtless shows his own viewpoint on the Northern oppression of the South in his discussion of the Ku Klux movement. When any high-spirited class becomes used to being supreme and to ruling, it is not to be expected that it will sit idly by and watch unscrupulous men, bent only on advancing their own fortunes, subject it to the humility of forcing Negro equality. Southern agriculture, the only means of living, depended upon sure, unskilled labor, at which the Negro was fairly apt and economical. When slavery was abolished, the whites were compelled to find some substitute, the same sort of labor they had used under slavery. They made a place in the new order for the blacks, but felt them unfit for citizenship. Indeed, when their arms were laid down, it was not understood that the Negro was to have citizenship. They understood that he was to be free, but not that freedom implied citizenship and suffrage. Then Congress interfered and undid their work.

The itching and galling of the Northern yoke was worst in the lesser communities where government comes more closely in contact, and in this case, in sharp conflict with individual
men and women. While the carpet-baggers piled up in local
governments immense debts, much greater in proportion than in
the state governments, the Southerner must now, as a crowning
misfortune, suffer the countless humiliations and irritations
which the rule of the freedman and the stranger brought upon
him. His state of mind was not thus improved. He saw his for-
mer slaves repeating at elections, with, he is told, flagrant
impunity, while he himself, even if he is given the ballot,
must walk literally under bayonets and fight his way through
a mob of ill-smelling blacks to cast his vote; if his own mili-
tary service is offered, it is rejected. He saw the Negroes
going to school and learning things under the tutelage of
strangers, things which he thought unfit for them. He saw his friends brought
before ignorant incapable judges whose decisions were to be
executed by officers just as incompetent.

He saw the Freedmen Bureau deliberately trying to
substitute its alien machinery for that patriarchal rela-
tion between white employers and black workmen which
seemed to him right and inevitable. In every boisterous
shout of a drunken Negro before his gate, and in every
insolent glance from a group of idle Negroes on the street,
he saw the hand or heard the harshly accented voice
of the stranger in the land.¹

Brown now opines that it seems astounding that the Con-
gressional leaders did not foresee that they were imposing

¹. The Lower South, p.198. The essay on "The Ku Klux Move-
ment" is bound with the essay on the Lower South.
conditions on the Southerners which they themselves would have resisted, and would have found some way to make their resistance effective. Now the Southerners, having borne for a while in silence the oppressive, unwise, and impossible scheme, took what measures they could, and found the Ku Klux Klan ready to their hands. This was indeed the only form which their resistance could take. "It must be revolutionary, for they had formally renounced the right of secession. It could not be open war, for they were powerless to fight. So they made secret revolution. Their rebellion could not raise its head, so it went underground."^2

Brown, with reserve, answers the question: Was it necessary? No other plan would have worked so well; and: Was it successful? Completely. As to its being justifiable, that question is harder to answer. "One is ready to declare, not perhaps, that the end justified the means, but that never before was an end so clearly worth fighting for made so clearly unattainable by any good means."^3

The Ku Klux orders were not without their effect upon the later South. Brown traces their influence directly down to the present. "The whole South, being so intensely united against a common enemy, and having that intensity of feeling somewhat crystalized by the Klans, has kept its solidarity

---

2. The Lower South, p.223.
unimpaired by any healthful division of public questions. This is shown in many Southern states where good sense and justice cried out for the cleansing of a rotten party system. But the constituencies were too solid against any other party, holding their solidarity inviolate because of the awful lesson they had learned. It has reacted upon the South and robbed them of the full participation in the political life of the country. Brown's experience in trying to combat this solidarity is seen in another chapter of this paper. He wanted to make the politicians mindful that there was a serious threat to the nefarious schemes of old line party corruption. "As they rule by fear, so by fear they are ruled. It is they themselves who are now befooled, and robbed of the nobler part of their own political birthright."4

Further than this essay, Brown's viewpoint on the Reconstruction South is shown by his attitude in the few chapters of his projected history which were published in the *Atlantic Monthly*. His fairness and impartiality are evident on every page.

No judgement of the course of the Southerners can be just that does not take account of the woeful state in which defeat had left them. But neither invention nor eloquence is needed to win them the sympathy of generous minds. The plainest recital of the conditions under which they had to take up their lives is enough.5

This recital is followed by a record showing the completeness of the devastation. One-fifth of a million men had perished, and one-third of the rest were permanently maimed. These were the men who had to take up the main burdens of peace.

That they should at once take them up hopefully could not be expected. They would not have been human if in the overthrow of their proud hopes, they had not for a little while bowed their heads in something like despair.6

The loss of half the entire wealth of the South not counting slaves and natural resources was so great that this despair is not unwarrantable.

The complete discouragement of the Southern planter is also to be expected from the condition that not only had the product of a few years' labor been destroyed, but also the means of producing it. White labor existed, it is true, in some parts of the South, but not in those sections where slave labor had produced and controlled by far the greater part of the South's wealth and prominence. Here the real damage was done, and it is in this section that Brown, forty years later, saw an advance, and that advance being due to white, rather than Negro labor, caused Brown to rejoice in his mild way. White labor which during the pre-war era, was considered contemptible, was now becoming the foundation of a new society.

But those who had returned from the war were less given to bootless repining than to silent endurance and masterful assertions against adverse circumstance. These men simply and candidly faced the true circumstances which they found, and turned manfully, almost doggedly to rebuild a new civilization from the ruins of the old. This of course would take some time. It was not to be expected that the Southerners were to immediately slough off the old civilization and assume a new one as easily as one tries on a new hat.

Completely broken from a military standpoint, emancipation a fact, and secession merely a shattered illusion, these were the things the Southerners understood by surrender. Though more resistance was impossible, the Southerners still held their same convictions. The proud spirit of the South, related by many Northern travellers such as Schurz, J. T. Trowbridge, and others, cost the South as much if not more misery than did the war. They did not, and they could not if they would, instantly lose their dislike of Northern ways and Northern speech.

If on this point the returning soldiers, mindful of the courage they had encountered on so many battle-fields, and the kindly and humorous exchanges along so many picket lines inclined to a milder tone, the non-combatants, particularly the women - were more than ever scornful of everything the term "yankee" connoted.

The attitude toward the blacks, needless to say, remained unchanged, for human nature would not permit, nor inbred superiority and inferiority condone, equality.

The returning soldier also knew the real feeling at the North and the South, and knew the wisdom of a quiet, humble, non-resisting policy, until the hatred and violence of the conquerors had cooled. This was expedient. But the non-combatants would have none of such a policy. With almost ruthless disregard for the wishes of these soldiers, those who remained, at once set about trying to rebuild the old order within the enforced limits. However sincere they were, their lack of tact and almost arrogant attitude in the national legislature worked to their own disadvantage by turning Northern sentiment against them. The wisdom of serpents and the harmlessness of doves which the old New England abolitionists lacked, could have been used to great advantage here. But "black codes" were unwisely enacted while the South and its affairs still occupied the spotlight. The North had now come to look for any excuse for further censure of Southern society, and the South here played into its hands. True, the "black codes" were in large measure an attempt to regain a source of labor of which emancipation had deprived them. The South could not recover until the Negroes could be made to work as they did as slaves - or until the whites learned to do the work the Negroes formerly did. But Reconstruction policy prohibited the binding of the Negro to the soil which was so necessary to
a sound agricultural policy with laborers. Consequently, as Brown points out in his views on the contemporary South, the alternative of whites doing the negro's work has been chosen. This was becoming noticeable in 1904, and since then, though many Negroes have settled on farms, white tenancy had none the less been increasing.

While censuring the Southern conventions for not tactfully admitting Negroes to anything like even political equality, Brown does not hesitate to put in a good word for that most hated of all Reconstruction institutions, the Freedmen's Bureau. He points out that many of the atrocities ascribed to it were not its work at all; also that some of the work done by the Bureau must be done, and that even its critics suggested no better machinery. Whatever the Bureau's merits and shortcomings, it is unreasonable to hold it solely responsible for the failure of the whites and blacks to find quickly a right and happy modus vivendi.9 The North should have known that the Negro could not be changed into its type of free laborer in a day, and even if it did aim at this, it should have made this clearly known so the South would not attempt, as it did, a compromise system. Neither seems to have profited by the lessons of the British and Russians in their then recent emancipation of slaves and serfs, respectively.

Here then, are the interpretations and views of the Reconstruction South. It is strange to find a Southerner of the first decade of this century, so shortly removed from the Civil war, blaming, in a manner of speaking, his own countrymen for their indiscreet behavior following the Civil War. And it is with good reason that he does this; his reasoning seems plausible and indicative of excellent judgement. At present, it is easy to understand how incautious and tactless it was for the exConfederate states, late in rebellion against the Union, to send as its representatives in that Union, fifteen men who had fought most valiantly to destroy it. And it was unheard-of for a Southerner of that day to defend the Freedmen's bureau.

Relative to the men at the North who held in their hands the fate of the defeated South, Brown is not less of a fair judge. He gives elaborate descriptions of Sumner and Stevens. Neither was married, nor dwelt in an atmosphere of domestic affection. Neither had ever traveled in the Southern states, nor lived in intimacy with Southern men and women, or in anywise sympathetically studied the Southern life, with which they both wished to deal so intimately and so drastically. These two factors, according to Brown, account in large measure for their inability to see the Southern viewpoint, and for their ruthless and vengeful policy regarding the South. Brown gives a character sketch of Sumner which shows an exceptionally keen insight, and attempts to explain, on an absolutely fair basis, his nature. Sumner was a handsome man,
stately and easy in his bearing, and delightfully courteous to all. His friends were the foremost people in nearly all walks of life. Yet all with whom he came in contact noticed something that he lacked in his nature. He was "curiously without insight into other men's lives and characters, strangely undesirous of incapable of any touch of elbows. Many thought him overbearing and conceited. His arders were for causes, not individuals." With no sense of proportion at all, or any sense of humor, he was unbending and regarded circumstance not at all. "The slave of principle," he once exclaimed, "I call no party master."

As for Stevens, Brown paints him in terms not at all un-likeable. It is exceptionally strange and unusual to find a Southerner who can see in Thad Stevens anything but a dire portrait of an old man terrible, who had in his heart nothing but a blizzard, and in his whole being nothing but hatred for the South. Brown pictures him as an old man who had a good sense of humor, at all times shedding about him an atmosphere of mirth composed of banter, repartee, and biting sarcasm, even in the midst of the most heated contests. The first humorist who had been in the House since John Randolph of Roanoke, it is no wonder that he first attracted attention, commanded it, and then completely dominated his hearers. Far

from being a puritan like Sumner, he was given to many of the pleasures of the world; and many are the stories which have enlarged on his indulgences. In his critique of Thad Stevens, perhaps it is better for Brown to speak for himself:

To his familiars in politics, he was "old Thad", hard, but not unlikeable, and to thousands who shared his views, he was the greatest of all the great commoners in our history. To the dispassionate judgement of such as now, without favor or prejudice, review his life work, his errors seem to have been chiefly excess of a deep sympathy with the oppressed, that too readily turned into merciless hatred of all whom he thought guilty of oppression or of condoning it. He is but one of many men who, in warring against injustice, have themselves forgotten to be just.11

He finds not the slightest trace of mercy in Steven's speech following Johnson's message to Congress. Sumner's speech in the Senate was not less harsh, but suffers by comparison with "inordinate trenchery, the harsh candor of Stevens."12

He thinks Johnson unwise in refusing to sign the freedmen's Bureau bill, saying that he could have done it without any sacrifice of principle, and it would have averted the quarrell between himself and Congress which later had such dreadful consequences. His stubbornness cost him every vestige of control over the legislature and the nation.

11. Ibid., p.476.
12. Ibid., p.471.
Brown also feels that the other Southern states would have been wise to follow the lead of Tennessee in ratifying the fourteenth amendment, and being readmitted to the Union. Such a course was called magnanimous" by James Ford Rhodes, and though Brown does not go that far, he is certainly inclined in that direction.

But it is unjust to represent the others as insanely and wickedly rejecting reasonable terms, accompanied by a promise of restoration, and thus forcing congress to make the terms much harder. Inability to read the future is not madness, nor is it a crime for the conquered to try to profit by a division among the conquerors.13

The men in Congress could not, and in many cases would not see the actual state of the people in the South. They, who had surrendered to the executive department in good faith, and finding themselves in bad enough situation as it was, now found another department of that same government, the Legislative, imposing harder conditions containing neither justice nor mercy, but only hatred and revenge. Small wonder it is, then, that the South tended to support and follow Johnson. It was only natural. It should also be remembered that the radicals had favored severity from the first, and hence could expect no enthusiastic support from a Southerner. It is probable that they welcomed the opportunity to go before the country with the contention that they had tried moderation, i.e.,

Our target audience today is likely to be our students in the office of the visitor. As we are aware, a new teacher is joining our faculty, and it is time to welcome them into our school family.

To begin, I would like to first introduce our new teacher, Mrs. Johnson, who will be taking over the science class next semester. She brings with her a wealth of experience and enthusiasm for teaching, and we are all very excited to have her on our team.

In addition to Mrs. Johnson, we also have a new administrative assistant who will be helping us with the day-to-day operations of our school. She will be responsible for managing our office and ensuring that all students are receiving the support they need.

We are confident that with the addition of these new members, our school will continue to thrive and provide our students with a quality education. Thank you all for your continued support and dedication to our school community.

Let me now introduce you to Mrs. Johnson and the new administrative assistant.
admittance on the same terms as Tennessee, and it had failed. Andrew Johnson, moreover, by not weakening, had given the Southerners ample cause for not deserting him.

Brown thinks Johnson was unwise in stubbornly opposing the majority. Johnson seems to have had a "peculiar sense of responsibility which outweighed in his mind considerations of honor and loyalty that would have controlled any other man in his position." 14

Was Brown traitorous to the South in defending its traditional enemies? One need not feel him so. He could not have had any feeling whatsoever against the South. His whole body of writings is impregnated with a deep and earnest love of the South, even as was the life of Nicholas Worth. Indeed, this autobiography by Walter Hines Page 15 could easily be a story of Brown's own life, and it certainly must portray some of his feelings. The Reconstruction boyhood, the small preparatory school, the two years at Harvard, and the return to the South are very like Brown's own story. But there is a difference in that Brown did not see so much of the seamy side of the post-war South as did Page. Perhaps the two were looking for different changes. There is little of despair and bitterness in Brown that one often finds in Page. The former seems always hopeful for the success of his land, eco-

nomically, socially, and politically. It is such views as Brown expresses in these sections of his "Tenth Decade" that make him unique among Southern writers, and call forth such comments as Judge Pearce makes when he refers to its temper and spirit which will lead to further investigation of this period, "unbiased by the reckless and irresponsible utterances of too many writers from the South." 16

Brown understood also just how much of a friend to the South Lincoln really was, and how great a calamity for the South his death meant. Such sympathy for Lincoln from a Southerner must have been very unusual at the time. Rhodes wrote to Brown relative to his discussion of the great emancipator:

...The part where you bring in Lincoln is masterly. That has attracted a good deal of attention, and I took pleasure in telling a good old lady who was an abolitionist before the war that the writer was a Southerner. She thought at first that I must be mistaken, that no Southerner could write so sympathetically of Lincoln. 17

17, James Ford Rhodes to Brown, April 8, 1902.
Chapter VIII

Brown's View on the Contemporary South

While all the works of Brown which deal with the South show exceptional insight into the southern situation, there is none which so reveals him as an impartial observer and at the same time so human a person as the twenty letters written to the Boston Transcript during his journey through the South in the spring of 1904. Beginning his writings at Richmond, he seems to completely adjust himself to every locality so quickly and easily as to be able to write almost as a native of it. It is to be remarked also that as he progresses on his way, his defense of the South and Southern position and institutions seems to become more and more vehement. It is remarkable that this is true in the face of the large amount of hostile criticism which had previously been directed toward the South by other travellers there, and those who drew conclusions and made criticisms on the strength of testimony from these voyageurs.

When at Richmond, Brown talks with Governor Montague, a "modern looking man," who agrees with his interviewer that "to the vital movements of the present, in Southern society, the politicians contribute nothing. They are in fact a hindrance to
progress and... not conservative of anything worth conserving." While here he favors the industrial education of both races.

The Negroes are migrating north from Virginia, mainly because they seem to be deteriorating as agricultural workers, and from a desire on their part to find easier manual work. Virginian Negroes, he feels are the best class of blacks. Here they have been in constant contact with the best of whites. This is natural, because by a selective process, the whites had kept in Virginia the better class of Negroes and had sold the inferiors to the states further South. This probably offers one explanation of the Northern feeling that the Negro in the South is the white man's equal. Being familiar only with Virginia as a Southern state, and only with its Negroes through travel there or contact with the emigrant black, it was natural for them to conclude that the bulk of the Negro race was like those of Virginia. This was an obvious fallacy. Since also, the bulk of the Negroes which have migrated northward from the states of the lower South were the most intelligent ones, this fact has tended to confirm the untravelled Northerner in his belief. Hence the conclusions of the average Northerner that the South was grievously mistreating an equal and gentlemanly race was probably justified on the basis of his inadequate knowledge and observation.

Brown turns again to the situation at the South on the migration northward. He thinks it on the whole best for Virginia that "white labor is here coming into its own, in
agriculture and industry taking up the Negro's work." This tendency, which runs through all his works, seems to be considered a hopeful sign, and one which means a progress of the South toward a status which will approximate that of the North. As to whether the labor situation of the North in the matter of white labor in all fields with innate Southern qualities will produce a society infinitely better than the one existent in 1904.

This series of letters written to the Transcript makes a contribution to knowledge of Southern conditions and an interpretation of them so unique and interesting as to be practically alone in the field at the time. Interest in the South had tended to wane a bit with the travelogues of the seventies and the eighties, and with the advent of other national questions which had distracted attention from it. It will be remembered that the country had grown tired of the constant reference in the reconstruction period to the "Southern situation", the "waving of the bloody shirt" and other uses of the South as a political issue. So for some twenty years it seems to have been left quite a bit to its own devices as, to use Brown's own expression "a sort of Nazareth out of which only troubles and perplexities have come." But for the five years after 1898, when the South and North combined so readily against

1. The Lower South, p.1
Spain on the Cuban question, the South had been making wonderful advances. Birmingham and its district had arisen, textiles in South Carolina had become nationally important. Florida, with its new fruit, rail road and resort development, and Texas with its vast cotton land and rice possibilities were drawing national attention.

It was quite natural then that something of this nature should soon be a topic of discussion among those who were interested in Southern affairs. Whether Brown himself or a member of the Transcript staff suggested the writing of this series of articles is impossible to ascertain. However, Frank B. Tracy, editor for the special features department mentions in a letter to Brown: "We would be glad to have you write the series you and Mr. O'Brien talked about." The O'Brien referred to is doubtless Robert Lincoln O'Brien who was at that time the Washington correspondent for the Boston Transcript. Brown had no doubt known him for many years since the two were both members of Harvard's class of 1891. In the same letter Tracy advises Brown to go and see W. H. Page for advice on the subject. "He is a very good judge on southern questions...I think you might see him with profit."—as if Brown himself were not a southerner and from farther south than Page himself!

The records fail to show whether he saw Page or not.

2. February 8, 1904.
is, however, unlikely that he did, for he seems to have followed such a course and to have written as the latter would certainly not have advised had he been faithful to his own writings on Southern topics.

Brown's original plan, which he communicated to Tracy, was to follow the same itinerary as that of Fredrick Law Olmsted, who describes his travels in his Journeys and Explorations in the Cotton Kingdom. Having been published in 1861, this work was much quoted at the time of the Civil War and was probably well-known by the reading public. The editor, however said he did not readily fall in with the plan, and asked the articles should concern "industrial and general conditions in the South, treated with the interesting touch that you have given your works in history." What he wanted particularly was "News, new things, new enterprises, new aspects of old problems and prospects of the future. I make mention of the news element because so many people imagine the Transcript to be still repository of reminiscences. Nothing could be farther from the truth." 3

Brown had also mentioned some pretty constant references to Olmstead which also had not suited the editor. The latter further added, "What we want to know is how the South is picking up now, and how it has improved in the last ten years rather

3. Tracy to Brown, February 9, 1904
than how it has improved since the war."

Brown obtained his information by talking to business men and editors. After having traversed his whole route, Brown remarks on the exceptional hospitality enjoyed by him from the South's busiest men. Not once did he find them uncivil or rude, but on the contrary they went to the greatest pains to aid him in his search for proper material and conversation. Then he asks rather slyly if there is any other section in America where the business men are so hospitable to a mere inquirer who takes up valuable time.

Due to the fact that these letters are at once so rare and interesting and revealing, it is perhaps a good plan to review them here at some length in order to obtain a view of the ground as Brown had it, and see his viewpoint.

The first letter, which came from Richmond Locomotive Works of Brown's day. This company has furnished the engines for many of the Southern railroads. He is rather vehement about Virginia's need for good roads, especially for the benefit of the truck farmers in the tidewater region. Mention is made of the need for education and the work being done by Captain Vauter with the Miller Manual Training School. Vauter was ex-captain of Stonewall Jackson's sharpshooters. It is remarked that the best soldiers of war are able to find a place

---

4. Tracy to Brown, February 10, 1904.
in peace pursuits.

The next letter comes from Durham, North Carolina, where he finds a great opportunity for a migrating northern farmer. He admits that a man may not rise nearly so high as he might in the North, there are compensations. "While he may not rise quickly, he certainly will not be crowded out".  

There follows a description of Durham with its few idlers and of its tobacco sales. He even gives a short history of the Duke family, captains of the tobacco industry in North Carolina. He mentions old Wash Duke who came back to his farm in 1865 after serving the Confederacy against his will, and started with his sons the business that was to build Durham. "The youngest [of his sons] James Buchanan has fought for power more passionately, and has won more of it than any other Southerner we know about." Durham at that time was peopled mostly by North Carolinians, "simple as Virginia's best bred, but lacking in distinction and charm." There was some display, but surprisingly little for the nouveau riche. Negro labor is used somewhat in the factories. In the winter, cold weather makes them want to work in the warm buildings, but summer's balmy days make it hard to hold them in the factories. "The Negro settlement of Haiti (pronounced Hay-ti) is the most prosperous looking Negro settlement I have seen."

5. Boston Transcript, Mar. 9, 1904.
The growth of tolerance here is noted with some elation. There was a Negro doctor "who several years ago...voted for a Democrat, an unusually good candidate for the office and it cost him twenty-five per centum of his practice. To-day he believes he might do the same thing with impunity." 7

In this matter of tolerance the next letter, which is also from Durham, sheds more light on Southern intellectual broadening. The Bassett incident at Trinity College is compared to the case of one Professor Hedrick of the University of North Carolina who in 1856 mildly expressed views favoring Fremont for president and said he wished some day to see all slaves free. He was attacked by newspapers of the state, hanged in effigy by the students, and repudiated by his colleagues. The trustees made decisions tantamount to a request for his resignation. Having resigned, he was barred from an education convention at Salisbury and was finally forced into virtual exile in Washington.

The Bassett incident, however, turned out differently. Having expressed the opinion that save Lee, Booker T. Washington was the greatest man born in the South in the last hundred years, he was immediately attacked by the newspapers. The press seems to have been quite unrepresentative in this matter,

for the faculty and students asked the Trustees not to accept his tendered resignation, though none agreed with his views. The resignation was not accepted and the following year, the college gained students and the editor who was most bitter against him ceased firing; it was supposed that he was losing subscriptions.

"If the screaming onslaught showed how much, after nearly fifty years, there still remains in North Carolina of blind prejudice and intolerance, the way it was met shows beyond question that there has been a great advance. It shows also, what we are learning all over the country, that the press, and the politicians are very often entirely out of touch with the public opinion which controls. Like managers of theatres, they seem to concern themselves chiefly with the less intelligent classes. And it is the misfortune of North Carolina that, Negroes apart, she has within her borders a very great number of very ignorant people."

This state must advance through the efforts of young and enlightened business men and broad-minded professors. Wandering, it seems, into a discussion of the Southern clergy, he seems to disagree with Page, and comes to it's defense. Although they are somewhat guilty in the small towns of tyranny and censorship, the moral standards they uphold are higher than that of the people in general. Underpaid and overworked as they are, with little opportunity for education, culture and travel, "I am unable to sympathize with either the bitter- 


9. The remark attributed to W. H. Page is that the Southern Protestant clergymen were "leading the women and children beside the still waters of stagnant theology."
ness or the ridicule which has been displayed toward the Southern clergy."

A letter from Columbia, South Carolina describes the remarkable growth of the textile trade in the up country where more spindles have been installed in one year than in all other states combined. The demand for white labor is great, and the managers are constantly working toward the goal of more highly skilled operatives.

A change is occurring in South Carolina in regard to the labor system. Large numbers of whites are going into the mills and the Negroes are migrating North. This leaves a large amount of land idle, and it presents a wonderful opportunity for Northern farmers to come South, and with white labor and late machinery, build for himself a new home in a land which is not overcrowded.

The Negro as an agricultural laborer is deteriorating for several reasons, says Brown. Most important among these is the type of education he is receiving which makes him useless for farm work. The first thing he learns is how to avoid hard work and next he goes to the city to get a job which requires less manual labor. The best laborer is still the very black Negro; he is happy, docile and ignorant. "The lack of candor to admit the truth there is in such southern contentions is an exasperating feature of much argumentation about the Negro." 10

Brown feels that the remedy for the abuses of too little education for the Negro is not less education, but more. The Negroes have had a hard time in the cities where they have gone, and their beatings to and fro tend to reflect on the section from which they have come. This section has been charged with too little provision of opportunity for the Negro. Neither is it unnatural for many Southerners to oppose Negro education since it makes the black unfit for his use.

"Is it not true that discontent, mistakes, beatings to and fro are always the true signs of progress? It must be understood that when a Southerner speaks of what is good and what is bad for a Negro, he is thinking always of the Negro 'in his place.' On the other hand, it is certainly a serious responsibility which any man takes who advises a Negro, North or South, to conduct himself as if he did not have 'his place.'" 11

In experiments in cotton mills the Negro failed as a cotton worker. Booker T. Washington claims that the experiment was inconclusive because the machinery was old and the laborers were improperly selected and it was mismanaged. 12 Whether or not this experiment was fair or conclusive, Negro labor has not been tried extensively in South Carolina mills. Brown concludes that the Negro must depend upon his own

11. Ibid.
efficiency for his salvation. He expresses the hope that someone will prove this point one way or the other and thus perform an incalculable service to the race.

The next letter comes from Brown at Orlando. Florida is already a great resort state. Here, however, one must differentiate between the type of tourist visiting each section. The wealthy tend to remain in the eastern part of the state while the traveller of moderate means goes farther west and inland. Up until this time, Florida had been existing under what was almost a one-crop system—that of fruit growing. The winter of 1894-5, however, brought a series of freezes which destroyed nearly every fruit tree in the state, certainly all in the lower portion. This freeze became almost a blessing in disguise, because it suggested to and forced diversification on the farmer. Many new industries and crops are springing up causing the great extension of railroads. To such an extent is this true that the state is almost at the mercy of the railroads. "But it does not seem possible that these will be so short-sighted as to hold back its development."  

Brown predicts that Jacksonville will be without a rival to the South of it as a distributing point. It has greater possibilities than Charleston ever had.

Further discussion of the Negro problem comes from Jacksonville where the general feeling is that the Negro is not making good in his fight for a place in the new regime.

In order to make good, he must create a different impression. The accumulation of property is no measure. Supporters of the Negro may point to the increase he has made since freedom, when he had nothing. On the other hand, he did have the knowledge of how to farm, the protection of Northerners and of the Constitution. Even then he has not advanced near as much as have the native whites. Compared to foreign immigrants who came to America with practically nothing, having to learn new social conditions, language, and industry, the immigrants have advances far ahead of the Negroes as a class and man for man. This advance has also been evidenced in the experiment at Sunnyside in the Mississippi valley.

That the native whites have made (by 1904) a place for themselves in the new regime is evidenced by the way in which they have made manufacturers of themselves. One town is given as an example in which it was desired to build a cotton mill. They were represented in Massachusetts by two of their citizens who were to buy machinery from the Drapers. Having bought a million dollars worth, some Englishmen who were there at the time were astonished, saying they thought the South was poor. The Southerners then told the gentlemen of how the whole town bought stock. Those particularly interested put in all they had and all they could borrow. The county was canvassed, and the directorate was auctioned off. "Conservative Southerners have become good manufacturers starting with very little money, experience and knowledge. If he finds a place in the new re-
gime, why not the "negro?" 14

Brown finds that open-minded men feel the Negro and white both should be given a good education. He here engages in some very plausible reasoning.

"The ability and character of certain well-known members of the race is freely conceded, but the present inferiority of the mass of the blacks is apparent. The exceptional Negro who displays the same sort of competency and wisdom that the strongest white men display is nearly always a mulatto.

It is desirable that the proportion of whites to Negroes should everywhere be increased... but what is most to be desired is that they shall soon become so few relatively to the whites that in this respect we shall soon approximate the status of the North.

...Conceding everything that has ever been urged concerning the Negro's right to live and be free, admitting that the whole history of this race in America is a record of wrong and injustice, one must still feel that it would be best if this people should disappear." 15

The best minds among the Negroes agree with the whites. But the question arises, how long will this system prevail? But Brown very reasonable asks "What hope have we that it will ever cease to prevail? It is hard to say which is more remarkable—the unyielding instinct of the South, or the inability of the Northern people to comprehend how unyielding it is." 14

The state laws which protected slavery, and the master in his rights were no more effective than the unwritten and inevitable codes which in Brown's day and in this day regulate the relation between whites and blacks.

Here, it must be admitted, custom diminishes the efficiency of the Negro because it in some measure diminished the incentive to exertion. He may attain high prizes and rewards, but they are a different set from those for which he must not strive at all.

In the matter of acquiring wealth, the Negro is at less disadvantage than in any other respect. His property is much better guarded than his life, which is guarded insufficiently. Over a scheming and crooked white who is obviously trying to swindle a Negro, especially if that white be a Jew, the jury will in most cases favor the Negro.

A letter from Birmingham reveals the labor situation as one controlled completely by labor unions. Scabs are the object of intense hatred; but as mentioned elsewhere in this paper, the Negroes do not, probably from fear of the consequences, offer their services when union men strike. Even though they are not members of the union, they follow its lead. "The situation often provokes strong language from the employers."

It will be remembered that Birmingham had been founded in 1869, only two years after Brown was born, and having barely weathered two depressions in 1873 and 1893, it was just now becoming important in Southern affairs, though still very young. Brown describes this city rather fully as to its majority of Southern population, and capital, the impossibility of keeping one's linen clean, the uncertainty of steel and profits and the hope for diversification and machinery manufacture.
Moving on to Jackson, Mississippi, Brown bemoans the fact that Vardaman has been elected Governor while declaring against Negro education. Brown feels, however, that his victory at the polls was in spite of, and not because of these views. He feels that there are very many people in the state who favor Negro education. Indeed, a short time after his election, a bill for an appropriation to the state normal school for Negroes failed to pass over his veto by only two votes. The views favoring Negro education of Governor Montague of Virginia and of the other Southeastern states seem to be shared by a considerable number in Mississippi. Alabama education for blacks had long been established. Brown had suggested to Tracy that he take a trip to Tuskegee to write a letter from there. Tracy answered: "I do not become enthusiastic about a trip to Tuskegee. We have had that institution written up ad multitudenem, if not ad nauseam."\(^{16}\)

Vardaman's election was effected by campaign promises of patronage after his predecessor Longino had made some bad appointments. Many votes were also gained by a violent protest when it was noised about that Roosevelt had entertained Booker T. Washington at lunch. The truth of the matter seems to have been that the two were so busy at work in Roosevelt's office that the latter merely called for food when lunch time arrived, and the two dined most informally—a proceeding which would have

---

caused no comment even in the South. Roosevelt had remained silent when questioned about the matter because of the advice of a Southerner whom he thought knew public opinion in the South. Relative to this affair, the Southerners were narrow and extreme, thought Brown, but the Northerners should not throw stones from their glass house, since they themselves excluded dusky individuals from collegiate social clubs, and other fraternities where strict race equality would have admitted them. Page's definition of a Negro never seems truer than in these instances: "A form of insanity which over takes Americans." 17

Brown here takes occasion to lament the absence from public life of men of ability who really represent the people. The present politicians do not do this, and men of ability are not attracted to public office because of insufficiency of remuneration, because business pays better, and lastly, the one-party system causes petty personal bickerings which are disgusting and revolting to an intelligent man. Mississippi is cited as a good field for competent public men. Previously, politicians needed only to raise the cry of "regularity" and appeal to race prejudice to have the old machinery perpetuated. With the constant and definite elimination of the Negro from political consideration, the race issue is beginning to lose its force. Since the cry of "regularity" gains its potency

from race, then it too is becoming less a battle ground. Brown feels extremely hopeful over this situation.

Only four years after this was written, North Carolina sent three Republican representatives to Congress as a protest against a corrupted Democratic machine. Had Taft been wise enough to patronize this movement, he might have won the state to the Republican fold. Such, however, was the blunder of the President that the Democrats soon regained their position, though not without some change for the better.

A letter from Greenville, Mississippi shows there the crying need for government aid in the matter of levee construction. Land values remain depressed because of the constant danger of inundation due to weak levees. Brown described the land as the most fertile he has ever seen. Ten feet down still produces the same black fertile soil. Fertilizer is unknown here. In New England, this land itself would be considered a good fertilizer. A man from Illinois is said to have remarked to a farmer of the Yazoo delta, "The river made your land, but the Good Lord made ours." True," answers the Mississippian,"but the river has picked up the best of your land and brought it down here to us."

The strengthening of the levees would more than double the price of the land here. "It is high time that the American people, having fully committed themselves to a policy of national appropriations to improve their rivers and harbors,  

should complete their conquest of the Mississippi River." Brown feels that since the government is spending such a staggering sum at Panama, it should find a mere $20,000,000 to make the levees safe in its own Southland.

An incident is related of a gentleman from Wisconsin who was contemplating buying some land in this Yazoo delta. Riding horseback over the land with its Southern owner, he noted mud-marks about knee-high on the tree-trunks which had been made by flood waters. Inquiring as to their cause, the stranger was informed that they had been made by hogs. Upon penetrating further into the wilderness, the mud marks rose higher and higher until at last they were above the heads of the men on horseback. Returning to the house of the owner that evening, the Northerner decided to buy the land, and also expressed the desire to buy some of those hogs which had made the mud marks.

Several letters from Houston, Austin, and College Station in Texas describe that vast domain as to labor, education and agriculture. He thinks it too big, it being impossible to lie or be truthful about it. Humorous sayings are mentioned, such as that of the Mexicans who remarked that they could have whipped the United States if they could have got across Texas. Brown himself opines that the newcomer, the boll weevil will despair of spreading all over Texas, but will first attack the other states of the cotton belt and then return to the conquest of the big state. The boll weevil by this time had covered
about thirty per cent and forcibly suggested diversification just as did Florida's freeze of 1894-5. It has also provoked scientific study with a view to combatting it. Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, together with other schools have not been lagging in teaching farmers not only how to fight this pest but how to grow and care for other crops.

"These people are addressing themselves very practically indeed to the problem of getting better and better returns from their extraordinary prairies...the feeling seems to be universal that there is much to learn and that the time is past for the farmer who in unwilling to be taught...Were it not for the massing of wealth and people in two or three of our eastern cities, I should not hesitate to predict that within the lifetime of Americans already born, Texas will surpass every other member of the union in the production of population and wealth."

Texas is described as not as distinctly Southern as her sisters; the people are very proud of their state.

"There is also a feeling of independence of the older states quite different from the chip-on-the-shoulder attitude which I have occasionally found in the South...The vast majority of those who have left their homes in the east and come to Texas, no matter whence or when, brought very little with them. No state of the West could show a greater proportion of self-made men."

The real reason for the difference and independence found in Texas is given by Brown in a letter from Cleburne:

It is the free white labor, rather than immigration from the North per se or immigration from anywhere else, that has been gradually transforming Texas from the likeness of southern communities behind it into the likeness of the western commonwealths above it and beyond it. Perhaps it would be better to say that Texas is growing more and more like what the South might have been if there had never been any slaves."

The two best letters of the series are the last two which he wrote. They seem to be a summary of all the previous ones, and a conclusion seems to be drawn from the observations recorded in the other eighteen.

The bulk of the troubles of the South may be laid, he says, to its labor system. Slavery itself was not the South's original trouble, but the fact that those slaves were African Negroes.

"When the Negroes were freed, they did indeed begin to change in some respects. They have gradually got rid of some of the characteristics which always and everywhere belong to Negroes. But their history as freedmen has been immeasurably different from what it would have been if they had been of the same race as their owners... Slavery was succeeded not by equality, but by cast."

About this time there had been some talk of amalgamation of the two races. Brown thinks it never less probable than in 1904. The Negroes are accepting the caste barriers. The immoral relationships between the races are constantly growing less. Negro labor is more costly than White labor, even at that
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The Negro is especially apt at making excuses, shirking responsibility, childishness, waste, and theft. These faults make him an expense rather than an economy. Such in part was Brown's diagnosis.

With the definite social elimination of the Negro and the rising feeling among whites that the black man is no longer their charge, the Negro is coming more and more to be considered a party in business. Since this attitude gives the Negro an attitude of independence to seek the best business opportunities, and the feeling that he is no longer to expect white care, he migrates to the North and into the large cities where, in the former there is little race prejudice, and in the latter, there are more business opportunities. This prophecy was seen to come true in increasing numbers during the middle twenties when so many Negroes went from South to North.

Just at this point, it is perhaps well to insert an opinion of a Negro bishop, writing from Fayetteville, North Carolina, relative to the recent disfranchisement of Negroes in that state. He merely shows how completely the Negro was being removed from political, as he had already been removed from social consideration. This bishop of the African Methodist Church writes:

Everybody here knows that the talk about social equality is the shallowest kind of claptrap kept up for effect. A black man may be the social equal of a white man and yet not want to associate with him. So I presume social intercourse is what is meant, which is a thing not thought of here. While the upright and intelligent black
man does not admit any inferiority, yet he does recognize the line long existing, and is as little inclined to cross it as the white man is to have him cross it. "It has made him clannish, and he feels as independent of white society as it can possibly feel of him."  

Brown now takes pause, to be candid again: "My fear is that the Negro occupies too much of the foreground. It is, however, my desire to point out that the Negro as a factor in Southern civilization is on the whole of less importance relatively than he ever was before."  

This feeling is also expressed by Page (that the Negro occupies too much of the foreground) who, writing at this time, puts in the mouth of old Ephriam these words:

"I don't lak so much talk 'bout de nigger and de white man. Godamighty, Jerry, ain't we gittin' 'long wid one er'ner same as we allers is? Nothin' ain' happen. But all of a suddent dey all falls a-talkin' 'bout de white man and de lan' -- makin' a mighty 'do 'bout nothin.'"  

Brown never wanted to have the South considered a "problem." His idea was that the South should be considered a part of the American nation--normally as any other section. The constant wall erected, with the aid of misguided Northerners around the South made this impossible. Here again, if Page may be 
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referred to, their common sentiment is expressed:

"If you, you who live in New England in particular, would regard us who live and work in these Southern commonwealths as citizens of the Republic, your regarding us so would help make us so. So long as we are regarded as a problem, we must play the part of a problem, whether we will or no." 26

The most remarkable advance in the South was probably between 1850 and 1860. During this period, farm values doubled; the South outstripped all other sections in railroad building, even New England. Other advances were planned there of large proportions.

"It is hardly too much to say, in fact, that save for the discovery of unsuspected opportunities such as the fitness of the western Gulf coast for rice growing, and the inventions of new appliances and methods, nothing of the first importance has been done since 1880 which was not at least planned before 1860." 27

That the South was completely devastated and stagnant during the war and carpetbag periods is a point which need not be labored here. At the same time, other sections of the country were phenomenally prosperous. The old college president in Page's Southerner is astonished to find that "they pay their preachers four times as large salaries as the governor of our commonwealth receives." 28 The saying that the first thousand is

26. Ibid, p. 390
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the hardest is especially apt, for the South had not that first thousand. "Let us not therefore too readily and glibly attribute any backwardness in the South of today solely to the defect of her industrial system or to the lack of enterprise of her people."29

The changes which Brown noted were recent ones, and the cause of the South's recovery could not be laid to them for they were rather a result of that recovery. This recovery began when capital was scarce, and labor uncertain. "The credit for it belongs distinctly to the Southerners themselves. If northerners have put in money, it was because attractive offers were held out."30

At last Brown seems inflamed against the attackers of the South and he takes on an almost belligerent attitude in its defense. It is somewhat different from the mild, inquiring letter of Richmond, where he is starting upon a new adventure, knowing hardly what to expect. By the time he reaches St. Louis, however, he feels himself upon solid ground, and speaks out loudly and with assurance.

"Neither is there any justification for a tone of grievance which unlucky speculators in Southern investments frequently adopt. They talk sometimes as if, actuated themselves by wholly benevolent motives, they had been most cruelly victimized by ungrateful and rapacious
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'natives'. The truth is more likely to be that they went South to make money, that they found there individuals engaged in the same pursuit, and more familiar with the field and that there was the same sort of encounter of wits which is always going on everywhere in business. It is as tiresome as it is unfortunate, that what in the East or West is sufficiently explained by a knowledge of human nature should in the South have to be attributed to some peculiar perversity in the Southerners. 31

That the South will be only what the Southerners make it, he has no doubt, and he has faith in their ability to make something of it. They have maintained complete mastery over the Negro, and this is as it should be in a land where only whites are fit to rule. The Southerners have retained more than they have lost of the characteristics which distinguished them. Even in the rawness of new industrial towns such as Birmingham, they have managed to bring something of the old plantation spirit. They are found by foreigners he believes, to be "if not the most satisfactory Americans, then the most interesting. Northern people living among them begin to like and be like them—always loyal wherever they are to their own section. The South will always be distinguishable, and having its own ideals, it will not allow another section to force its ideals upon the South." 32

Now to summarize very briefly the views expressed by Brown on this Southern trip.

31. Boston Transcript, June 1, 1904.
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First, industry is coming into the South, as evidenced by new businesses at Richmond, Durham, Atlanta, Birmingham, and in South Carolina.

Second, white labor is coming more and more to be desired in preference to expensive Negro labor. White labor is no more looked upon as contemptible.

Third, Negro labor is deteriorating due to education and migration. He is not making for himself a place in the new regime, a place comparable to the important one he held in the old.

Fourth, the amalgamation of the races will not come in the South.

Fifth, the diversification of farming and industry is necessary. Such "blessings in disguise" as freeze and boll weevil have aided this diversification movement.

Sixth, Southerners make good workers and business men. The present South is a product of their own hands, and not of benevolent Northern capital.

Seventh, the movement for Negro education, already recognized as a wise one by the best Southern minds, is steadily gaining momentum in spite of the setback of Vardaman's election.

Eighth, the equality of the great mass of the Negroes with the whites is non-existent. The story of the post-slavery South would have been much different had they been of the white race; and

Lastly, the South will always be distinguishable because
it has not lost those characteristics which have made it unique in American life.

Such was the picture given the North, the very town in which abolition started, of the South and its twenty-seven years of recovery since the return of home rule. It must be remembered that the South had had few defenders among men recognized nationally as unbiased. Brown, however, had the unique distinction of being a Southerner who had lived fully half of his life not only in the North, but in New England, where old ideas about the South were likely to be most unyielding. Concentrating on the decade following 1893, Brown showed the remarkable advances made in the South. The series was well received in the North, and the Transcript office reported that they were called upon to supply many copies of the back issues containing this feature. Tracy wrote Brown: "I think you are going to have a good deal of difficulty in keeping your anonymity." The articles were titles "The South at Work", and published over the pen-name "Stanton". He won the staff of the Transcript completely. Tracy wrote that it was the opinion of the Transcript office "that Brown ought to be kept with us and for us."

It is certainly a far cry from such reports as made by Frederick Law Olmsted fifty years before, and it can be credited
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with the beginning of a new attitude toward the South. It is quite likely that if more trips of this kind had been made and chronicled, the still-open breach between North and South would have healed much sooner.

Mr. Brown was a fine exponent of the culture and ideas of the new South; not the New South of industrialism, which defines itself most clearly in Atlanta and Birmingham; but the New South which reveals itself in the enthusiasm for education, in reverence for the idealism of the older social order modified by the demands of modern conditions, and transformed into a popular force. Men of his temper and training are not too common in this country; and his death in his early maturity is a distinct loss to American literature. 33

33. Outlook, 105-461, Nov. 1, 1913.
Chapter IX
Miscellany and Conclusion

In this the closing chapter, it is well to mention briefly a few of Brown's other works. Houghton, Mifflin Company, in 1900, published in its Riverside Biographical series, Brown's little book, The Life of Andrew Jackson. The work brings out and emphasizes the personal side of probably the most human of America's presidents. At times, it is true, Brown falls into that error of many biographers - that of idolizing their subjects. But on the whole, it is exceptionally fair and objective. The influence of Jackson's personal nature on the course of political history is strongly emphasized. Had Jackson not been so yielding to his passions, which were at times aggravated by ill-health, how many different courses might have been followed by him and his associates!

The biography includes the whole span of Jackson's life, being evenly distributed from beginning to end. It is written in Brown's characteristically impeccable English and the style is most readable and interesting. Not being a scholar, Brown does not concern himself with the political theories, critiques, and learned treatment of the why and wherefore of Jackson's
policies. It would indeed be difficult, and even useless to attempt scholarly analysis of the reasonings and processes of a mind such as Jackson's, which was so hasty in most of its decisions, and also utterly lacking in seasoned knowledge.

Jackson typifies the American ideal of being free and equal - the ideal of the nineteenth century. No better example has been shown of the "every-boy-can-become-president" doctrine. A tribute to Jackson closes the book. After admitting his many faults, Brown continues:

Education, and training in statecraft, would have saved him many errors; culture might have softened the fierceness of his nature. But untrained, uncultivated, imperfect as he was, not one of his great contemporaries had so good a right to stand for American character.\(^1\)

Another of Brown's biographies is one of Stephen Arnold Douglas. While the writer has been unable to see copy of this work, there are critics who may speak instead. It is pointed out as "one of the best volumes of a series that has had some excellent numbers. The distinction of its quality is that it is written with a dramatic sympathy which does not for a moment confuse the writer's moral discrimination."\(^2\)

Douglas is shown as the most powerful and efficient advocate of "those measures which were the latest fruit of

\(^1\) W. G. Brown, The Life of Andrew Jackson, Cambridge, 1900, p.156.

Clay's unprincipled and superficial mind. In the Kansas-Nebraska legislation, we see Douglas as the leader in the renewal of the conflict for which the compromise of 1850 had been only a temporary truce. It is plainly shown that the characteristic note of Douglas was moral indifference to slavery. Brown, with striking vividness brings out Douglas' part in splitting the Democratic party and thus assuring a Republican victory in 1860. Also, his influence on the Northern Democracy which tended to produce a war party in its own ranks. This aided Lincoln in the performance of a task which otherwise would have been too hard for him to perform. A parallel is drawn between Douglas and Lincoln at various points. He shows Douglas' rapid advancement as compared with Lincoln's long delays. Champ Clark once reparked of the work:

The best piece of political biography of the past twenty years is a book on S. A. Douglas by William Garrott Brown. I think I have read all of the American biographies, and none of them is so interesting and so well done as this piece of work."

A third biography by Brown is one of Oliver Ellsworth, which was written at the request of the relatives of its subject. Brown was paid a substantial sum for the work he did on it. It is perhaps his only claim to work of the treatise type. It is heavily footnoted, showing a great amount of painstaking
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research. Its main value in a study such as this paper is perhaps to show that Brown was capable of thorough investigation. But with all its footnotes, quotations and citations, it is the most uninteresting bit of work Brown ever did. It earned but eighty-five dollars during the first five years of its publication.5

Thus the second chief justice is rescued from perhaps unmerited obscurity, but his stolid, unimaginative character inspires hardly the slightest spark of hero worship. He is followed from his small farm near Hartford, Connecticut, to the State assembly, the constitutional convention, to Europe, and back to the Senate with meticulous care. Some of his decisions while on the Supreme Court bench are noted, and while all of them showed a great amount of common sense, none are evidences of a long legal training. One must feel that, having read it, the laurels should go to the writer for so much patience rather than to the subject for the colorless life he lived.

In an essay called the "New Politics", Brown reviews the history of American parties, showing their development and various changes as to principle. Dividing the parties into two classes, he shows that there is always one of order and authority and one of progress. Perhaps they may also be called the party of special privilege, and the party of strict equality.

America, according to Brown's theory, is fast approaching the state of European nations in that the new lands are being taken up and old pioneer life is disappearing. Her fight is now against a monarchy of wealth and combination which her freedom has fostered. This type of rule cannot be fought by armies and physical revolutions. Public opinion and citizenry and law only can combat it.

The parties have changed relative to this self-made privilege. Brown shows how the Federalist party, the first of special privilege, was defeated by the common man's party in the hands of Jefferson and Jackson. After the political death of these two men, the Democratic party itself began to protect special privilege in the form of slavery, while making itself anomalous by its defense of state's rights and individualism. The new Republican party then arose and fought special privilege by demanding equality for the blacks, only to become itself the party of the financial barons of the early twentieth century using that same party to defend the special privilege they desired. The Democratic party then became the party of the common man, drawing its supporters from urban working classes, mid-western farmers and from the plain Southern men who possessed the distinction of neither wealth nor birth. That party seemed on the whole to have decidedly the best right to claim support as the party of individual liberty, of Democracy in the full meaning of the word.
And that, I think, has been its real bent. For the past ten years its specific proposals have been, for the most part, unfortunate. It has suffered also from bad management, from bad organization, from factional divisions. As contrasted with the business-like control and direction of the Republican organization, its leadership has been pitifully weak. The party has been distrusted and the people have refused to grant it power, because they have felt it to be incoherent, unbusiness-like, ineffective, more like a mob than an army - but not because it has not been democratic in animus and temper and composition. For years, in fact, it has wanted only able and intelligent leadership, and firm organization to commend it to popular favor. A majority of the American electorate would many times have preferred to support that party if they had not been afraid to.

There follows a discussion of Roosevelt, showing how nearly a dictator he was, and could further become. Although he did little that he promised in his inaugural speeches, he was the idol of the American people, and would have excellent chances for a third term election. This would be contrary to American Democratic principles. Roosevelt could make himself more of an influence for good by stepping down from the high places than he ever could by a candidacy for a third term. A policy of less self and more America would be good for all concerned.

By no conceivable self-assertion could he now render to his country such a service as is open to him to render by crucifying his own ambitions and in no other way could he make his fame so secure... Let him once pledge himself in plain words never again to seek or take the presidency, and his power to advance causes, his hold on

public opinion, his opportunity to contribute what he has to contribute to the solution of the new problems would not be less, but greater.

An interesting sidelight on Brown's character is given by his essay on "The South and the Saloon". Following the Civil War, the common people in the South became the controllers of the government and used it to stop those things which most irritated them. "Demon rum" happened to be one of these things, for to the plain Southerner, drink meant hard liquor, drunkenness, and family poverty. This conception was held by the Methodists and Baptists, most numerous in the matter of members. Episcopalians, and Presbyterians were those aristocratic persons whose alcoholic thirsts were quenched by wines and liquers and temperance. But the former group being in the majority, tried to have the government force everyone to become a teetotaler. One remarkable feature of the Southern prohibition campaigns was that the race question was not mentioned. For once, the South had put that question aside. "One is tempted to declare that if it can do that, it can do any-thing."

Brown's father had been Methodist, but he himself became

8. Bound with "The New Politics".
Presbyterian. Due to his deafness, however, he was almost never in attendance upon church services during his later years. His views on the drinking of liquors are evidenced in his own use of them, unwise as it was in his physical condition. Within a year of his death, one finds a letter to him such as this:

I sent you down a little Bourbon whiskey lest the government should make such gifts impossible. And I hope you will drink it. If you find any doctors hanging around your place, you tell them the story of old Dr. Cunningham, who was sent for to see a poor sick Negro girl, and when he arrived he asked the girl's father what the last doctor had said; to which the father replied: "He felt of the gal's pulse and tasted of the spirits and said, 'When you get two dollars send for me again.'"

Brown himself was not a religious man. When Caffey was in Cuba, Brown wrote: "I almost wish I were a religious man again so that I could pray for you." His boyhood connection with rural Methodism doubtless turned him away from it in later years. He once wrote: "Most people simply irritate me when they 'talk religion' to me." He was too candid for any emotionalism, but had a great respect for proper conduct and an intellectual religion.

10. F. G. Caffey to the writer, April 17, 1935.
13, Brown to Martin, Dec. 9, 1912.
The image contains text that is difficult to read due to the quality of the scan. It appears to be a page from a document, possibly discussing a biological or scientific topic, given the context and terminology. However, the text is not legible enough to provide a meaningful transcription.
In only one work does Brown set forth his own views of the way to write history. "The Task of the American Historian", bound with his "Foe of Compromise" reveals him as one of the pure narrative school. Recognizing that there are no generally accepted rules governing the writing of history, he goes on to show what are his own ideas on the subject. He discusses three recent works, giving his opinion of each. He feels that the seventh volume of the Cambridge History, written by a number of different men, can not be called a solution of the problem, due to its cooperative feature. It has as many different view points as it has contributors, and those men show themselves to best advantage in their own works, rather than in a fraction of another. This type will never replace the personal historian, he feels.

Brown admires Fiske for his simplicity in his Essays. He writes just as he speaks, and that is as it should be, says Brown. He sees clearly and humanly, and holds the attention of the reader. He thinks Fiske the most engaging writer of American history since Francis Parkman, although he suffers by comparison with that author, whom Brown thinks is America's best chronicler.

Woodrow Wilson's "History of the American People" is described as "brilliant". So brilliant, in fact, that one

14. John Fiske, Essays, Historical and Literary, New York, 1902
•
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comes to admire its superb style, the sentence structure, and the judicious choice of words, until he presently forgets the story which, after all, is what he set out to read. It is astonishing, says Brown, that Wilson, who is so studied in the proper ways of writing history, should not succeed better at it than anyone else, Fiske, for instance, whose way, apparently, was the way he talked. Wilson's main trouble, Brown feels, is that he has spent too little time on it for it to be a really great history. A varied academic career has made this necessary. Brown was sure that a lifetime would have to be spent on an immortal history of a people.

Even a lifetime may be vainly devoted to this ambition, and the highest powers wasted on it, unless either fate vouchsafe the man his share of ordinary human incitements to do his best, and spare him the worst temptations to despair, or else there be in the man himself a singular fixedness of purpose. So much of good fortune or of character being granted, it is not alone in the erudition of his work but in the entire quality of it, that the sacrifice of his years will be found to have availed.  

Only by this means could one produce a history comparable to the work of the old masters such as Thucydides and Herodotus. Brown himself wanted to write such a History of the United States. Having written his Lower South, he prefaces it with:

16. Dr. W. P. Few, in conversation with the writer.
My true task, like many another task of many another man, must wait for better days: for days of confident mornings and calm evenings. Such his days must be, his mind at peace, his silence undistracted, who would enter into the body of civilization and make it live again through these and other of its times and seasons, he also living in it, and dying in it, and rising in it again. For that, and nothing less is the demand it makes on its historian.¹⁷

How unfortunate that those mornings and evenings did not come for him!

His method of writing history was the straightforward, natural telling of the truth. It was not to be cluttered up with the devices of the dramatist or the novelist. They were very well in their fields, but history tells a story, and its criterion is to have that story itself hold attention, rather than to require the aid of other devices. "I shall probably preach the brethren another little sermon on my favorite line...urging that we ought to always keep the untrained reader in mind, since the past is his as well as ours."¹⁸

As opposed to the documentary school, Brown's is one of making history a literature of its own. "Their [the Germans'] sole consideration has been informer - how to find the truth and present it. Brown's ideal is different. He wished to make himself a narrator of human achievements. He had the power

¹⁷. The Lower South, preface, p.viii.
Hilack, Hi!
of telling and did not know the first thing about discussing"19

A historian, thinks Brown, ought to make the figures of
the past impressive. It is reasonable because it is so easy,
and not always an untruth. It is also good for the race. It
is good to set up ideals in historical study to which men
may look.

There is no other way to weaken the higher purposes
of men half so effective as to induce in them the habit
of seeing life as a mean affair of chance and physical
reaction. Even to reason that there is no moral order
whatsoever in the universe is not so hurtful to the moral
standards of men as it is to make them see themselves
and all their fellows alike as but little things. Memory
tends to ennoble and enlarge the same way an artist does.
Readers can only ask then, that historians deal with past
life as honestly as their own memories do, even though
he magnifies his subject just as our memories magnify
their own.20

Brown’s ability at writing and at the criticism of his-
tory was known and respected among the best writers of his
time. Upon one occasion, Brown reviewed the fifth volume of
James Ford Rhodes’ History of the United States from the
Compromise of 1850. Rhodes seemed highly pleased with the
review.

I could not be otherwise than highly gratified at
your review of my fifth volume.... To have the mature
judgement of a man who knows the period that I have
told the truth, have been accurate and yet written a
readable book is, like approbation from Sir Hubert

Stanley, "praise indeed." 21

Brown was opposed to the German method of writing history. This method of placing documents before narrative was an especially dry and uninteresting one. The best known advocate of it in the Western Hemisphere was Hermann Eduard Von Holst, a German who was for eight years head of the history department at the University of Chicago. While there he exerted powerful influence in encouraging American students to follow more closely the German methods of historical research. His best known work is Constitutional and Political History of the United States, and it is written from a strongly anti-slavery point of view. 22 It was this school which Dunning referred to when he wrote of Brown's Lower South: "It is refreshing to find in his work evidence that what may be called the Von Holst era of American historiography is passing." 23

Another of Brown's friends has this to say:

The dry-as-dust school of historians, made in Germany has had the field in this country so much to itself that I have never felt that Brown was properly appreciated, as it always infuriates that school to have anybody write History that it is a pleasure to read. 24

---


W. R. Thayer was probably Brown's greatest admirer in the matter of historical writings. His own work, Cavour went through several editions. He wrote Brown on one occasion, "I have always regarded your breakdown as a serious blow to historical writing in America, because of all the younger men here [at Harvard] in my time, you seemed to me to have the keenest perception of what history should be, and you had also the best talent as a writer." And again, writing to Bassett, "He possessed a more ample gift for producing history of the highest rank than anyone who came out of Harvard during the past twenty-five years." Bassett said, "I think he was one of our best teachers of men."

Brown's greatest service in writing history was the fair treatment he gave the South, and his attempts to stop the re-fighting of the Civil War, and to give a true picture of the ante-bellum South. His time made him able to do this, and he made for himself the name of being sober-minded and impartial. One correspondent wrote him:

We of the South have been sadly wanting some historian to come to the front who was willing and able to do us full justice. Ever since I saw the concerted effort that was made by New Englanders, just after the Civil War, to re-write and revamp the history of the U. S. I have earnestly wished I had the time and ability

25. Thayer to Brown, March 1, 1912.
to enter the field myself. However, I have been blessed with very little of either and so my contributions have in that direction necessarily amounted to very little. I sincerely hope that you will be blessed with the health and strength to enable you to do for your native section what others have, so far, signally failed to accomplish.

I do not, of course, mean that you should undertake the role of standing forth as a champion of the South. You would not, and could not, be a historian if you should pose in any such attitude. What the South wants is not an advocate, or even a defender; it needs only a just judge - a lord chancellor on the woolsack, who shall sum up all the evidence and render a righteous judgement. That is what we have never had, and it is, at the same time what I feel the South is to look for in you.28

A life-long friend once wrote to Brown: "I don't know whether I ever told you that Thomas Nelson Page said to me once... that he considered you the most accomplished writer of your generation."29

For some three years after the beginning of his connection with Harper's Weekly, Brown was able to travel at rare intervals. During the Summers of 1908 and 1909, he traveled in Europe, thus becoming more and more cosmopolitan. The winters were spent in Asheville, and the summers of 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 were spent at various places in the North. The summer of 1910 was spent at Lakewood, New Jersey; of 1911 at Loomis sanitarium, Liberty, New York. During the summer of 1912, he was at Provincetown in Massachusetts. His last summer was spent at New Canaan, Connecticut.

29. Wat Lord to Brown, Nov. 6, 1911.
During January of 1912, Brown became extremely ill. He had started work too soon after a relapse in June of the preceding year when his interest in the Taft patronage was at its height. His brother, Eugene Brown hurried to Asheville at the request of the physician. He was sinking rapidly, but it seemed not to have affected his spirits at all. He wrote to Martin on the tenth, "The reason you do not recognize my handwriting is that it is my brother's." On the twelfth, Eugene wired Martin, "My brother not expected to live through the day." But by the fifteenth it appeared that W. G. Brown was out of danger. He was not able to do any work, however, and was advised by both the magazines to which he contributed,\(^{30}\) to take care of himself and not to try to send in any material until he was strong again. Both were very considerate, and offered to continue his salary during his illness. Brown would not permit this, however.

He absolutely refuses to accept pay while he cannot give value received. He is very positive on this point, and while he appreciates to the fullest your offer to keep him on the payroll, he cannot bring himself to think that, in view of your kindness to him in the past, that he would be justified from any standpoint in receiving money for work he does not perform.\(^{31}\)

At this time, Brown was living at Asheville, and this il-

\(^{30}\) Brown also had a department of current topics in Harper's Bazaar

\(^{31}\) E. L. Brown to Martin, Jan. 17, 1912.
ness convinced him that the high altitude did not agree with him. Consequently, he removed by private car to Southern Pines, North Carolina, where he spent the remainder of that winter, and the winter of 1912-13. Brown suffered a great loss during the winter of 1910 while he was living at Asheville. He was staying at Kenilworth Inn that winter, and had the misfortune to be there when that hotel burned. In this fire, he lost the materials and manuscripts for his History of the United States since the Civil War, and of his life of General Grant. The following December he cancelled the contracts for these two works, and seems not to have attempted to renew the work he had been so long a time preparing.

During the last two and a half years of his life, Brown was almost continuously bed-ridden. But he kept up his work in the best of spirits. His nurse wrote relative to him in these years:

I wish that my words were adequate to express what I found in that great character during the two and a half years I was with him. He placed his work before his life always and I have seen him so weak he could hardly hold his head up, get off those editorials. He used to say "I must work for the time is short." 

In the latter part of May, 1913, George Harvey sold the
Weekly to Norman Hapgood, and it became one of the McClure
publications. Hapgood did not immediately take charge, how-
ever, and the Weekly continued under the direction of Martin,
with Brown still writing as before. The sale was rather sud-
den, as is evidenced by Brown's letter.

The whole thing has of course been a shock and a
surprise to me. I fear it has been so to you also, and
after long years of service, you were surely entitled
to more consideration. What I have done has of course
been far less, but under the circumstances, it has meant
a great deal to me, as I have grown weaker, to be able
to do something that at least seemed worth while. It
has helped to keep me alive.35

June first saw Brown in New Canaan, Connecticut, and his
position with the Weekly somewhat uncertain. "The matter is
a little complicated by another offer of attractive work, but
Hapgood is coming to see me to talk the whole situation over."36

Hapgood saw Brown the first week in June, but made no
definite statement as to the editorial policy. Brown sugges-
ted that there be no break, and offered to try to make it as
inconspicuous as possible. Brown agreed to work until the
August 16th issue at least, for with that issue, Hapgood was
to take personal charge. Hapgood, however, said he wanted a
pronounced change, but did not say what kind of change.

This situation put Brown in a delicate position.

I can only guess at his opinions, and what to avoid saying.... Of course I can't anyhow write anything I don't believe merely because I may suspect he may believe it.

I can't feel that he himself sees much need of me beyond the present stop-gap arrangement. I shall go on with that the best I can, but as he disclaims responsibility till August, and we're merely hanging on till he gets ready, I think he ought to be a bit considerate himself.37

On July 30th, 1916, Martin sailed for Europe, Brown wishing him bon voyage. At the same time, his own connection with Harper's Weekly ceased, and Hapgood took charge with the issue of August 16th.

"One of the beautiful things about Mr. Brown's character was his loyalty to his friend. He never forgot anyone he loved. You are fortunate to be one of them." So wrote Bertha Clement to Dr. Bassett three years after Brown's death. This loyalty was a conspicuous feature of Brown's character. His winning personality was of such nature that it encouraged his friends to reciprocate this feeling. Shortly after his removal to Southern Pines, Brown received a letter from Thomas Settle which philosophically remarks: "I wish I could see you and tell you a few 'ribald' jokes, that might tend to cheer you up some, for this damn old world is an intolerable place without a sense of humor and an appreciation of the ridiculous."

This letter was written from Asheville where Brown had known Settle for some years. Another friend wrote in a more serious mood:

Never was anything wiser than that a guilty conscience needs no accuser. For two days your letter has remained upon my desk unopened. I was sure it contained a good cussin' - I would look at it (or rather it would look up at me) and I would call myself all sorts of dn---- things and quadrupeds. I would pile things on top of it, but the blamed thing would keep getting uncovered. It just wouldn't stay put. I went home last night and the blamed thing wouldn't let me go to sleep; then I dreamed about you all night long. In my dreams I saw myself as I must have seemed to you in those long days without a word. Indeed, old man, I saw myself as I hope you saw me - because if you have that fondness for me I would have you have, you must have thought of me so. I am sorry, forgive me if you can - make some sort of excuse for me and my love for you.

Brown seems to have lost all interest in life generally after his connection with the Weekly ended. No letters from him are preserved after July 30th, 1912. He grew steadily worse, the disease having by now nearly made his lungs useless. The first week in September saw him sinking into alternating coma and delirium. For a little more than six weeks longer, he lingered on, his brother, Wilson, at his bedside. A simple telegram from W. R. Brown to Martin, dated October 19, 1913, tells the rest of the story. "Your friend, W. G. Brown, died to-night. He loved you."

"His loss of health was a national misfortune," wrote Martin the following month. 40

No one can say what he might have accomplished with unimpaired health and a longer opportunity. "But those who knew him believe that William Garrott Brown would have gone very far. And if he had never accomplished anything, they would have loved him none the less." 41

The most beautiful tribute is paid to him by Dr. Few, life-long friend to Brown: "America has lost a man of talent, but above and beyond this loss, those of us who loved William Garrott Brown have felt that in his death, something of tenderness and beauty and glory has passed from the earth." 42
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