

was executed. I believe some good men have been honestly misled, but that the plot existed and will cost the city dear there can be no question."

An Anecdote of Jefferson Davis.

JEFFERSON DAVIS was not by any means a general universal favorite among the Confederates, either soldiers or civilians. While many considered him arbitrary and self-willed, it is doubtful if any one man in the entire Confederacy for one moment doubted his honesty of purpose.

A year before the close of the war army orders brought me to Columbus, Georgia. At that place the Confederate Government had located a large ordnance establishment. An ordnance officer, Colonel Oladowski,—not unknown, I believe, in the old service,—one day handed me a heavy black object some six inches in diameter, saying, "What is that?" I answered, "A lump of coal." "Examine it closely," said he.

Taking a knife and cutting it, I found it to be a hollow iron casting roughly shaped to resemble coal, and covered with asphaltum or some such substance in which was baked coal dust and small lumps of coal, giving the whole the exact appearance of ordinary coal.

A number of similar pieces were exhibited, of various sizes and shapes. The officer explained that he had had them made, had carried some of them to Richmond and had exhibited them to President Davis, with a carefully prepared plan by which he proposed to have them sent by suitable men to various points on the Mississippi River where the Federal gun-boats coaled, and, after being filled with a most powerful explosive, deposited among the coal designed for the gun-boats, or even introduced into their bunkers. He had also perfected a plan to have them introduced into the Northern navy yards and in various foreign coal-ing stations of the United States navy. That it could have been done by shrewd and desperate men is beyond a doubt.

As the explosive with which they were to be filled was one of the most powerful, and only exploded by heat, they would not have been detected, and exploding in the furnace of a gun-boat would have sent all on board to the bottom.

The officer told me that when he exhibited them to Jefferson Davis the President was horrified, and furiously declared himself insulted that any man should have dared to suppose that he would be a party to any such unjustifiable mode of warfare; "and," said the officer, "the President's eye fairly blazed while he gave me such a blessing that I would have been glad to crawl into a rat-hole to get away from him. When he had exhausted his fury he said abruptly, 'Return to your station, sir, this very day.' I firmly believe he would have put me in arrest and preferred charges, but that he did not want the matter to become public."¹

Carlisle Terry, M. D.

COLUMBUS, GEORGIA.

¹ In a letter written after this article was accepted, Dr. Terry says, "I have since heard, though I do not know if true, that the torpedoes spoken of were used on the Mississippi River." There does not appear to be official confirmation of this.—EDITOR.

Comments on "Abraham Lincoln: A History."

I.—MCCLELLAN AND THE PEACE PARTY.

I HAVE read with deep interest Nicolay and Hay's history of Lincoln from its opening chapter to the present. While I believe that as a history of the lamented martyr President it is an excellent and in the main a correct work, I have found much in it, especially wherein it refers to General McClellan's conduct while in command of our armies, which seems to me to be unjust to a loyal and brave soldier whose lips are sealed in death. In the *AUGUST CENTURY*, at page 548, the writers use the following language:

The Democratic convention was finally called to meet in Chicago on the 29th of August. Much was expected from the strength and the audacity which the peace party in the Northwest had recently displayed, and the day of the meeting of the convention was *actually chosen by rebel emissaries in Canada* and their agents in the Western States for an outbreak which should effect that revolution in the Northwest which was the vague and chimerical dream that had been so long cherished and caressed in Richmond and Toronto.

I can see no motive in this paragraph other than that of throwing discredit upon the Democratic leaders of that day, and an attempt to throw around its standard-bearer, General McClellan, and his thousands of loyal friends, both in and out of the army, at least a filmy cloud of disloyalty.

All know that at that time, 1864, there was among all classes great and general dissatisfaction regarding the Administration in its conduct of the war. None doubted the loyalty, the integrity, or the honesty of the great war President, but our general want of success in the field, the numerous and rapid changes of our commanding generals, and above and beyond all the management of the War Department by Stanton and Halleck, apparently regardless of the wishes of the Executive, had begotten a feeling of unrest in the minds of all loyal people, both in and out of the army, and very largely the belief that Mr. Stanton especially had no desire to bring hostilities to a speedy determination by capturing Richmond and thus ending the war.

The overwhelming defeat of Vandaligham for governor of Ohio the fall previous, by an opponent without personal magnetism or individual strength, other than that he represented the spirit of national loyalty in the people after the great Democratic victories in New York and other Northern States in 1862, and without any considerable victories in the field meanwhile, had amply demonstrated that the "peace element" was to be despised rather than cultivated and made the controlling element in the party.

I personally had full means of knowing, and know that in the early months of 1864 it was the earnest desire of the "peace party" to possess themselves of the Democratic party machinery; that their great aim was to nominate Mr. Seymour of Connecticut for President and Mr. Vandaligham for Vice-President, and make the presidential struggle on that issue. To that end they endeavored to induce members of the National Committee to call an early convention, place the ticket in the field, and thus avail themselves of the nascent feeling of antagonism against the Administration. I was present at the house of George Greer in 28th street at one of these conferences, in the early part of 1864, at which I met Mr. Vandaligham and

several others of the Western "peace party," and at least three members of the Democratic National Committee. Vallandigham there urged his plan of an early convention, and scouted the idea of nominating McClellan, or any other soldier or war Democrat, as puerile in the extreme.

Notlong after this conference, and on March 10, 1864, I was seated beside Reverdy Johnson at dinner, at the house of Richard Wallack in Washington. Mr. Johnson, like myself, was a stanch friend of General McClellan. I narrated to him the substance of what had lately taken place at Mr. Greer's house, when he said: "Vallandigham is crazy. He thinks that he is a martyr, and it has turned his head." He continued, in substance: "The convention should be deferred to the latest possible day. If our armies should be successful meanwhile, notwithstanding the great obstacles they have to contend with, the credit will be due to the President, and not to his advisers. Then he should have no opposition, but be permitted to settle the troubles in his own way. If not, then McClellan should run upon a platform favoring a more vigorous, systematic, and honest prosecution of the war to an early peace through crushing the rebellion and reestablishing the old Union."

Some weeks later, in a conversation with General McClellan, I stated to him Mr. Johnson's remarks to me, and that I thoroughly coincided with them. He assented to them, but said at the same time that he believed that the committee were intent upon calling the convention in July. I thought that at least two months too early, and he apparently concurred.

Later on, and after the terrible battles of the Wilderness, to my knowledge several of McClellan's friends in the army wrote him begging him not to accept a nomination unless circumstances occurred later that would make his success at least probable. One of these letters was written by General Hancock, whose name ranks among the greatest of the heroes of our war. That letter I conveyed from his hand to General McClellan. On reading it the latter expressed much feeling regarding both the writer and the contents of the letter, and asked me to see my lifelong friend Augustus Schell, and bring him that evening to S. L. M. Barlow's house on Madison Square. I did so. The general, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Schell, and myself spent the entire evening in discussing the best means of meeting the issue, he (McClellan) producing several similar letters that he had received from army officers in the field. The result of this was that Messrs. Schell and Barlow took it upon themselves to see as many of the members of the committee as possible, and write others urging that the convention should not be held until the middle of September.

At this prolonged interview at Mr. Barlow's house it was determined that every possible means should be

used to keep Vallandigham and his cohorts in the background as much as possible. That effort was continued, on the part of McClellan's friends, to the end of the campaign. It was thought by both the general and his friends that his letter of acceptance, repudiating the platform by modifying it, would have that effect, but it did not. They seemed determined to follow the principle of rule or ruin, and did so, much to the disgust of General McClellan and his loyal friends, who now think it hard at this late day to have his and their honest and loyal action attributed to "rebel emissaries in Canada."

HARTFORD, CONN.

D. C. Birdsall.

II.—PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT FROM THE SAME STATE.

REFERRING to the work of the Cleveland convention in nominating General Frémont and John Cochrane, the authors of the "Life of Lincoln," on page 286 of the *JUNE CENTURY*, make the following statement:

"No one present seemed to have any recollection of the provision of the Constitution which forbids both of these officers being taken from the same State."

This is manifestly an oversight. The Constitution makes no provisions for national conventions for the nomination of candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States; nor does it make any such prohibition as is implied in the statement quoted. But Article XII. of the Amendments reads: "The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves," etc.

This does not forbid the choosing of both President and Vice-President from the same State; for if all the electors of the several States had cast their votes for General Frémont for President, and the electors of all the States except New York had cast their votes for General Cochrane for Vice-President, both men would have been elected in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

PARK COLLEGE, PARKVILLE, MO. *Wm. H. Tibbals.*

"A Side Light on Greek Art."

THE terra cotta groups which are illustrated in the article under the above title, in this number of the magazine, are owned by the following gentlemen, who courteously give permission for their reproduction:

"Æsculapius and Hygeia with a Dying Woman," Cotter and Co.; "Nymph with Wine-jar and Garland," Thomas B. Clarke; "Beginning the Bacchic Dance," Rollin & Feuardent; "The Boyhood of Bacchus," James W. Ellsworth; "Apollo Discovering in the Baby Mercury the Stealer of his Cows," Brayton Ives.

