CHAPTER XXIII.

SOME OF THE MEN WHO FIGURE IN THIS HISTORY.

GEORGE W. SUMMERS OF KANAWHA.

DIMINUENDO.

No delegate from Western Virginia went into the Richmond Convention with a larger fame than George W. Summers of Kanawha; none came out of it with reputation more diminished. He was a man of proved ability, who in earlier years among Virginia public men had towered like Saul among the prophets. He had held a high place in Virginia public life on the Whig side of politics. He was a consummate orator and was regarded on all sides as a very able man. In the Virginia Convention of 1850-51 he was considered the champion of Western rights and interests, in behalf of which he made a speech that was deemed the greatest effort of his career. In this he clearly showed that all the wrong and discrimination suffered by the West was the outgrowth of the malignant system of slavery which ruled the State. Under the constitution submitted by that Convention, Mr. Summers was a candidate for Governor. He was defeated—
only because of his anti-slavery attitude—by "Jo." Johnson of Harrison, a pro-slavery Democrat, who, without education, without any of the graces of oratory and with a lack of personal pulchritude amounting almost to ugliness, was an acute and successful politician.

Summers was sent to the Richmond Convention of 1861 on pledges of faithfulness to the Union—pledged no less by his whole public life as an opponent of the pro-slavery party in Virginia. He avoided in the Convention a technical betrayal of his pledges by voting against the ordinance of secession; but from facts already stated and others yet to be mentioned, he was clearly far more culpable than many who voted for the ordinance. The mischief done by him was on a larger scale—profound and far-reaching. After his return home (with full purpose to go back and take part with the revolution) he expressed in a printed address to his constituents his acquiescence in secession and his wish to assist in the work of adapting the constitution of Virginia to its new relation to the Confederate States. Apparently at this point his heart failed him and he had not the courage to go back to Richmond and take the part his feelings prompted.

UNSUPPORTED PROFESSIONS.

He emerged from his retirement in 1863 long enough to make a speech at Wheeling trying to excuse his course in dissuading the Union commanders from occupying the Kanawha Valley prior to Wise's descent into it in the Spring of 1861. In this speech, he professed devotion to the principles held by the supporters of the United States
and claimed he had never departed from them—a declaration contradicted flatly by his own printed address to his constituents, and equally by the Lincoln-Baldwin episode detailed elsewhere, then known only to half a dozen people in Richmond and Washington but since disclosed to the world. Summers died in 1868, with a cloud on his fame which is not likely ever to be lifted.

**FATAL CONCESSIONS AT RICHMOND.**

In Mr. Summers' two-days speech in the Richmond Convention, while making unanswerable arguments against both the legality and expediency of secession, he neutralized them all by fatal concessions. "We are all against coercion," he said. "We are all pledging ourselves against the policy of coercion, and rightly." "I recognize the secession of the Cotton-States," he said again, "as an existing fact." It was "a narrow and unphilosophical statesmanship that would regard the movement of those States, as organized commonwealths and by conventional decrees and ordinances, in the light of partial insurrectionary movements in opposition to State authority. Who would compare them with such movements as Shay's Rebellion or the Whiskey Insurrection?" Answering the inquiry, what were best to be done, he said he would "let those States alone." He "would use no force. Force now is Civil War, and with Civil War the bonds of our Union can never be reunited." When a man like Summers could thus surrender the key to the Union position, what hope could there be for men less able deluded by the same fallacy? It was only necessary for the conspirators to
bring events to the convergence where the government would be driven to use force or disband, to put Mr. Summers and all of like faith at their mercy. That was the strategy, and it won; and we have seen how carefully Mr. Summers helped prepare the way.

The fatal weakness of Mr. Summers' attitude in the Richmond Convention, and of others like-minded, was perceived by Horace Greeley who printed in the *Tribune* April 6, 1861, an open letter to the Virginia statesman, from which are these extracts:

We shall readily agree that slavery is at the bottom of our National troubles; and when I add that I accept your speech in the Constitutional Convention of your State, nearly thirty years (?) ago, as in the main a forcible and full expression of my own views on that theme, I shall have disposed of all preliminaries. That speech proves that you are just as well aware as I am that it is slavery, and nothing but slavery, that has dragged Virginia down from the proud position she once held. * * * You know that slavery alone, as you have so forcibly depicted it, has been the overshadowing curse of Virginia, depriving her people of decent roads, of common schools, of manufacturing and mineral development, and of every other element of rapid and beneficent progress. And you have no more doubt than I have (I claim to know only by your public record) that if slavery were expelled from your State to-morrow, the value of her soil would thereby be trebled, the aggregate of her wealth increased, and her population doubled in the next twenty years. When, therefore, you try to say what will be satisfactory to the natural and earnest advocates of free trade, eternal slavery, and all that have made Virginia what she is, you wrong yourself without deceiving them. They know that you are acting a part, and you feel that they cannot deem it a creditable one. * * *

The Union is quite as important to the South as to the North, and you know it. When, therefore, you talk, as in the never-ending conclusions of your Convention, of the "grievances"
of the South and of the "guaranties" you will require of the North, you talk as becomes Secessionists only, and in such manner as to play directly into their hands. And when you talk of the withdrawal of the Gulf States from the Union, as if that were the exercise of a conceded constitutional right, you do your best to show that the professions under which you carried Virginia for Bell were hollow, and yourselves, in consistency with your present views, ought to have voted for Breckenridge and Lane.

His Treachery to the Unionists in the Convention.

In the chapter on the Richmond Convention, the facts touching Mr. Summers' betrayal of President Lincoln's confidence at the critical time in the Convention when the history of that body, and of the country, might have been turned into different channels if he had been faithful to his professions and his friends, are brought out in detail from official sources. Mr. Lincoln's sagacity had perceived, what others did not seem to comprehend, the dangerous folly of holding the Convention in session at Richmond exposed to the campaign of conspiracy—of intimidation, bribery, false promises, flattery and other seductions—when nothing could possibly be gained to the Union cause or to the peace of the country from its presence. "Why don't you adjourn the Convention?" were Mr. Lincoln's first words to Mr. Summers' emissary, whom he supposed to be in full sympathy with his own purpose. Adjourn the Convention! Mr. Baldwin was astounded. That was the last thing to be thought of by himself and other secret rebels masquerading in the garments of Unionists. He would never consent to adjourn till the issue raised by the Secessionists had been settled—as if that
Convention could possibly settle it by staying there except in the way it did. Mr. Lincoln’s proposition was a center shot. Lewis says it would have been accepted by the Union majority of the Convention if it had been made to them. If it had been, it would have disconcerted the conspirators, have broken up all their plans and have forced them into open revolution with far less strength than they derived from the act of secession.

When Baldwin came back with his report of Mr. Lincoln’s offer to evacuate Sumter if the Convention would adjourn, Summers instead of communicating it to the Union men of the Convention continued silent and secret as the grave. When Botts, after being told by President Lincoln, repeated the story of Baldwin’s refusal to sturdy John F. Lewis, he told his room-mate Algernon S. Gray, who jumped out of bed in his surprise and declared he had supposed these facts were known to only three men in Richmond—who must have been himself, Baldwin and Summers. Baldwin, like Summers, voted against the ordinance; but he changed his vote and signed it, received a colonel’s commission in the Confederate army and held a seat in the Confederate Congress throughout the rebellion. What honors and emoluments would have been conferred on Mr. Summers if he had gone back to Richmond, as he expected and desired, who can guess? This Lincoln-Baldwin episode, proven by the sworn testimony of Mr. Baldwin and others, is an “X-ray” on the Kanawha statesman. It illuminates his whole connection with the Convention, interprets the things he said and did at Richmond and after his return home, and shows the faithlessness of his pretended Unionism.
He sent his resignation to Governor Letcher, still recognizing him, and therefore, the rest of the rebels and usurpers at Richmond, as the lawful authorities of the State. Then under date of May 27th, he published a letter to his constituents announcing his resignation and explaining that "nothing but an imperative sense of personal duty" had induced this action. The condition of his family, "with the slow means of communication and transit between this Valley and Richmond" precluded his "absence at such a distance." Entirely willing otherwise to continue to act officially with the rebels and usurpers! He expresses regret that he had not resigned in time to permit the election of a successor May 23d but explains:

AND ACCEPTS THE CONFEDERACY.

"I still entertained hope that I might be able to return to the adjourned session of the Convention which commences on the 12th day of June next. For," he continues, "although the greater question has been decided and the subsequent labors of the Convention will be of less moment and importance comparatively. * * * I was especially desirous to have participated in the amendments and modifications of the State constitution which will become necessary for the Convention to prepare and submit to the people, several of which, in addition to those applicable to inherent defects in the constitution itself, have become essential in consequence of the change which has occurred in our political relations." Fully accepted the
Southern Confederacy and wanted to have a hand in it! When Summers told the Wheeling people in August, 1863, that he had never been anything but a supporter of the government of the United States, he must have forgotten about this address.

"REINFORCING" THE UNIONISTS.

He totally ignored the movement of the Unionists in the Northwest; never went near nor communicated with them. He seems to have been busy making fair weather with the Secessionists around him. There were then, before Wise went down into the Valley, some 1,500 to 1,800 organized Confederate volunteers there; and the reports that reached Wheeling were to the effect that Summers had gone over to all intents and purposes to these rebels and was in full fellowship and co-operation with them. "Yet at Richmond" said the Intelligencer at the time "he had advised the Northwestern members to hurry home and inaugurate their movement, telling them he would be along in a little while to reinforce them." This was reinforcing them with a vengeance! His manifesto was regarded by the Unionists as an abandonment of all that he had professed in former times—and such it was. In the course of the document, from which we have already quoted, Mr. Summers said:

REPELS UNION "INVASION."

The idea suggested by some excitable persons that any portion of the people of this region desire Federal troops to be sent to our soil for our protection, apart from the imputation
which it conveys [?], is simply ridiculous. Our people have recorded their opinions at the polls as freemen. When called upon to act, they will act as becomes them. They neither need nor ask such protection; and any attempt to afford it would be regarded in the light of an invasion, and would most likely unite all classes in its repulsion. All we ask is to be let alone.

One of the first declarations made by the loyal Convention at Wheeling in June, 1861, was that the march of United States troops into Virginia was not an "invasion" but was welcomed for the protection of the rights of her citizens. This reveals the gulf that yawned between Summers and the Union associates he had abandoned. A man of his intelligence did not need to be told that in war, within the theater of action—a theater which could not be limited except by the exigencies of the parties to it—nobody could expect to be let alone. It is true this was all Jefferson Davis asked; but even this trifle could not be permitted him.

UNMOLESTED BY WISE.

It is also true that Mr. Summers personally was let alone when the Confederate army came in—and the fact does not strengthen his claim that he was a supporter of the United States government. While Wise ravaged and destroyed, confiscated and stole, the property of Union men wherever he found it, and made them prisoners when he could, Mr. Summers with a large estate was not disturbed and lost not a penny. Yet nobody impeaches Wise's hatred of Unionists. Summers told his Wheeling audience in 1863 that Wise had given out in passing through Lewisburg that Summers would be the first man
he would hang when he got down into the Kanawha Valley. General Wise did not execute the threat. He would have been very ungrateful to have done so, for nobody had done so much to give him a clear field in that valley. After the restored government had been seated in Richmond, Wise, who used to sometimes lounge in the office of Lewis, Governor Peirpoint’s Secretary of the Commonwealth, told him one day that when he invaded Western Virginia in the Spring of 1861, if he had captured Peirpoint he would have hanged him. But as for hanging Judge Summers—that was a different proposition. His success in hanging John Brown and the glory it conferred on him, rather unsettled Wise on the subject of hanging. There were people forty years ago, and may be a few yet, who believed a little hanging would not have been wasted on Henry A. Wise himself.

KEEPS OUT UNION TROOPS.

The day Mr. Summers dated his address to his constituents about being let alone and not needing the protection of United States troops, Confederate soldiers were in Fetterman, moving up to Grafton to join others just coming in from the South. Mr. Summers was never accused of being a fool. He knew, even if not in the counsels of the rebels, that the immediate invasion of Western Virginia was to be expected. Yet he went to work with great activity to dissuade the Federal commanders in Ohio from sending troops to occupy the Kanawha, going himself to Gallipolis for that purpose and sending a delegation on to Cincinnati to see General McClellan, in
command of the department. He argued this policy in his address, claiming that the Kanawha Valley might maintain a position of neutrality and exemption from military operations.

"Let the military forces on the other side of the Ohio," said this innocent, "so far as there are any, remain on their own soil and let their mission be to preserve the peace and quiet of the border, not to irritate or invite violence." Mr. Summers' coadjutor, Baldwin, argued to Mr. Lincoln that the presence of the garrison in Fort Sumter was calculated to "irritate" the peaceful lambs in Charleston and provoke them to "violence." Therefore the Fort should be evacuated. But Mr. Summers seems to have made no effort to keep out troops which might try to get into his peaceful preserve from the South.

SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS ATTITUDE.

The Wheeling Intelligencer printed Mr. Summers' letter and made the following and other pointed comment on it:

All Judge Summers wants is to be let alone—just like the Secessionists talk. All they wanted here in Wheeling a few weeks ago was to be let alone. "Don't get up your Union organizations," they said; "you will raise an excitement." And while they were talking this way, Governor Letcher was writing letters to Colonel Porterfield to come up here, take our arms, burn the railroad and its bridges, and commit any amount of depredations that might be necessary to make us helpless and defenseless. That is the way the let-alone policy works. It means secession and nothing else. And Judge Summers, when he uses it, is either wilfully or ignorantly playing into the hands of the Secessionists. What the people of the Kanawha Valley need in their midst is United States troops; and we rejoice in the hope and belief that they will see them there before Saturday night.
But that was just what did not happen. Mr. Summers had the ear of McClellan to the exclusion of his Union neighbors who protested. Troops were withheld from the Kanawha until Wise had come in, possessed and ravaged. Then, near the end of the summer an army under General Cox was permitted to go over into Mr. Summers' neutral domain and, with the help of Rosencranz, drive Wise out. Meanwhile, not only the valley of the Kanawha but that of the Guyandotte—indeed, all the Southwest—were overrun and suffered deplorable loss and outrage at the hands of Wise and his subordinates, Jenkins, Witcher and Pate. Albert Gallatin Jenkins, who had been a congressman, immediately on the passage of the ordinance of secession began to raise a cavalry regiment in Cabell County. Now his and similar bands, issuing from Wise's headquarters, overran the country "arresting" Parker says "and taking to Wise's camp incorrigible Unionists; and such as he failed to convert and subdue, Wise forwarded to Richmond." Mr. Parker himself and Henry J. Samuels had to leave their homes to escape Wise's vengeance. Mr. Parker left his house at Guyandotte on the third of July "about an hour," he says, "before a squad of Jenkins' cavalry came to arrest me and take me to Wise's headquarters."

SATAN LET LOOSE IN KANAWHA.

A vivid picture of Wise's drastic treatment of the Unionists in the Kanawha Valley during his reign of terror there in the Summer of 1861 is found in an account given to the editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer by some gentlemen from that region who visited Wheeling in
November of that year. The following is an editorial statement of their report in the issue of that paper for November 29, 1861:

Since early in the summer, the valley has been the scene of warfare. Wise came among the people as a besom of devastation. He literally laid bare the country all around him. His worthless promises to pay are left widespread among the people: but their corn, their wheat, their oats, their hay, their bacon—their all—is gone, to be heard of no more. He took horses, mules, wagons, and impressed them in his service, both as he came and as he left. He paid for nothing the whole time. His cavalry sustained themselves by depredating first upon one farm and then upon another. They roved from field to field, from locality to locality, like droves of grasshoppers. They let down fences, entered and fed their horses from grain in the shock. They took corn and oats from the barns. They quartered themselves at the tables of the farmers like so many brigands and footpads, never even giving so much as a slip of Wise's script in return. Their trail was desolation everywhere. The infantry were provided for by the script system. Foragers were sent out whose duty it was to spy out the fat places, to stay and make valuation on farm products, to store houses of provisions, etc., and give the owners certificates therefor. If the owners objected, the property was considered sold in spite of the objection, and was transferred to the wagons just as though it had been paid for in gold. Nothing was allowed to interfere. In like manner clothing and everything else that was of value was taken.

In the town of Charleston, the case of two young Jews, clothes dealers, afforded a distressing example of Wise's brutality. He got hold of a letter which one of them had written to a dealer in the East, at the bottom of which was a note indicating his sympathy with the Union. Wise had him and his brother arrested and thrown into prison; and on being visited by a lawyer on their behalf, revealed a depth of devilish brutality that astounded his visitor beyond belief. He said he intended to have these Jews shot unless they made over their stock of goods to him; that if they would assign the goods, he would
not shoot them; but that he wanted it understood that either through blood or an instrument of writing he intended to have the goods. The lawyer (from whose own lips we have these facts) went back to the poor fellows and told them the sorry tale. He left them in prison in tears. The sequel was that Wise took the property and carried them away captive with him.

The old demon used to curse frightfully. His profanity was most disgusting. When he had no one else to curse, he cursed O. Jennings, his son, and cursed him roundly, too. Especially did he belabor him when Jennings remonstrated against destroying the beautiful and costly bridge over Elk River. His whole bearing was that of a maniac devil—seemingly let loose to fill a portion of the unexpired term of Satan himself. Never did a people more rejoice to see a pestilence leave their midst than the people of Kanawha to see Wise compelled to make off. The feeling was not confined to Union men; it was general.

In his message to the Legislature in December, 1861, Governor Peirpoint called attention to the lamentable condition of the southern section of the State which had been overrun by the secession forces:

There seems to be no doubt that nearly all the able-bodied men between sixteen and sixty have been forced into the Confederate army, including thousands who are at heart true to the Constitution and the Union. Public improvements—railroads, canals, bridges and public buildings—have been destroyed wherever the secession forces have had control. Rapine and plunder have marked their path; and men arrogating to themselves a superior civilization, derived, as they say, from the existence of negro slavery among them, have abandoned the rules of civilized warfare and made war like savages, a scene of indiscriminate and useless destruction. A large proportion of the slaves have been sent farther South for security. All the live stock within the rebel lines has been seized for the use of the army. Farms have been stripped of horses, wagons, fencing and timber, and the houses of the people of blankets and even clothing—whatever, in short, could be made useful to the soldiers. The property of men known or supposed to be true to the Union has been taken without compensation, and they
regard themselves fortunate whose lives are spared. The property which is pretended to be paid for is paid for in treasury notes of the Confederate States, or in bank notes issued on the deposit of such treasury notes. This currency, even at Richmond, is already at a discount of not less than thirty per cent—really valueless. In those counties where loyalty to the Union has prevailed, I am happy to announce, the people to a great extent have been spared the ravages of Civil War, and the powers of the State government are now in the hands of true men.

The man very largely responsible for these calamities remained, most of his time, on his farm some twenty miles from Charleston, in peace and security—unmolested, as Woods of Barbour would say, losing neither sleep nor property but losing what men everywhere deem inestimable, the respect and confidence of those who had put faith in his professions as a man and citizen.

**THE MISTAKE OF HIS LIFE.**

It is a curious and instructive commentary, no less on the instability of men than on the vicissitudes of politics, that a man of Mr. Summers' caliber—whose life-long and commendable aspirations for public distinction had been antagonized and defeated by the pro-Slavery party of Virginia, which now, by easy transition, had become the party of secession, should have finally surrendered to it in the ripe maturity of his powers, under pressure of a crisis which was about to overthrow forever the malign power which his intellect and moral convictions had forced him to resist all his life. If he had only remained true to these—to himself—through that crisis, he would have emerged with a distinction and honor which would have crowned the best labors and purposes of his career.
Both in the Richmond Convention and for a short time after his return home, Waitman T. Willey held an attitude not unlike Mr. Summers. But the case at home was a little different with them. Summers’ constituency included a large and influential secession element; Willey’s practically none. Summers was a rich man and could afford to sulk in his tent if he chose. Not so with Willey. Both labored under the disability, as it was given out, of having a relative in ill health consideration and care for whom afforded a reasonable pretext for retirement. But while Mr. Summers was independent, the exigencies of Mr. Willey’s circumstances brought him around into cooperation with the reorganization movement in time to profit by the election of senators under the restored government; and only ten days after the rebel Convention at Richmond had discussed whether he was or was not “disloyal” to them, and had given him the benefit of the doubt by refusing to expel him along with the rest of the “traitors,” he was elected by the Legislature at Wheeling to the United States Senate. Mr. Summers held on in his recalcitrant course, but two years later, when he found he had made a mistake, went to Wheeling and made a speech in attempted exculpation of himself.

In the old ante-bellum times, Summers and Willey were the “wheel-horses” of the Whig party in Western Virginia. Both were famous stump speakers. In the Richmond Convention both took high rank for ability and
oratory; and both made fervid speeches on the side of the Union—yet guarded and negative, standing in that zone of Border-State conservatism which recognized in a vague way the undefined grievance of the State against the general government, and conceding, as the accepted method of putting themselves in touch with those to whom their arguments were addressed, certain essentials fatal to the outcome of their whole argument. In one of these speeches of Mr. Willey from which quotation is elsewhere made, it was more than implied that if the hypothetical wrongs of Virginia, which nobody ever attempted to precisely define, should not be righted by legal and constitutional redress, he was prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with the revolutionary Wise and bring ten thousand strong arms from the Northwest in the ultima ratio as against the oppressor. That is what the phillipic meant if it meant anything. If as Fontaine Smith claimed, this was only Mr. Willey's way of winning his rebellious auditory, the method was not without its perils. It was playing with fire; for Mr. Wise might reasonably have been led to expect that when his army of invasion got across the mountains these ten thousand strong arms, with Mr. Willey at their head, would hasten to join his standard. The whole theory of such argument was wrong. There was no hope of winning back the secession conspirators. Argument was wasted on them. It was the weak-kneed Unionists who needed bracing up. What they needed was not baby-food, but nourishing diet and tonics such as were administered by Carlile.

Mr. Willey, himself a slaveholder, was intensely pro-slavery in his sympathies. He had been on intimate terms,
politically and personally, with Whig politicians; had been a candidate for Lieutenant Governor on their ticket with Goggin two years before. He sought to stand well with them. He had political aspirations which his talents justified; and no politician with his leanings could see any future in Virginia at that time if he did not fall in with the pro-slavery ideas that ruled the Commonwealth. In the Richmond Convention, his great embarrassment was that he represented the hottest Union county in the Northwest, right up against the Pennsylvania border. It was hard to please the old Virginia regime without offending the constituency at home. It was a situation to keep a man on the ragged edge and undermine his constitution.

Mr. Willey voted against his Northwestern colleagues on Carlyle's decisive motion to strike from the report of the Federal Relations Committee the declaration that the United States must not enforce the laws in the seceded States. In the presidential campaign the year before, he was a supporter—I believe an elector—of the Bell and Everett ticket, which stood on a platform for "the enforcement of the laws." He was especially bitter against the Republican party and against Mr. Lincoln as its successful representative; and gave expression to this feeling as late as the Fall of 1861, in an election circular when a candidate for a seat in the Constitutional Convention, when merely party feeling among Union men had been nearly everywhere forgotten. Yet can any one, in the clearer light of the intervening forty years, point out to-day any other party in the United States which in the election of 1860 could possibly have organized enough resistance to the growing insurrection to have saved this
Nation from going to pieces, or to have saved it on any moral basis except hostility to slavery?

When Mr. Willey came home from Richmond, it soon appeared that his position was equivocal; that he was not in harmony with the movement in the Northwest to resist the usurpation; and it was freely reported that on the way back through Virginia he had made a speech very severely arraying the President for issuing the call for troops—as if there was any other thing left for the President to do, unless he was to basely abandon his post of duty and surrender the government to its assailants. This speech is referred to by Mr. Parker in his "Formation" as an exhortation to the people of Virginia "to repel any invasion of Virginia's soil by the Yankees."

But Mr. Willey was a man of fine talents and engaging qualities, whom neighbors and friends wanted to save to the Union cause, and to his friends and family, if they could. Peirpoint's anxiety to have him attend the May Convention, and the zeal of Leroy Kramer and others to make him senator, was in part an expression of this wish. But in the May Convention he was clearly out of sympathy with the popular feeling as there manifested, and asked to be excused from service on its committee which was to formulate the business of the Convention on plea of necessary absence, though he remained to the end. And notwithstanding the fact that the State was already in the military possession of the Southern Confederacy, he professed to believe that the first duty before them was to try to defeat the ratification of the ordinance of secession. He did not appear again in public co-operation with the movements at Wheeling in the Summer of 1861; but
when the State government had been successfully reorganized and recognized at Washington; when the Federal troops had driven out the rebel invaders and held the mountain inlets into the Northwest, and when, under these conditions of assured safety and success, the Legislature of the restored government came together and proceeded to fill the senatorships made vacant by the treason of Hunter and Mason, he became a candidate, and, to the very general surprise, was elected over Lamb and Van Winkle, who had all summer been doing heroic service in the work of reorganization. In the House of Delegates, he was nominated by Fontaine Smith, who apologized at length for his candidate's short-comings. Mr. Smith said:

I am aware that it has been said that Mr. Willey's course heretofore has been too conservative, and his speeches in the Convention at Richmond have been pointed out as evidence of that conservatism; and also certain flings at the Administration; certain ifs and ands and certain recommendations in relation to compromise. Let me say, what I believe it almost unnecessary to say and what every gentleman must know, that a speech adapted to a Wheeling audience or this body would be ill adapted to a Convention at Richmond. He had, sir, when there to temporize his arguments; he had to address his auditory according to their prejudices; and hence he may not have come out so fully as we would have desired at that time. He adopted the language of the illustrious Apostle: "Babes will not endure meat." They must be fed on weak diet. The arguments we advance here would not suit the people at Richmond. * * *

He engaged in that species of argumentation for the purpose of winning and captivating and carrying along with him that people. He erred in judgment, I know, sir, but not in motive. For they did not desire reason or judgment, or anything but rebellion; they were going into that headlong in spite of logic and everything else.
I know, too, it has been charged upon Mr. Willey that he did not stand up to Mr. Lincoln when he issued his proclamation after the fall of Sumter. But who among us did not at that moment waver? Not in relation to the constitutionality of such a course; but I put the question to gentlemen whether they did not at that moment doubt the propriety of it? Did they not believe if that proclamation had not been precipitated upon us we could have fixed up some sort of a compromise which would have been honorable to us and would have restored harmony in the South.

If ever man was "damned with faint praise," Mr. Willey was in this speech of Smith's.

Mr. Parker thinks the secret of Mr. Willey's sudden and successful emergence was the aid of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which he was a zealous and eminent communicant. This church was at that time a political power in the Northwest. In the chapter contributed by Mr. Burdett, will be found his theory of the matter; and perhaps if we accept a combination of the two, we shall not go far astray. Mr. Carlile's election was the spontaneous tribute of all classes and creeds in recognition of his heroic attitude in the Richmond Convention and his subsequent services at home; Mr. Willey's was the result of an adroit still-hunt of some kind, for he had not yet done anything to entitle him to the popular gratitude, or even confidence, and it was not even known he was a candidate till nominated in the two houses of the Legislature.

In the Richmond (rebel) Convention, June 29, 1861, after the recess, report of the Committee on Elections was taken up, recommending "expulsion of disloyal members," and the recommendation of the committee agreed to. Hon. William G. Brown of Preston was the first to walk the
plank. Then "the other names on the list were taken up seriatim and the traitors expelled," they being: Burley, Burdett, Carlile, E. B. Hall, Hubbard, Jackson, McGrew, Porter, Stuart of Doddridge and Tarr. "In the case of Willey of Monongalia," the report in the Richmond paper continues, "an animated debate and interchange of views took place. Statements affecting the loyalty of Mr. Willey and remarks upon the weight of evidence presented pro and con were submitted by several members. The report was then, on motion of Mr. Haymond, recommitted to the Committee on Elections." No doubt Mr. Haymond's personal friendship had something to do with this tenderness towards Mr. Willey; yet the facts inevitably suggest the equivocal attitude Mr. Willey held in that Convention. There was no hesitation about expelling Carlile, Burdett and the rest of the "traitors." After Mr. Willey had been in the Senate several months, he was expelled from the Richmond Convention, not on a report from the committee but on the motion of an individual member. The Convention could hardly do less.

In the Senate, after the defection of Mr. Carlile, under pressure of the public demand from West Virginia, Mr. Willey yielding to the obvious necessity of the case, fell in with the current then setting strongly in favor of the erection of the New State, and did good service in the later discussion in the Senate, and there is no doubt of his zeal and sincerity in that behalf from that time on. He had cast his fortunes with the measure and there was no reason why he should not desire its success. No cause ever lacked friends after its success was assured. It was hardly fair, though, for the friends of Mr. Willey to claim for
him all the credit of the "Willey Amendment;" which was not his measure in any sense save the technical one that it was offered by him; for in offering the first substitute in which emancipation was embodied, he distinctly disavowed that feature of it on the floor of the Senate, declaring it an advance beyond what was "personally agreeable" to him, in deference to the manifest determination of the Senate to pass no bill without such a provision.

In 1876 was published a letter addressed to Mr. Willey by Hon. Jacob Beeson Blair of Parkersburg, certifying to the Senator's zeal in behalf of the New State bill when before Congress and when it was in the hands of the President. It is far from clear that Mr. Blair was quite in position to furnish such testimonials. At the critical time when Mr. Carlile's Trojan-horse had been introduced in the Senate, Mr. Parker reports the three Western Virginia members in the House were quite indifferent. They apparently believed a corresponding indifference existed among their constituents. Mr. Whaley declared the bill for admission could not get a vote in the House. His attitude is confirmed by a statement made by Mr. Willey in the Constitutional Convention that he believed Mr. Whaley was "opposed to the whole project of the New State." But when West Virginia began to be heard from, these gentlemen began to warm up. Mr. Blair's later heat, like the Senator's to which he testifies, seems to have been developed under pressure from home. The production of heat by pressure, whether in politics or physics, accords with scientific principles.

Of the Northwestern delegates who withdrew from the Richmond Convention, Mr. Willey was the only one who
felt it necessary to fortify his reputation with the testi-
monials of friends. The others were content to accept
the judgment of their contemporaries and of posterity
upon the open and notorious facts. Perhaps Mr. Willey's
place in history would not have suffered, in dignity at
least, if he had been content to do the same.
Gen. John J. Jackson of Wood was conspicuous in the Richmond Convention as a champion of Western rights, but his ardor cooled when he got back home. He had talked boldly at Richmond in the early part of the session when the Union tide seemed to be coming in about what he would do and what the West would do in the event of secession; but his first appearance after he came home indicated, if not a change of heart, at least a change of manifestation. He went to the May Convention without the holding of any county convention, or the formal appointment of delegates in any other manner, as recommended in the Clarksburg meeting, accompanied by a numerous claque, and insisted on organizing that body as a mass-meeting, so that his claque might have its hundred voices against Carlile's five regularly chosen. Three men appeared to be jealous of Carlile, whose courageous defiance of the conspirators at Richmond had, in the popular estimation, placed him at the head of public matters in West Virginia. These were Jackson, Willey and Peirpoint. General Jackson's course at the opening of the May Convention created a good deal of feeling; and if he had persisted might have disrupted it and defeated the high hopes and great results which depended on it. When Carlile was pressing his immediate division plan, Jackson threatened to take his hat and leave the hall—like the spoiled child which threatens to take its playthings and go home. Again when Polsley asked to have the final report of the Committee on State and Federal Relations, which came in
late at night and embodied the work of three days' sittings, laid over until morning so there might be a little time to examine and consider it, General Jackson objected; he wanted to go home; it was "corn-planting time."

The Jacksons were a wealthy, and therefore influential, family. The old "General" as he was called, had grown to be rather arrogant and dogmatic. It required a good deal of deference to keep him in working line. If he could not have his unquestioned way, he was apt to make a row. There were plenty of loyalists in that Convention who did not have to be either persuaded or bribed to be such. They were Unionists from principle, not for precedence, nor "for revenue." A suspicion attaches to the Jacksons at this period that they did not rise to quite this serene level of patriotism; that so influential a name had to be suitably recognized before it could be brought into cordial support of the government. Indeed, some of the offshoots were clear on the other side of the fence. In administrative circles it was a time of doubt, uncertainty, anxiety. There was a great deal of groping in the dark. Many Border-State Union men expected to be taken care of; others had to be consulted, deferred to, placated. It was especially important to hold Western Virginia in line and conciliate doubtful elements. Under advice of party friends, in whom he had to trust, Mr. Lincoln in this crisis made some appointments which he and his friends found abundant cause to regret when it was too late to recall them. The self-seekers came in for a largely disproportionate share of the appointments; and in West Virginia at least one of them has proved to the Republican Sinbad a veritable "old man of the sea."
About the last of June, 1861, a correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial, writing from Grafton, said:

When at Parkersburg, I was curious to see General Jackson, the most conspicuous and one of the most influential citizens of that region. He is an object of general curiosity and suspicion. The common people have no faith in him; but he professes Union sentiments and was extremely attentive to Generals McClellan and Rosencranz and their staffs, and to all the principal field officers who were in Parkersburg. He is a keen, sharp-featured, determined looking man, positive in deportment and impatient of constraint. He may be earnest in his professions of his fidelity, but he neither acts nor speaks like a man sincerely devoted to the Union. He expressed a fond wish that this expedition might be victorious, but our impression was that he was merely indulging in cheap lip service. At this time he is anxious about the fate of James M. Jackson, one of his sons, who a few days ago was arrested at Clarksburg on suspicion of treason, together with ten or a dozen influential citizens of that place.

The Cleveland Leader about this time, referring to the outlook in Western Virginia and the June Convention, about to meet, remarked:

The report says that General Jackson will probably be the provisional governor. Whatever his executive abilities may be, we cannot think from what we saw of him at the former Convention that he is the man for the position. And if it be true, as reported a few days ago, that when the Ohio troops entered Parkersburg he complained of their "trampling down his grass," the people will agree with us. If he has not loyalty enough to spare an acre of grass for the sake of the salvation of his State, he will hardly do for Governor.

This was doubtless written by Mr. Page, who had been the representative of the Leader at the May Convention.
CARLILE THE LEADER.

In a limited sense, Carlile was the Mirabeau of the Western Virginia revolution—in that he was the most intrepid, forceful, commanding figure early in the struggle; and in that the people were swayed by his eloquence somewhat as Thomas Carlyle says they were by Mirabeau in Provence: "The wild multitudes moved under him as under the moon do the billow of the sea." Carlile showed himself mightily in earnest from the time he entered the Richmond Convention till he went to the Senate five months later. Despite his apostacy in the Senate, let us not believe but he was sincere at the time in his noble attitude in the Convention. There he did not mince matters, nor adapt his speeches, as Willey and Summers did, to the delicate political digestion of the hypothetical Unionists in that body. He told them the wholesome truth in plain and sometimes eloquent English. His manner of speech was distasteful to the conspirators in the Convention, as it was to the mob in the galleries and elsewhere. He was one of the limited number of loyalists in that body who realized that the purpose of the conspirators was a deadly one and involved the gravest consequences; one of the few who dared openly on the floor declare the right of the National government to enforce its authority in Virginia and elsewhere in the South. Not all his subsequent fault, grievous as it was, can cancel the debt we owe Carlile for his defense of the Union on the floor of that epochal body, from whom was to issue the edict that should open vials of wrath more devastating than those seen by the Revelator; where, with treachery and cowardice all around
him within, and angry mobs ready to burn him in effigy or hang him in the original in the streets, he dared to utter these glowing words:

And now, Mr. President, in the name of our illustrious dead; in the name of all the living; in the name of millions yet unborn—I protest against this wicked effort to destroy the fairest and freest government on the earth. And I denounce all attempts to involve Virginia—to commit her to self-murder—as an insult to all reasonable living humanity and a crime against God! With the dissolution of this Union, I hesitate not to say, the sun of our liberty will be set forever.

When the Western delegates returned home, Carlile easily rose to the leadership of the loyal movement in the Northwest. His readiness, his earnestness, his force, his commanding oratory, won admiration and assent wherever he spoke. In the May Convention in the advocacy of a plan crude and impracticable for immediate separation from Virginia, so captivating was his speech and presence that he carried the popular applause till Peirpoint gave way to pique and complained that all others were pushed aside.

It is true, and it plainly so appears in the story of these pages, that Mr. Carlile lacked the constructive strength necessary for the highest and enduring success. He could not project himself into the untried and unknown and find with constructive foresight the safe and only way to bridge the abyss, like Lamb; but as a leader bringing popular opinion up to the point where the methodisers could take up the work, he did invaluable service, which must not be underestimated now.

When first heard on a serious theme, Carlile impressed one with his eloquence and power. In time the
listener to frequent speeches perceived his limitations. He was not a Mirabeau in profundity, nor in the overmastering force which sweeps men away from all their moorings of him who for a time carried the secret burdens of France—alike of the Revolution and of the imbecile monarchy tottering towards the guillotine—on his Atlantean shoulders.

Carlile was a native Virginian, born at Winchester and self-educated. His father was a lawyer of brilliancy and power; his mother a Marshall of the line of the Chief Justice. After he had studied law he crossed the mountains and began the practice at Beverly. He finally settled at Clarksburg, which had long been the seat of a refined social circle and an able bar. In 1855 he went to the House of Representatives on the Know-Nothing wave, and at the end of his term returned to his law practice. After later vicissitudes, he returned to his old home and friends at Clarksburg and there ended his life in 1878.

When Mr. Carlile was chosen to the Senate in the Summer of 1861, he was at the zenith of his fame. He was the idol of the Union people of Western Virginia. He had caught the commendatory notice of the whole country as the Virginia champion of the Union who had snatched a loyal State from the wreck of the Old Dominion. He possessed the confidence of the administration and of the Union majority in both houses of Congress. No man in the country in civil life had at that moment a greater future within his reach. Truly, like Wolsey, he had blossomed and bore his blushing honors thick upon him. But in an evil hour he seems to have listened to the suggestions of the tempter, and when he fell it was like Lucifer, never to rise again.
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The people of Western Virginia, in their emergency, were fortunate in having the co-operation and services of Daniel Lamb, who had given up the law some years before and at the opening of the war was cashier of the Northwestern Bank at Wheeling. He was sought out by those who needed his help in the public emergency; and busy as he was in his responsible post, he gave it without stint.

Mr. Lamb's mind, by nature or through training, or both, was peculiarly logical and legal. He was judicial in temper; could see the merit of a thing not his own; was always ready to help along the measures or ideas of his friends, though they might differ from his own, and to put them in the best shape for presentation.

At the opening of the movement in the Northwest there was a lack of digested plan not surprising in such an emergency, painfully evident in the May Convention. The determination was hot enough, and the object obvious enough, but the way was not yet clear. All soon came to see that Mr. Carlile's first plan of setting up a State government for the Northwest and finding the authority afterwards, would not do; and he soon saw this himself; but what would do was not so easily worked out. To Mr. Lamb more than to any other one, I believe, is due the credit of solving the problem. It was his far-seeing comprehension and his power of putting things together in orderly sequence which found a way through the obscurities
of a situation that afforded no precedents. He, beyond all others, was able to think out connectedly the successive legal steps necessary on the untrodden way before them. Mr. Carlile's plans were only provisional, perhaps revolutionary. Others had fragmentary ideas of measures necessary—glimpses of the path along which they sought to advance. Mr. Lamb planned for regularity and permanence; and it was his clear discernment of the legal bearings of the successive measures needed which blazed the way through the obscurity.

Judge Cranmer of Wheeling, an associate at the bar and life-long friend of Mr. Lamb, wrote me after this estimate of Mr. Lamb had been written: "I have been
astonished that such meager mention has been made of the man who was really the main factor in the accomplishment of the work of the Convention, and who was consulted and advised with before any important steps were taken."

Mr. Lamb frankly avowed himself against the New State measure at the time it was brought forward, deeming the time and circumstances inopportune; but with equal frankness and the sincerity characteristic of him, he declared that if the Convention chose a different course, he should "join heartily, fairly and honestly in carrying out their wishes." And that is exactly what he did. But if the reorganization of Virginia had not been laid on the unassailable foundations of legal and constitutional regularity prepared by him, the procedure for the New State must have fallen to the ground, for it did not lack enemies lying in wait to overthrow it at every stage.

All familiar with the work of those years in the conventions and in the Legislature of the New State, wherever Mr. Lamb took a hand, know what an indefatigable and admirable draftsman he was. He was the Madison of that time—and the comparison is quite as much to the credit of Mr. Madison as of Mr. Lamb. His mastery of every subject he touched was surprising; his facility in the execution of work unequalled. Every document he drew, down to the smallest detail, seemed to have been shaped in his mind before he began to put it on paper; and in writing, each detail fell into place with the ease and precision of well-trained battalions. Besides the ordinances of the earlier conventions, much of Mr. Lamb's work went into the constitution. Here Mr. Van Winkle was a very
able second, fitted both by his abilities and by his studies in connection with the Virginia Convention of 1850-51 for such work. In the first West Virginia House of Delegates, which sat in continuous session five or six months after the inauguration of the State, remodeling old statutes and making new ones to fit the new constitution, the bulk of this work was put upon Mr. Lamb, who performed it cheerfully and faultlessly. Every morning at the opening he would come into the House with a budget of bills, written in his dainty chirography—faultless in punctuation, paragraphing and arrangement; the lines written just a little above the ruling so that they looked as if faintly underscored—and the wonder all felt was not only as Goldsmith puts it, how one head could contain it all, but where he ever found the time and strength to perform the labor. The type-writer was yet unknown. The work was done so quietly that his associates scarcely realized or appreciated the magnitude of the labor, the quality of the work turned out or the unselfish sacrifice of him by whom it was done. No committee chairman who rose to explain his measures could put his explanation into so few, so terse, so clear and convincing sentences. Mr. Lamb made not the least pretence at oratory. He spoke quietly, earnestly, with little gesture or inflection, seeking only to express his thoughts; and these he stated with the same lucidity and precision as he did on paper. There was nothing redundant, nothing for captandum. He was in all things, speaking or writing, the same plain, sincere, unpretending yet wise and able counsellor.
The one man who exercised a powerful and enduring influence on the fortunes of Northwestern Virginia—who went beyond any other in moulding public opinion towards the result—a free and separate State—but who does not appear among the professional artificers of the structure, nor among those who enjoyed the honors and emoluments of success, was Archibald W. Campbell, editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer. Like Peirpoint, with whom he was always in close touch, Mr. Campbell was a poor politician. Both were too earnest and single minded to give themselves to self-seeking. Peirpoint accepted a post and duty surrounded with danger and rather shunned than sought by his contemporaries; and having served the public ends in this difficult place, in a most trying time, with scanty thanks from those he most directly served—without trying to promote his own personal fortunes—he went back when his thankless task was finished, and he had been made the victim of a legislative Frankenstein at Richmond, to his modest home by the Monongahela and sat down again to earn his bread and butter as an attorney. Impelled by a kindred sincerity and devotedness of purpose, Mr. Campbell gave himself without reserve to the work of educating and preparing the people of Northwestern Virginia for the high destiny he had faith to believe awaited them. When the time of fruition came—as it did in an unexpected way—he left it to others more adroit, less deserving—less scrupulous possibly—to reap the harvest he had sown.
ARCHIBALD W. CAMPBELL.
Mr. Campbell came of good stock, and combined in his make-up a fine quality of brains with an ever finer probity—the "invincible probity" which Emerson attributes to Montaigne. In his paternal ancestry there was blended the sturdy, conscientious Scotch-Irish with a strain of French Huguenot—a heredity likely to tell for force and brilliancy; which may explain the traits that in Mr. Campbell's career were best known to his contemporaries. On his mother's side, he came of an old New England ancestry of genuine Puritan breeding.

At Bethany College Mr. Campbell laid the foundation for the liberal education to which every year of his busy and studious life made additions. A term at a law school where he sat at the feet of that Gamaliel of free-soil, William H. Seward, probably helped give to his political thought a direction in consonance with his innate principles. He began newspaper work in 1856 on the *Intelligencer* and later in the same year joined John F. McDermot, then printing Bishop Campbell's "Millenial Harbinger," at Bethany, in the purchase of the *Intelligencer*. At that time it being understood the new proprietors expected to make a Republican paper, it was predicted that within six months their press would be in the Ohio River. The five years that followed were years of struggle for existence; but it was a case of the survival of the fittest. The young editor, wiser than his years, laid out a programme of deliberate, cautious, steadfast advocacy of free-soil principles. He took the highest ground on the Republican side of American politics—then just beginning to stir profoundly the moral consciousness of the North—and maintained it with a dignity and ability that commanded the
respect of enemies and the confidence of friends. In a pro-slavery community, in a slave State, at a period when the oligarchy controlled the National government and silenced public opinion even in the North, it seemed a perilous venture to try to establish an anti-slavery journal in the Panhandle of Virginia. Yet courage born of conviction is a wonderful solvent of difficult problems. Though through these years, many a week did not know where the money was to come from to pay the Saturday composition strings, or the next paper bill, yet somehow it came, like the manna in the wilderness; and each morning this brave John the Baptist continued to proclaim in that corner of Virginia the gospel of freedom, which was not many years thence to possess that land. The paper lived; the editor did not recant his faith; the public, despite the threats of the ruffianly element which had its inspiration in Richmond, continued to tolerate, to endure, finally to approve and patronize. It was a day of small things, but better days and larger results were to come.

When the crisis was reached at Richmond, in the Spring of 1861, Mr. Campbell went there and spent some time studying the problem at short range. He had never a moment's doubt as to the supreme duty of the hour; never felt it expedient to curry favor with the aristocratic disloyal element either at Richmond or at home; was not shaken in his loyalty to the United States by the President's call for troops. There was never an instant's misgiving or hesitation in making known his attitude of unqualified Unionism. His paper became at once and continued to be the exponent and medium of the loyal sentiment of its section. Mr. Campbell's personal high charac-
ter, his fearlessness, his bold and steadfast advocacy of resistance to the Richmond programme and later usurpa
tion, made his paper a power at home and respected else­
where as an exponent of loyal Western Virginia.

As the evolution of events brought to the front the proposition for division, it found its earliest friend and faithfulest supporter in Mr. Campbell, who saw no reason for separation from Virginia that was not equally a rea­son for separation from slavery. When the Convention which framed the constitution for the New State refused to incorporate in it, or even submit separately, a mild pro­vision for gradual emancipation, he warned them they were wasting their time to go to Washington with such an organic law.

When the New State was fighting for its life at the National capital, no one labored more effectively with members of the two houses, with whom he had a wide acquaintance. The fate of the New State was in the hands of the Republican majority in each house, and it was these that Mr. Campbell was able to most influentially reach. When Thad Stevens said he voted for admission because he had confidence in the people of West Virginia “and in the worthy men sent here to represent them,” it was a tribute to Mr. Campbell and his co-laborers, among whom none was more widely or more favorably known than he. It was he more than any one else who enlisted the interest and aid of Bingham, the “old man eloquent” of Ohio, who took West Virginia under his arm and car­ried us through the shoals and floods of the House. It was he, above all others, who waked up the sturdy old
senator from the Western Reserve, who stood godfather for us in the Senate after the defection of Carlile.

When it came to the election of senators for the New State in 1863 and again in 1865, some of Mr. Campbell's friends put forward his name; but the Legislature was more impressed by the names of other candidates, pressed in one case by a powerful church organization, in the other by a railroad corporation. Mr. Campbell would not deviate from his path in the least to propitiate the legislative gentlemen—indeed, had not long before criticised them sharply for taking pay during a recess. Public bodies, like some other bodies, are grateful for things to come rather than for things past. Mr. Campbell's claims to their consideration lay on a level rather too high for the average legislative appreciation. He could help other people into the Senate but he could not—or would not—help himself in the least.

After Mr. Campbell's death, the editor of the Intelligencer was moved to say:

It is no exaggeration to say that no State owed a man so much and paid so little of the obligation; that no man worked so unselfishly for the consummation of an object and received so few of the rewards for honorable efforts and conspicuous success. These lines are not written in the sense of a reproach but in justice to truth. This lack of tangible gratitude on the part of the State has many explanations which would perhaps be in bad taste in these columns.

It should not be inferred from this that Mr. Campbell did not enjoy the popular confidence and esteem, for he did in an eminent degree.
In his later career, he was as capable and successful in business and affairs as he had been admirable as a leader of public opinion. A student all his life, he grew in intellectual riches and power with every year; and in later years rounded out his accomplishments, knowledge and character by extensive travel.

While he took no part in "practical" politics, he maintained a kindly attitude towards political friends and was always ready to help them and to promote policies he believed in the interest of the public. No man more thoroughly possessed throughout the State the respect of people of all parties. His attitude towards the West Virginia public was one of dignity and independence, but of amity and co-operation with political friends. He did not need to engage in politics for a livelihood, but he never lost his solicitude for the upbuilding of the State he had done so much to found. John H. Atkinson, one of the few survivors of the times and labors in which Mr. Campbell's earlier years were spent, and who was on terms of intimate friendship with him and in full sympathy with his anti-slavery attitude and work, says to me in a letter just received, that "Campbell was the leading spirit in West Virginia, with whom I rejoiced in every triumph that came to the Union cause and to the cause of human liberty."