

The Miscegenation Issue in the Election of 1864

Author(s): Sidney Kaplan

Source: *The Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Jul., 1949), pp. 274-343

Published by: Association for the Study of African American Life and History

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2715904>

Accessed: 19-06-2016 13:24 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Association for the Study of African American Life and History is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Negro History*

THE MISCEGENATION ISSUE IN THE ELECTION OF 1864

“Early in 1943,” wrote Helen Fuller in a recent issue of the *New Republic*, “Governor Sam Jones of Louisiana and Frank Dixon of Alabama invited the Conference of Southern Governors to join them in the formation of a new Southern Democratic Party, dedicated to ‘State’s Rights and White Supremacy.’” The plan failed — but was not abandoned. The day after Roosevelt was elected to his fourth term, one Charles Wallace Collins, a constitutional lawyer practicing in Washington, D. C., retired from active practice and “settled down in his Washington Press Building office to write a book stating the case for a return to the rule of the South by a small minority of well-to-do whites, qualified by ‘superior birth and intelligence’ to decide” what was best for everyone. In December 1947, “just as the more foresighted of the Southern Republicrats were beginning to think about what kind of ‘revolt’ they should plan for 1948,” his book *Whither Solid South?*, was published by the obscure Pelican Press of New Orleans. This “second-rate book” was intended by its “unknown author” to become “the ‘Mein Kampf’ of a new movement.”

Collins, to be sure, fancied himself “the John C. Calhoun of a new Secession,” and in his book dwelt “at length on the historical and ethnic bases of white supremacy, the illegality of the Fourteenth Amendment, the moral and religious case for continuing segregation,” winding up with a proposal for “a forty-ninth state in Africa.” What is of interest here is the technique suggested for accomplishing these things. For, according to Collins, it was entirely within the realm of possibility in 1948 for the conservatives within the Republican and Democratic Parties to combine harmoniously to form what would be the strongest party in the country “*provided* the issue of Ne-

gro equality was left to the sponsorship of a new Liberal Party.’¹ This was the line the late, unlamented States Rights party tried to follow. “The convention ended with a burst of shouts, cheers and rebel yells, as well as countless parades on the convention floor with a portrait of Gen. Robert E. Lee held high”—thus the *New York Times* of July 18, 1948, described the demonstrations at the Birmingham convention of the Dixiecrats, which followed numerous speeches denouncing Truman and his civil rights program as “threats to make Southerners into a mongrel, inferior race by forced intermingling with Negroes.”

It was, of course, a hoary tune. Alexander Stephens and Clement Vallandigham had played it earlier and better. Yet the issue—a sign of our times—cannot be thrust aside as too inane for gentle people to discuss. Collins and his cronies are no doubt even now examining the mistakes of their campaign. The issue will crop up again and again, and will have to be met with forthrightness and understanding. For those who ponder the meaning of the thirty-eight electoral ballots cast for the Dixiecrats in the recent election, an analysis of the “miscegenation” phase of the war-election of 1864 will be of more than specialist or antiquarian interest.

* * *

This rather nasty story begins almost a year before the election which returned Lincoln to the White House for a second term. His victory was an impressive one. Yet, as is well known, the summer of 1864 was a time of gloom in the Republican camp; indeed, as November approached, the President recorded his secret and humorless belief that it seemed “exceedingly probable” he would not be re-elected. Why this deep pessimism in August on the eve of

¹ “The New Confederacy,” *New Republic* (Nov. 1, 1948), 10-14.

victory? There were reasons enough: Sherman was not yet in Atlanta and Fremont's hat was still in the presidential ring—while dissension ruled within cabinet and party.

More intangible yet no less real a source of irritation was the unbridled arrogance of the Copperhead publicists, to whom the Emancipation Proclamation had providentially furnished "a real issue of principle." The war, they noisomely argued, had been declared to save the Union; now it had been transformed by Lincoln and the charlatans in power into a "nigger crusade"—compulsory inter-marriage of white and black had finally become the main plank in the Republican platform! "May the blessings of Emancipation extend throughout our unhappy lands," ran a "Black Republican Prayer" distributed by the Democrats in 1863,

and the illustrious, sweet-scented Sambo nestle in the bosom of every Abolition woman, that she may be quickened by the pure blood of the majestic African, and the Spirit of amalgamation shine forth in all its splendor and glory, that we may become a regenerated nation of half-breeds and mongrels, and the distinction of color be forever consigned to oblivion, and that we may live in bonds of fraternal love, union and equality with the Almighty Nigger, henceforward, now and forever. Amen.

From January to November 1864 the Democratic press would tear this "issue" to tatters. But could McClellan win on so frantic an issue? To Lincoln, thumbing through reports of vast conspiracies afoot and remembering the sickening draft riots of the previous summer, it was not an altogether bogus optimism exuded by the journals of the Democracy.²

In reality the optimism was false and the arrogance born of desperation, for the more knowledgeable politicians

² Edward Chase Kirkland, *The Peacemakers of 1864* (New York, 1927), 11-12, 28-29; Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln, The War Years* (New York, 1939), III, 267.

and generals of the South had by this time read the handwriting on the wall. Although armies in gray were still powerfully in the field, the most vital front of the war had already shifted to the "peace" press of the North; the keystone of Confederate strategy was now defeat of Lincoln at the polls. The war must go on, counseled Jefferson Davis, "until Mr. Lincoln's time was out," and then the North "might compromise."³

It was precisely at this time—a little before Christmas of 1863—that there appeared for sale on newsstands in New York City a seventy-two-page pamphlet, costing a quarter and bearing the enigmatic title, *Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro*.⁴ This pamphlet, a curious hash of quarter-truths and pseudo-learned oddities, was to give a new word to the language and a refurbished issue to the Democratic Party—although its anonymous author, for good reason perhaps, never came forward to claim his honors. In the welter of leaflets, brochures, cards, tracts and cartoons struck off by all parties during the Civil War, it stands out as centrally significant.

Miscegenation is a disorganized piece of work, difficult to summarize briefly.⁵ With a flourish of scholarship on his very first page the pamphleteer defines the "new words" he finds necessary to coin in order to present his argument. The first is *miscegenation* (from the Latin *miscere*, to mix, and *genus*, race) with its derivatives, *miscegen*, *miscegenate* and *miscegenetic*; the second—a more precise neologism—is *melaleukation* (from the Greek *melas*, black, and *leukos*, white) with its derivatives, *melaleukon* and *mela-*

³ George Fort Milton, *Abraham Lincoln and the Fifth Column* (New York, 1942), 210.

⁴ New York, 1863; hereinafter referred to as *Miscegenation*.

⁵ The quotations in the summary that follows are taken *passim* from the pamphlet.

leuketic, "to express the idea of the union of the white and black races."⁶

Having disposed of his definitions, the author gets his argument rapidly under way. Science and Christianity have proved beyond doubt "that all the tribes which inhabit the earth were originally derived from one type." Dr. Draper of New York University, Camper of Gröningen, Aristotle, Galen, Dr. Pritchard and Baron Larrey have established the "physiological equality of the white and colored races." Furthermore, if "any fact is well established in history, it is that the miscegenetic or mixed races are much superior, mentally, physically, and morally, to those pure or unmixed." Don Felix De Azara, Pallas,

⁶The current expression, *amalgamation*, was, according to the author, a "poor word" since it properly referred to the "union of metals with quicksilver, and was, in fact, only borrowed for an emergency, and should now be returned to its proper signification." Said the London *Morning Herald* of November 1, 1864: "Whatever good or evil the authors of 'Miscegenation' may have done in a political way, they have achieved a sort of reflected fame on the coining of two or three new words—at least one of which is destined to be incorporated into the language. Speakers and writers of English will gladly accept the word 'Miscegenation' in the place of the word amalgamation. . . ." *A Dictionary of American English* makes a curious typographic error in one of the historical citations attached to its definition of *miscegenation*. The citation—an excerpt from M. Schele De Vere's *Americanisms* (1872), 288-289—is printed in the *DAE* as follows: "I was one . . . who first publicly used the illshapen word miscegenation, and openly dared to advocate the expediency of favoring, by every agency of State and Church, the mingling of the black and white races." Can this mean that De Vere (Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Virginia in 1872) was a miscegenationist?—a startling thought, since a reading of his book reveals him as an unreconciled champion of the Confederacy. The matter is clarified by an examination of De Vere's text, where, following a partisan definition of scalawags as the "evidently dishonest among the Southerners, who went over to the dominant party, and unblushingly lived on their conquered friends and neighbors," the citation in question appears as follows: "It was one of this class, rather than the eloquent advocate of Women's Rights [Wendell Phillips] often charged with the crime, who first publicly used the illshapen word miscegenation, and openly dared to advocate the expediency of favoring, by every agency of State and Church, the mingling of the black and white races." De Vere, of course, was wrong. *Miscegenation* originated in the pamphlet of that title in 1863, as is recognized by the *New English Dictionary*; its brother word, *melaleukation*, did not "take" from the start.

Moodie, Laurence, Dr. Hancock, Dallas and Walker have confirmed this fact. The English are great because they are composite; the French—who invented divorce—were originally a blend; they intermarried and decayed; thus the two most brilliant writers France can boast of are “the melaleukon, Dumas, and his son, a quadroon.” The peoples of Sicily and Naples have inbred, and are therefore “probably the lowest people, except the Irish, in the scale of civilization in Europe . . . brutal, ignorant and barbarous,” while the “most promising nation in Europe is the Russian, and its future will be glorious, only because its people represents a greater variety of race than any other in Europe.” American vitality comes “not from its Anglo-Saxon progenitors, but from all the different nationalities” of the melting-pot. “All that is needed to make us the finest race on earth is to engraft upon our stock the negro element; the blood of the negro is the most precious because it is the most unlike any other that enters into the composition of our national life.”

The truth is that “no race can long endure without commingling of its blood with that of other races.” Human progress itself depends on miscegenation and “Providence has kindly placed on the American soil . . . four millions of colored people” for that purpose. It will be “our noble prerogative to set the example of this rich blending of blood.”

It is idle to maintain that this present war is not a war for the negro . . . it is a war, if you please, of amalgamation . . . a war looking, as its final fruit, to the blending of the white and black. . . . Let the war go on . . . until church, and state, and society recognize not only the propriety but the necessity of the fusion of the white and black—in short, until the great truth shall be declared in our public documents and announced in the messages of our Presidents, that it is desirable the white man should marry the black woman and the white woman the black man—that the race should become melaleuketic before it becomes miscegenetic.

The next step is to open California to the swarming millions of eastern Asia. The patience and skill of the Jap-

anese and Chinese in the mechanic arts must be blended into "the composite race which will hereafter rule this continent."

The Indian has shown—and the physiologists have affirmed—that copper is the permanent American skin-color; indeed, the "white race which settled New England will be unable to maintain its vitality as a blonde people." The proof is that tuberculosis in "our Eastern States is mainly confined to the yellow-haired and thin-blooded blondes. . . ." Ultimately, black will absorb white; it is a truth of nature. The conquest of Britain by Rome illustrates the fact that all the "noted ancient and modern wars of Europe may be traced to the yearning of the brunette and blonde to mingle." Americans must become "a yellow-skinned, black-haired people—in fine . . . miscegens. . . ."

How solve the mystery of the Pyramids? What answer give to the question of the Sphynx? It is the "principle of Miscegenation in ancient Egypt"; civilization, science and art are the creations of "the miscegenetic mind developed upon the banks of the Nile, by Asiatics and Africans." The Jews themselves "were partly of Abyssinian or negro origin." The conclusion is clear: "Let us then embrace our black brother" in America. Perfect religion and perfect mankind will be the results, for "the ideal or type man of the future will blend in himself all that is passionate and emotional in the darker races, all that is imaginative and spiritual in the Asiatic races, and all that is intellectual and perceptive in the white races." He will be "brown, with reddish cheeks, curly and waving hair, dark eyes, and a fullness and suppleness of form not now dreamed of by any individual people." Adam and Christ were type-men, or miscegens, red or yellow.

Furthermore, the mutual love of black and white is based on the natural law of the attraction of opposites. For example, the "sympathy Mr. Greeley feels for the negro is the love which the blonde bears for the black . . . stronger

than the love they bear to women." The Abolitionist leaders furnish additional examples: his complexion "reddish and sanguine," Wendell Phillips is one of the "sharpest possible contrasts to the pure negro." Theodore Tilton, "the eloquent young editor of the Independent, who has already achieved immortality by advocating enthusiastically the doctrine of miscegenation, is a very pure specimen of the blonde." That black loves blonde is shown also by the number of "rape cases in the courts and by the experience of Southern plantations." The only remedy is "legitimate melaleuketic marriage." Give nature a free course and men and women, "whether anti-slavery or pro-slavery, conservative or radical, democratic or republican, will marry the most perfect specimens of the colored race. . . ." This natural passion is "the secret of the strange infatuation of the Southern woman with the hideous barbarism of slavery. Freedom, she knows, would separate her forever from the colored man. . . . It is idle for Southern woman to deny it; she loves the black man, and the raiment she clothes herself with is to please him. . . ."

All this is only preparation. For it is with the specific relationship of the Irish working-people and the Negro—the New York draft riots of the previous summer were fresh in the memory of the country—that the pamphleteer is especially concerned. "Notwithstanding the apparent antagonism which exists between the Irish and negroes on this continent"

there are the strongest reasons for believing that the first movement towards a melaleuketic union will take place between these two races. Indeed, in very many instances it has already occurred. Wherever there is a poor community of Irish in the North they naturally herd with the poor negroes . . . connubial relations are formed between the black men and white Irish women . . . pleasant to both parties, and were it not for the unhappy prejudice which exists, such unions would be very much more frequent. The white Irishwoman loves the black man, and in the old country . . . the negro is sure of the handsomest among the poor white females. . . . The fusion, whenever it takes place, will be of infinite service to the Irish. They are a more brutal race and lower in civilization

than the negro . . . coarse-grained, revengeful, unintellectual . . . below the level of the most degraded negro. Take an equal number of negroes and Irish from among the lowest communities of the city of New York, and the former will be found far superior to the latter in cleanliness, education, moral feelings, beauty of form and feature, and natural sense. . . .

The "prognathous skull, the projecting mouth, the flat and open nostril" are characteristic of the "inhabitants of Sligo and Mayo." With education "and an intermingling with the superior black, the Irish may be lifted up to something like the dignity of their ancestors, the Milesians. . . ." There is only one correct course: the Irish should put aside prejudice toward their "dark-skinned fellow-laborers and friends and proclaim intermarriage with the Negro as a solution to their problem."

Do the Irish object to this prognosis? They ought not. Observe the noblemen produced by nature in the Southern aristocracy. Yet the "truth may as well be understood, that the superiority of the slaveholding classes of the South arises from their intimate communication, from birth to death, with the colored race. . . ." It is notorious that, "for three generations back, the wealthy, educated, governing class of the South have mingled their blood with the enslaved race." The "emotional power, fervid oratory and intensity which distinguishes all thoroughbred slaveholders is due to their intimate association with the most charming and intelligent of their slave girls." In fact, "legal melaleukation will be first openly adopted in the slave States." The large cities of the South, New Orleans especially, even now swarm with mulattoes, quadroons and octoroons, and the "unions producing these mixtures will be continued under the sanctions of public opinion, law, and religion."

His preamble completed, the pamphleteer is now ready for his main point. What is the meaning, he asks, of all these "scientific" and "historical" data for 1864, the fateful year in which the North must choose a new president? Only this—emancipation means amalgamation; the party of

Abolition is “the party of miscegenation.” True, the “people do not yet undertand” the point and the “party as a whole” will not admit it. But there is still hope that opinion will change, for the “leaders of Progress”—among them Phillips and Tilton—“urge miscegenetic reform” and the “people are ripe to receive the truth.” What must be recognized is that the Republican Party “will not perform its whole mission till it throws aloft the standard of Miscegenation.”

Yet examine the platform of the Chicago Convention—how meager it is on this vital subject. Nowhere does it acknowledge the fact that “miscegenation reform should enter into the approaching presidential contest.” Is it, however, too late to add the miscegenation plank to the platform? Not at all, maintains the pamphleteer in a grand finale: let Abraham Lincoln candidly proclaim that “the solution of the negro problem will not have been reached in this country until public opinion sanctions a union of the two races . . . that in the millennial future, the most perfect and highest type of manhood will not be white or black but brown, or colored, and that whoever helps to unite the various races of man, helps to make the human family the sooner realize its great destiny. . . .” And although the Democrats attempt “to divert discussion to senseless side issues, such as peace, free speech, and personal and constitutional rights,” let the motto of “the great progressive party of this country be Freedom, Political and Social Equality; Universal Brotherhood.”

Excerpts from “amalgamationist” speeches delivered by Theodore Tilton and Wendell Phillips in May and July of 1863, a few lines from a book review of Wilson’s *Pre-historic Man*, a selection from an article in the *Independent* on the “intermingling of Colors and Sexes at Oberlin University,” and a quotation from Harriet Beecher Stowe’s novel *Dred*—a description of Harry and Lisette under the

title of "Pen-Portrait of a Miscegenetic Woman and Man"—bring the pamphlet to a close.

* * *

So much for the pamphlet itself. The author, apparently an impassioned—even learned—Abolitionist, preferred to remain anonymous. Yet he was proud of his work. So, on Christmas Day, 1863, he mailed out complimentary copies of his little tract to a number of prominent anti-slavery leaders throughout the country. Tucked into each copy was a warm and friendly letter which, after noting that the doctrine of miscegenation might be "in advance of the times," asked the distinguished recipient for an opinion of its merits. There was nothing unusual in the practice; so Emerson had discovered Whitman. Replies were to be addressed to the "Author of 'Miscegenation,'" in care of his Nassau Street publishers.

Now the curious thing about this ostensibly Abolitionist tract was that it was *not* written by an Abolitionist at all. As a matter of fact it was conceived by two clever journalists in the offices of Manton Marble's violently anti-Abolitionist New York *World*—a newspaper which, in the words of the historian Rhodes, was "the ablest and most influential Democratic journal in the country, the organ of the high-toned Democrats of New York City and State. . . ." David Goodman Croly, managing editor of this quasi-Copperhead sheet, and his young friend, George Wakeman, a reporter on its staff, were the joint, forever unconfessed, authors of the pamphlet, *Miscegenation*. Croly himself footed the printing bill.⁸

⁷ James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States* (New York, 1906), IV, 471. In its editorial box, the *World* described itself as "a sound Democratic newspaper" with 100,000 subscribers and half a million readers.

⁸ *The Dictionary of American Biography*, Sabin's *Dictionary* and the Library of Congress catalogue err in listing one E. C. Howell as a third author. Howell (whose correct initials are S. C.) was city editor of the *World* while Croly was managing editor but probably took no part in writing the pamphlet. (*Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, XLIII [May 4, 1889], 613-614).

Of George Wakeman's life or opinions little is known. He had come from Connecticut to New York in 1858 to work on the *Ledger* and had contributed to the *Galaxy*, *Appleton's Journal* and other periodicals while his steady job was on the *World*. He was a lad of twenty-two, "a clever young journalist" just "discovered" by Croly when he collaborated on the pamphlet.⁹

There is a bit more to be discovered about David Goodman Croly. A dozen years older than Wakeman, he had come from Ireland to New York as a youngster, had served as apprentice to a Manhattan silversmith, reporter on the New York *Evening Post* when Bryant was editor, and head of the city intelligence department of the *Herald* under Frederick Hudson. A year after his marriage to Jane Cunningham, one of the country's pioneer female journalists, he had travelled west to Illinois. In the town of Rockford, the Crolys had purchased the *Democratic Standard*, a weekly newspaper then owned by a relative of Mrs. Croly's, which re-blossomed under their editorship as the *Rockford Daily News*, "Neutral in Politics—Independent in Everything." When the editor of the *Register*, a rival Republican newspaper, had charged that the *News's* "political stripe" was pro-slavery Democrat, Croly had denied it. "So Mr. Douglas and the whole pro-slavery north," the *Register* had commented, "call it a mis-statement when they are termed pro-slavery democrats. But by their fruits are they known." The *News* failed, although Rocklanders offered to refinance it, and Croly returned to New York to become city editor of the *World* just before the war. On its staff at this time were James K. Spalding, Richard Grant

"The little brochure was the joint work of Mr. D. G. Croly, my husband, and a very clever young journalist, Mr. George Wakeman," stated Mrs. David Goodman Croly in 1900. "No other person than the two mentioned had anything at all to do with the production. . . ." (MS letter of Mrs. Croly, Dec. 15, 1900, in Boston Athenaeum).

⁹ *Dictionary of American Biography* (Boston, 1872); *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, XLIII, 613-614.

White, Ivory Chamberlain and Manton Marble. When the *World* went bankrupt in 1862, Marble, backed reportedly by August Belmont—took it over as a Democratic organ and Croly became its managing editor.¹⁰

Were Wakeman and Croly scalawags among copperheads, fifth-columnists among the Butternuts? The history of *Miscegenation* will perhaps clarify the motives of its authors.

* * *

On Christmas Day Croly and Wakeman had mailed out *Miscegenation* to sundry prominent Abolitionists. By mid-January half-a-dozen replies were in their hands—from Lucretia Mott, Dr. James McCune Smith, the Grimké sisters, Parker Pillsbury and Albert Brisbane. The opinions of the Abolitionists were all rendered in good faith; admiration for the courage of the pamphleteers runs through their letters. But it is an admiration tempered with cautious enthusiasm both for the substance of the pamphlet and for the timeliness of its publication. Was it perhaps a hare-brained fellow they were dealing with? Were one's most vociferous friends sometimes one's most confounded enemies?

From Lucretia Mott, the Quaker leader of the American Anti-Slavery Society, came the most cautious reply of all. She had submitted the pamphlet to her "anti-slavery friends"; and while they were not "sufficiently familiar with physiological facts and theories" to render final judgment, they felt that the author's conclusions were scientifically untenable. Most "questionable" was the opinion that the "distinguished advocates" of the slave had been drawn to their task by "the natural love of opposites." As

¹⁰ *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, XLIII, 613-614. *Dictionary of American Biography*; M. James Bolquerin, *An Investigation of the Contributions of David, Jane, and Herbert Croly to American Life—With Emphasis on the Influence of the Father on the Son*, unpublished master's thesis (School of Journalism, University of Missouri, July 1948), 16, 17, 26, 36; Sandburg, *op. cit.*, II, 581.

for the idea of putting a miscegenation plank into the anti-slavery platform, while it was true that the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society had fought to repeal the evil law making inter-racial marriage a crime, the abolitionists had “never thought it expedient to advocate such unions” and had only sought “to remove all civil and social disabilities from this prescribed class, leaving nature and human affections to take care of themselves.” Nevertheless, although it was “not *yet* deemed *expedient* by the anti-slavery reformers to agitate the matrimonial question,” they continued to circulate Theodore Tilton’s discourse on the Negro. *Miscegenation*, she concluded noncommittally, would “doubtless find readers.”¹¹

The replies of the Grimké sisters of South Carolina were of the same pattern: joy in the essential liberality of the doctrine, disagreement with some of the flamboyant reasoning, grave doubt concerning the expediency of making miscegenation an issue in Abolitionist politics. Sarah Grimké felt that the author had spoken “extravagantly” in stating “that the first heart experience of nearly every Southern maiden is associated with the sad dream of some bondman lover.” That such things had happened she had no doubt; but she knew of only one instance where the passion was consummated and “the lady died at the birth of her child, without revealing the name of her lover.” Since the event “excited great horror and indignation,” she curiously reasoned, “it could not be common.” Since also “the immense distance between a slave and his young mistress would render such things very rare,” the statement required “great modification.” Angelina Grimké (Mrs. Weld) had found the pamphlet “interesting and instructive.” She and her sister were “wholly at one” with the author — “We have tried the caste system long enough to learn . . . that our safety in future is equality.” Would it aid the cause, however, to publish the pamphlet?

¹¹ *New York World* (Weekly Edition), November 24, 1864.

We confess ourselves doubtful on this point, because we fear it may retard that work of justice which has been begun by the nation toward the negro, by warning it or foretelling the ultimate consequence to us as a nationality. There is a laudable desire now to arm the negro, and efforts are being made to place him on an equal footing with white men in the army. The work of promotion for merit, too, has begun in Robert Small and Caesar Hall. We must not despise the day of small things . . . will not the subject of amalgamation, so detestable to many minds, if now so prominently advocated, *have a tendency to retard the preparatory work of justice and equality which is so silently, but surely, opening the way for a full recognition of fraternity and miscegenation?*¹²

Dr. James M'Cune Smith, editor of the *New York Anglo-African Review*, was less cautious. He had read the "bold brochure with great interest," and unlike Miss Mott, felt that it was marked by "acuteness, vigor, and learning." Its tenth chapter on "The Mistake of All Religions and Systems of Education was worthy of special attention to all who love human kind." Like the Quakeress, however, Dr. Smith saw no "necessity of inscribing 'Miscegenation' on the banner of a political party." His reasons, however, differed from Miss Mott's: first "Such parties always crush any moral cause which they embrace"; second, "when it is remembered that almost every slave state delegatized marriage between white and blacks, we have some testimony that such marriages are bound to occur where such indecent laws are abolished."¹³

¹² *Ibid.* The idea of "miscegenation," wrote Angelina Grimké in this letter, "was first born into our minds by what was, at that time, a very startling remark of my brother Thomas S. Grimké, of Charleston, South Carolina. We then lived in Philadelphia; and in 1834, just previous to his death, he came there to see us. In a conversation with him on the anti-slavery excitement, then in its infancy, he remarked, although he favored the Colonization society, it was only as a temporary and collateral expedient for the elevation of the colored race, as he well knew that it never could remedy slavery; in fact, said he, 'Emancipation must come in some form or other and amalgamation will be the salvation of our country.'"

¹³ *New York World* (Weekly Edition), November 24, 1864. Wrote William Wells Brown of Dr. Smith: "Unable to get justice done him in the educational institutions of his native country, James M'Cune Smith turned his face towards a foreign land. He graduated with distinguished honors at the Uni-

Parker Pillsbury, editor of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, writing from New Hampshire, was all enthusiasm with little reservation as to expediency. Although Pillsbury felt that his testimony could render small help to the author, and indeed, "publicly known, might do . . . more harm than good," the pamphlet had "cheered and gladdened a winter morning" which began "in cloud and shadow." He had long been confident of the correctness of the author's philosophy. Indeed he would gladly see the divorce laws "*so modified that new marriages among the American races might even now take place where unfruitful, or unhappy unions (or disunions) are recognized.*"

It may not be time to say this aloud; but it will yet be said, and I think not too soon. All the mysteries of the wonderful apocalypse now unfolding in our country, are not even dreamed of yet; and I hail your work as a true prophesy.

"You are on the right track," concluded Pillsbury; "pursue it; and the good God speed you."

Albert Brisbane, the Utopian socialist, writing from Buffalo, while indulging on his own hook in some abstruse Fourierist eugenics on the fusing of "extreme," "central" and "superior" races, was skeptical about the validity of the author's science and logic concerning the "perfect

versity of Glasgow, Scotland, where he received his diploma of M.D. For the last twenty-five years he has been a practitioner in the city of New York, where he stands at the head of his profession . . . he has justly been esteemed among the leading men of his race on the American continent. When the natural ability of the negro was assailed, some years ago, in New York, Dr. Smith came forward as the representative of the black man, and his essays on the comparative anatomy and physiology of the races, read in the discussion, completely indicated the character of the negro, and placed the author among the most logical and scientific writers in the country. The doctor has contributed many valuable papers to the different journals published by colored men during the last quarter of a century. The New York dailies have also received aid from him during the same period. History, antiquity, bibliography, translation, criticism, political economy, statistics,—almost every department of knowledge,—receive emblazon from his able, ready, versatile, and unwearied pen. . . ." (*The Black Man: His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievements* [Boston, 1863], 205-207).

race." Thorough "treatises on the subject" were needed, for men did not "as yet possess the *data* necessary to the forming of an opinion as to *what* races should be crossed, and how or in what proportions, in order to produce good results. . . ." His opinion on the subject of "improving the human race"—which was "still in a purely speculative state, or what August Comte would call the Metaphysical phases"—was "*worth nothing*." Indeed, raising the question at the moment was putting the cart before the horse; the effort was premature. Before miscegenation could become an issue, "the social organization must first be improved . . . women must be placed in a position to regulate the work of procreation . . . and Negro labor must be organized. . . ." A "new social order" of "universal association" had first to be established upon the earth; then great "industrial armies, composed of persons from all regions of the earth, would aid the work of a scientific and universal system of miscegenation." Clues would be furnished by the work of Fourier, "the great sociologist." What would happen then was difficult to say. Perhaps "sentiment aroused for the black race" might continue; it might "go even as far as has been dreamed of by some of the most radical abolitionists in the past—namely, amalgamation." He looked upon the pamphlet "*as a sign of the times, rather than a solution of a great problem*."¹⁴ He was curious to see how the work would be received. "If it excites interest," concluded Brisbane skeptically, "you will have touched an important chord; if not, then it will have proved that the public mind is not ready for the discussion of such subjects."¹⁵

Thus in good faith the Abolitionists replied to the unknown author, presumably a well-wisher of the Republican left, who, in his zeal for a doctrine that contained more than a modicum of social truth, gave that doctrine so eccentric

¹⁴ Fourier held that a certain portion of Negro blood was necessary to attain a perfectly blended race.

¹⁵ New York *World* (Weekly Edition), November 24, 1864.

a twist that it threatened to raise new difficulties in the fight to free the slave.¹⁶

* * *

Croly and Wakeman did not heed this combined counsel of caution. By the first week in February the brochure had been listed as a pamphlet received for review in Theodore Tilton's *Independent* and was being advertised provocatively in the principal Abolitionist papers of the country as available for purchase at newsstands or at the publish-

¹⁶ Wendell Phillips evidently did not reply, although the pamphlet was sent him (as probably to others who did not reply) and he is prominently mentioned and quoted in it. His copy is in the Boston Public Library. Lorenzo Sears, one of his biographers, says briefly: "About this time a great miscegenation outcry had been raised out of sundry 'amalgamation-of-the-races' remarks by Phillips on the 4th of July 1863. . . . The whole matter was best disposed of by the Boston Journal's remark, that it knew of no abolitionists who advocated it, but it was widely practiced in that portion of the Union where an abolitionist, if caught, would be hung to the nearest tree." In this speech, delivered at Framingham, Massachusetts, and quoted in part in the appendix to *Miscegenation*, Phillips had declared: "Now, I am going to say something that will make *The New York Herald* use its small capitals and notes of admiration (Laughter), and yet, no well-informed man this side of China, but believes it in the very core of his heart. That is, 'amalgamation'—. . . Remember this, the youngest of you: that on the 4th day of July, 1863, you heard a man say, that in the light of all history, in virtue of every page he ever read, he was an amalgamationist to the utmost extent. (Applause). I have no hope for the future . . . but in that sublime mingling of races, which is God's own method of civilizing and elevating the world." Phillips' other biographers—Beecher, Russell, Austin, Sears, Martyn, Sherwin—make no mention of his part in the miscegenation controversy.

The great Abolitionist agitator's practical attitude towards the problem in no way contradicted his impassioned platform utterance. To J. Miller McKim on February 8, 1858, he wrote: "A physician has just waited on me and says a merchant living in North Carolina, a patient of his, has fallen in love with a slave-girl—valued at \$2,000—he can't afford to redeem her. Is there any person in Philadelphia whom he can . . . communicate with. . . . You see, I know nothing of the man or case. The Doctor is a republican, but his correspondent may be honest or wishing to get someone into a scrape. Can you name anyone in Philadelphia who would aid if he proved honest in his effort? Answer immediately." (Oscar Sherwin, *Prophet of Liberty: A Biography of Wendell Phillips*, unpublished doctoral dissertation [New York University, April 1940], 168.)

Others to whom the pamphlet had been sent were Sumner, Seward and Abby Kelly Foster. (*London Morning Herald*, November 1, 1864.)

er's office. In the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, the advertisement appeared side by side with an announcement of the publication of William Wells Brown's *The Black Man*.¹⁷

The pamphlet did not have to wait long for notice and from the Abolitionist press it received its first reviews. On January 23, the *Anglo-African Review*, whose editor, Dr. Smith, had already written the anonymous author a fortnight before, hailed it glowingly.

The word—nay the deed—miscegenation, the same in substance with the word amalgamation, the terror of our abolition friends twenty years ago, and of many of them to-day—miscegenation, which means intermarriage between whites and blacks—"miscegenation," which means the absolute practical brotherhood or social intermingling of blacks and whites, he would have inscribed on the banner of the Republican Party, and held up as the watchword of the next presidential platform!¹⁸

It was too late, in the opinion of the *Anglo-African*, "to begin with infant and Sunday Schooling," for, at birth, children had "the bent of their parents," which perhaps could be slightly altered but not radically changed. The process of "education and improvement should begin with the marriage of parties who, instead of strong resemblance, should have contrasts which are complementary each of the other." It was "disgraceful to our modern civilization," concluded the reviewer, that there existed societies for improving the breed of sheep, horses, and pigs, while the human race was left to grow up "without scientific culture."

A week later the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* minced no words in greeting *Miscegenation*. Although it felt that no new vocabulary was needed to discuss the subject, the pamphlet itself came "directly and fearlessly to the advo-

¹⁷ *Independent*, January 28, February 4, 1864; *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, January 16, 30, 1864; *Liberator*, February 5, 1864.

¹⁸ These quotations are taken from S. S. Cox's speech in the House of February 17, 1864. [See page 295]. They are quotations out of context, excerpted for Cox's purpose. Because no copies of the *Anglo-African Review* for 1864 are extant, Cox's quotations must be relied on.

cacy of an idea of which the American people" were "more afraid than any other."

Through the whole thirty-three years of anti-slavery discussion, no statement has been repeated with greater pertinacity, no accusation has been more effective in stirring up the rancor of editors and the brutality of mobs, than the charge against Abolitionists of advocating "amalgamation" Now the idea thus charged Abolitionists, individually and collectively, of *preference* for black people as partners in marriage, is the very idea seriously advocated and urged in the pamphlet. . . .

Perhaps, thought the reviewer, the theory of attraction of opposites was "a true one." At any rate, it received "strong presumptive confirmation from the constant sexual intermingling" of the races in the South. On the question as to whether the Republican party should embody the theory in its platform, the *Standard* expressed no opinion. God's laws would "assuredly fulfill and vindicate themselves." It was "in the highest degree improbable" that He had placed "a national repugnance between any two families of His Children."

If He has done so, that decree will execute itself, and these two will never seek intimate companionship together. If, on the contrary, He has made no such barrier, no such one is needful or desirable, and every attempt to restrain these parties from exercising their natural choice is in contravention of His will, and is an unjust exercise of power. The future must decide how far black and white are disposed to seek each other in marriage. The probability is that there will be progressive intermingling and that the nation will be benefited by it.

"We are sure," declared the *Standard*, "that many will agree with us in finding the pamphlet interesting and instructive, and in thanking the unknown author for it."¹⁹

So far Croly's *World* had scrupulously avoided notice of the pamphlet; nowhere in its columns up to this point is

¹⁹ *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, January 30, 1864. The *Standard* concurred naively with certain aspects of the pamphlet's chauvinism: "It is agreed that the strongest, ablest, most intellectual, most practically effective race in the world is the Anglo-Saxon; the product of a mixture, or rather of many mixtures."

the controversial new word to be found. Meanwhile, the fame of *Miscegenation* had crossed the Atlantic. On February 5, the New York correspondent of the pro-Southern London *Times* informed his English readers that a new doctrine had been discovered by "the advanced spirits" of the Republican Party: the Negro was "in many important respects the superior of the whites," and if the latter did not "forget their pride of race and blood and colour, and amalgamate with the purer and richer blood of the blacks," they would die out of America.

The first to give tongue to the new doctrine was the Rev. Theodore Tilton, the coadjutor of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher in the editorship of the *Independent*, who a few months ago declared in an assemblage composed of women—possibly all of the strong-minded order—that it was good for white women to marry black men, and that the "passional" and "emotional" nature of the blacks was needed to improve the white race.²⁰ Mr. Wendell Phillips has often hinted the same thing.

²⁰ In this speech, delivered to the American Anti-Slavery Society at Cooper Institute in New York on May 12, 1863, and quoted in part in the appendix to *Miscegenation*, Tilton had said: "The history of the world's civilization is written in one word—which many are afraid to speak—and this is Amalgamation. . . . It is not . . . a philosophical statement to say . . . that the negro race is being absorbed by the white. On the contrary, the negro race is receiving and absorbing part of the white. A large fraction of the white race of the South is melting away into the black. . . . I am not advocating the union of whites and blacks. This is taking place without advocacy. . . . I am often asked, 'Would you marry a black woman?' I reply, 'I have a wife already, and therefore will not.' I am asked, 'Do you think that a white man ought to marry a black woman?' I reply, 'When a man and woman want to be married it is *their* business, not mine, nor anybody's else.' Is not that plain sense? But to read what some newspapers say of the 'monstrous doctrine of amalgamation,' one would think it consisted in stationing a provost-marshal at street corners, to seize first a white man and then a black woman, and to marry them on the spot, against their will, for a testimony to human equality. But I will venture to advance the opinion . . . that a slave-woman's master, who makes himself the father of her children, is in honor bound to make himself her husband. So far from denouncing the marriage of blacks and whites, I would be glad if the bans of a hundred thousand such marriages could be published next Sunday. . . . But whether in marriage or in shame, the fact grows broader every day, that the whites and the blacks of this country are coalescing; or to use the more horrible word, amalgamating. In Slavery, this amalgamation proceeds rapidly; in Freedom slowly. . . ."

A little tract called *Miscegenation* had recently been circulated, continued the correspondent to his British readers, in which the whole subject was discussed “for the study of such Yankee girls as have exhausted the sensational novels.” It had been distributed at a meeting addressed by the famous Miss Dickinson, who perhaps was its author, although it was “highly probable that the author himself” was “one of the lean, gaunt, bloodless Yankees whom he so eloquently describes, and that, failing to find a wife among the strong-minded ladies of whom Miss Anna Dickinson and Mrs. Beecher Stowe” were the types, he longed for “a more congenial partner from the Southern plantations. The unctious of this ‘new Anacharsis Cloutz’ might almost make one suspect him of being a *mauvais farceur*.” If this was done “in the green leaf, what shall be done in the dry?”²¹

On February 17, *Miscegenation* broke into Congress. While the House was arguing the establishment of a Bureau of Freedmen’s Affairs, Samuel Sullivan Cox—Vallandigham’s mouthpiece—rose from his seat to use the pamphlet as a bludgeon against the Republican members.²² This development was, of course, to be expected; for the pamphlet by this time was notorious public property and bound to come to his attention. Unexpected, however, was the fact that the personal letters of the Abolitionists anent it—the private property of the apparently Abolitionist pamphleteer—had been placed in the hands of the Copperhead member from Ohio. So “Sunset” Cox crowed to the House:

²¹ London *Times*, February 8, 1864; in Palmer’s *Index to the Times*, the article is listed as “the Cloutz’s Plan for Improving the White Race.” (London, 1887), II, 263-264.

²² Cox was one of the most foully articulate of white chauvinists in Congress. On January 10, five weeks prior to his miscegenation speech, the Washington correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* wrote of him: “Mr. Cox, as usual, moved to strike out the appropriation for the Haytian mission, and hung a mean little anti-negro speech upon his motion. . . Mr. Cox is fond occasionally of ventilating his brutal prejudices. . . .” On this occasion, Thaddeus Stevens thoroughly chastised him. (*National Anti-Slavery Standard*, January 16, 1864.)

The more philosophical and apostolic of the abolition fraternity have fully decided upon the adoption of this amalgamation platform. I am informed that the doctrines are already indorsed by such lights as Parker Pillsbury, Lucretia Mott, Albert Brisbane, William Wells Brown,²³ Dr. McCune Smith (half and half-miscegen), Angelina Grimke, Theodore Weld and wife and others.

Cox, with a certain grisly Copperhead humor, flayed the pamphlet in thorough racist manner, sneering at Greeley, that "Warwick of Republicanism," and blasting Phillips, whose golden-lipped eloquence could make "miscegenation as attractive to the ear as it is to the other senses."²⁴ Holding the author's eloquence to be "better than his science," he advanced his own scientific refutation of the miscegenationist doctrine: "The physiologist will tell the Gentleman that the mulatto does not live; he does not recreate his kind; he is a monster. Such hybrid races by a law of Providence scarcely survive beyond one generation." Moreover, the irrepressible conflict was not "between slavery and freedom, but between black and white; and as De Tocqueville prophesied, the black will perish."

On the main point, however—how to make miscegenation a campaign issue—Cox kept his eye.

. . . there is a doctrine now being advertised and urged by the leading lights of the Abolition party, toward which the Republican party will and must advance. . . . They used to deny, whenever it was charged, that they favored black citizenship; yet now they are favoring free black suffrage in the District of Columbia, and will favor it wherever in the South they need it for their purposes. . . . The Senate of the United States is discussing African equality in street cars. All these things . . . culminating in this grand plunder scheme of a department of freedmen, ought to convince us that that party is moving steadily forward to perfect social equality of

²³ There is no record extant of a reply from William Wells Brown. Apparently Cox was referring to a statement of Brown's on the subject in another place.

²⁴ "Has he forgotten his fine-spun theories upon miscegenation and the grand mulatto species which is to result from them?" asked the *New York Herald* the following day in an editorial on a reconstruction speech by Phillips. "Is he going to retract his former declaration that amalgamation is the only way to save the nation?"

black and white, and can only end in this detestable doctrine of—Miscegenation!

Cox spoke at length, but it was by no means all smooth sailing. Kelley of Pennsylvania, Eliot of Massachusetts and Washburne of Illinois heckled and rebutted him effectively. And the *Anglo-African Review* of February 27, commenting on the tirade, noted that although the country needed patriots, a “cross” between Cox and Vallandigham would fail to produce one “for the simple and obvious reason that in both the blood” ran the other way; but, “per contra, if we should get up a ‘cross’ between Hon. S. S. Cox and Capt. Robert Small,” continued the *Review*, “the result would be an average miscegen and a superior patriot.”²⁵ For a bankrupt party, however, Cox’s speech was urgently needed

²⁵ Samuel S. Cox, *Eight Years in Congress, from 1857 to 1865* (New York, 1865), 354. “Another remarkable phase of this discussion,” says Cox in his memoirs, “was the queries propounded by Robert Dale Owen, Dr. S. G. Howe, and Col. McKaye, Commissioners on the Freedman, as to the capacity and condition of the mulatto, his offspring, and their tendency to bodily and mental decay. The ‘Anglo-African’ of the 20th of February, 1864, retorted very pungently upon these querists, and informed them that as the two publishers and one editor of ‘The Anglo-African’ had had born to them in lawful wedlock no less than twenty-nine children, of whom twenty are now living—some married and budding—they could not help regarding the queries as in a measure personal and impertinent.” The *Anglo-African Review* tolerated no nonsense on this subject. Since the issues of this important journal are not extant for 1864, it is necessary to reconstruct its pages from other sources, frequently hostile to it. Such a source is the anti-Negro *New York Freeman’s Journal & Catholic Register* from whose issue of April 16, 1864 the following editorial is quoted in full:

Under the teachings of the *Tribune*, the colored people are beginning to “put on airs.” In the *Anglo-African* of this week we find a sharp attack upon Elizur Wright, a Boston Abolitionist, because he presumed to say that the negro has not as much virility as the whites. The editor goes on to show that the colored race in this country doubles every two years, while it takes thirty years for the whites, even with the aid of emigration, to double their numbers. But hear how this darky editor talks:

No friend Wright, you need not disturb yourself about the black man in these United States; he has a good standing color, and an abundance of endurance; just brush some of those knotty cobwebs from your brain and look at him; tall, brawny, well-limbed, sound-brained, as God made him, a man and brother. You sharp nosed, hatch faced, black

political capital.²⁶ Edited and reprinted in Washington, D. C., at the office of *The Constitutional Union*, a "Democratic Conservative Union Newspaper," Cox's speech was to have a wide circulation in the Democratic press of the country.

* * *

haired people, aided by science and the "hub," have vainly tried to crush the manhood out of him, and failed; do give up; you cannot lie him out of his manhood He is a better man, a better citizen than your race "ever dare to be," under any circumstances, in all climates; if not, why do you cut down his equal chances? Why shut your eyes to facts? Bluff Ben Butler, the other day, started on a forced march of some two or three days. He had two white and two black regiments of infantry. It was in a climate, moreover, favorable to whites. How was it when they arrived there? One half the white soldiers had straggled, exhausted, on the road, every black soldier answered to his name at roll call. Pshaw! Don't fool any longer. If you want this rebellion wiped out, take three hundred thousand of our blacks; give us Ben Butler, or let us go alone, and in sixty days the South shall be wiped out.

This is decidedly rich. These darkies now claim, it seems, to be of a healthier, sounder, brighter race than their New England admirers . . . Negro equality is no longer the doctrine: it is now negro superiority. What next, we wonder?

²⁶ *Miscegenation or Amalgamation. Fate of the Freedman. Speech of Hon. Samuel S. Cox of Ohio delivered in the House of Representatives, February 17, 1864.* (Washington, D. C., 1864), 5, 10. The Washington correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* in the issue of February 27 reported some of the heckling in detail: "The book on *Miscegenation*, which has been noticed in the leading papers of the country, came in for an elaborate 'notice' from Mr. Cox . . . Mr. Cox, as a matter of course, found men in the House who would laugh at his coarse wit upon 'miscegenation,' but he was compelled to hear the House laugh on the other side of the question. Mr. Washburne of Illinois got the floor as soon as Mr. Cox sat down, and proceeded to refresh the Ohio member with extracts from one of his own books written several years ago . . . I must quote . . . 'I desire to show the House what the Gentleman from Ohio has written in regard to the "African," in a book entitled "A Buckeye Abroad: or Wanderings in Europe and in the Orient. By S. S. Cox." He is describing St. Peter's, and says: "In the meantime seraphic music from the Pope's select choir ravishes the ear, while the incense titilates the nose. Soon there arises in the chamber of theatrical glitter"—what?—"a plain unquestioned African!" (laughter), "and he utters the sermon in facile Latinity, with graceful manner. His dark hands gestured harmoniously with the rotund periods, and his swart visage beamed with a high order of intelligence." (laughter) What was he? Let the Gentleman from Ohio answer: "He was an

“... No one in Congress,” wrote Cox in his memoirs a year later, “thought of questioning the genuineness and seriousness of the document.”²⁷ The statement is not entirely true. “The little book upon ‘miscegenation’ has very generally been regarded here as a burlesque, or satire,” observed the Washington correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* in his dispatch of February 28. “It is said that Mr. Sumner, upon first glancing over its pages, was inclined to think the writer was in jest. . . . Nobody here *advocates* amalgamation, though doubtless there are very many who believe that in time the two races *will* amalgamate. So far the Democrats have gained nothing by the debate on this subject.”²⁸

From Croly’s *World*, the fogleman of the Democratic press, the word was still mum—not even a report of Cox’s speech appeared in its columns. On February 18, in a short filler, a jokester observed that it was an error to look on a miscegen as a “new light”—he was “Half *light* at best.” But that was all. And meanwhile, in the political press from Copperhead right to Abolitionist left, the battle of words continued to rage on the issue of miscegenation.

Egged on by Cox’s diatribe, on February 25 the *Independent*—“the leading family newspaper of religious cast

Abyssinian. What a commentary upon our American prejudices! The head of the great Catholic Church surrounded by the ripest scholars of the age, listening to the eloquence”—of whom?—“of the despised negro; and thereby illustrating to the world the common bond of brotherhood which binds the human race” (roars of laughter) . . . “History records that from the time of the revival of letters the influence of the Church of Rome had been generally favorable to science, to civilization, and to good government. Why?” . . . Let the Gentleman answer: “Because her system held then, as it holds now, all distinctions of caste as odious.” (great laughter.) This is the third time that this book has been read upon Mr. Cox by way of reply, but it was never before done quite so well as Mr. Washburne did it.”

²⁷ Cox, *op. cit.*, 354.

²⁸ *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, March 5, 1864. Sumner had been one of the abolitionists to whom Croly and Wakeman had sent a copy. (*London Morning Herald*, November 1, 1864.)

in the country”²⁹—gave a long column to a consideration of the pamphlet in which its editors had been so copiously quoted and praised. “As some of our contemporaries, who make no scruple of misrepresenting us, have challenged us for an opinion on this subject, we give it today, in the absence of a more pressing topic.” The little brochure, carrying “as a figure-head the new and strange word Miscegenation” had “lately launched into a sudden tempest of criticism.” For style, not quite good or bad—“clever, inelaborate, and ill-considered”—it had had “a many-voiced condemnation into fame.” On such a topic, John Milton himself would be speared, knived and tomahawked.

Its authorship, continued the *Independent*, was “a well-kept secret”; at least it was unknown to the editors. Nor were they convinced that the writer was in earnest. Their first and remaining impression was that “the work was meant as a piece of pleasantry—a burlesque upon what are popularly called the extreme and fanatical notions of certain radical men named therein.” It was in turn sober, absurd and extravagant; if written in earnest, it was not thorough enough to be satisfactory; if in jest, “Sydney Smith—or McClellan’s Report” was to be preferred.

The *Independent* was not to be booby-trapped. While its editors candidly agreed with some ideas presented in the pamphlet, they disagreed heartily with much also. The Irishman was not a “July rioter by nature”; he was made so “by Democracy and grog. . . .” Nor was it any part of the duty of anti-slavery men, or anybody else, “to advise people whom they should marry, or not marry.” Marriage was an affair between bride and bridegroom, “with, perhaps, a mother-in-law’s advice thrown in.” If black and white intermarried, it was “nobody’s business but their own.” Further than this, “before a white-skinned slave-master becomes the father of a black woman’s child, he ought to be her lawful, wedded husband.” The thesis about

²⁹ Sandburg, *op. cit.*, II, 577.

the perfect brown man of the millennial future was absurd. The rebellion itself did not arise from color prejudice, "for if the slaves were white, instead of black, their masters" would have been no less unwilling to give them up.

As to the main point—here the *Independent* was acute—that the next Presidential campaign, as suggested by the pamphleteer, "turn upon the advocacy of marriage between any two classes of our community—Saxons with Celts, fair faces with dark, Northerners with Southerners, Down-East Yankees with Californians"—this was so absurd as to furnish another reason for thinking these "piquant pages" were "a snare to catch some good folk in, for a laugh at them afterward." The conclusion was clear: "the next Presidential election, nor any succeeding, should have nothing to do with Miscegenation. . . ."³⁰

On February 27, Cox's speech was attacked by the Copperheads as not going far enough. Cox had done the heinous thing of paying lip-service to the idea of abolishing slavery. Dr. J. H. Van Evrie, the rabid editor of the *New York Weekly Day-Book (Caucasian)* would have none of this. Give the Negro freedom and miscegenation would result: "the mixing of blood follows mixing of 'freedom' . . . where numbers approximate and white men are so degraded and wicked as to get down to a level with negroedom. Every man, therefore, opposed to 'slavery' is of necessity in favor of amalgamating with negroes." Thus, in opposing slavery, Cox "necessarily" fostered the idea of amalgamation—at least he was "for forcing it on others, if not liking it exactly for himself." When Cox took umbrage at Van Evrie's impolitic attack—after all they both stood on the Vallandigham platform—the *Day-Book* backed water: "Mr. Cox is about the last man, among the public men of the day, we

³⁰ Wrote the Washington correspondent of the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* in the issue of March 5, 1864: "I think Mr Tilton's article in the last *Independent* expresses the views of most of the intelligent Republicans in Congress upon the subject" Tilton's article was reprinted in full in this issue of the *Standard*.

would do an injustice to, for, with all his errors in respect to putting down 'rebels,' etc., we doubt not he really means to be a Democrat.'³¹

"The question of the crossing of races, or as the newly invented sacramental word says, of *miscegenation*, agitates the press and some would-be *savants* in Congress. . . ." wrote Count Adam Gurowski, a Washington observer, in his diary a month after Cox's speech.³² By the middle of March, Greeley was forced to enter the lists. "We notice a tolerably warm discussion going on in the newspapers and elsewhere," editorialized the *New York Tribune*, "concerning what used to be called 'amalgamation,' and is now more sensibly styled 'miscegenation'—a word tolerably accurate, although a little too long for popular and daily use." The mere mention of the word filled "many minds with an unspeakable wrath," and "long-harbored prejudices" obscured the truth; yet it was a question that had to be "considered well, and decided, not by an appeal to old notions, but by experience." Physiologist, ethnologist, historian,

³¹ *New York Weekly Day-Book*, March 12, 1864.

³² Adam Gurowski, *Diary: 1863-'64-'65* (Washington, D. C., 1866), 139-140. Gurowski's opinion is worthy of note: "The worshippers of darkness and of ignorance, as the worshippers of darkness and ignorance all over the world, but principally in America, are in their element when they utter falsehoods and lies, or when in the most approved democratic manner they back their bad faith by the grossest ignorance. But the other side, the so-called defenders of the negro or African, pitch into the contest as empty-headed as their antagonists; and by high-sounding generalities and phraseology try to make up for their thorough want of scientific information. Neither the one nor the other know in the least anything whatever of the scientific researches and discoveries of the last forty years; and thus neither the one nor the other know how far the ancient continent in Europe and Asia was once occupied by the physiological negro; nor do they know where in Asia are still to be found living remains of the primitive negro race. Oh, these lecturers, these leading editors of dailies, weeklies, monthlies, etc! . . . Oh, these empty-headed rhetors and sham scholars and legislators. . . . Science in hand, how easily it could have been shown to those swarthy-haired and black-souled Seymours, Marbles, Saulsburys, etc., that the difference is only in *melamine* which blacks their eyes, hair, etc., and blacks the whole African! And perhaps, if dissected, their *cerebella* would be found to have less convolutions than those of the negro."

theologian and economist were needed to answer accurately the questions inevitably raised. It was a shame that those who professed "to be the leaders and informers of the public thought" permitted themselves "blindly to be led by those who are still blinder into a ditch of *ipse dixit* and noisome assumption."

The prejudice against the Negro—"the result of a cruel and systematic degradation"—was by no means a novelty. "All Christians in the middle age supposed that Jews exhaled a bad odor from their bodies, and the marriage of a Jew and Christian at that period would have been far more likely to provoke a mob in any civilized city than the marriage of a white man and a black woman would be now." In spite of religious professions, "we do not dwell together as brethren"; in spite of our Bibles, we do not believe that "God has made all men of one blood." That is the simple fact despite "the whole Copperhead power of wriggle. . . ."

If a white man pleased to marry a black woman no one had a right to interfere.

We do not say such union would be wise, but we do distinctly assert that society has nothing to do with the wisdom of matches, and that we shall have to the end of the chapter a great many foolish ones which laws are powerless to prevent. We do not say that such matches would be moral, but we do declare that they would be infinitely more so than the promiscuous concubinage which has so long shamelessly prevailed upon the Southern plantation.

Concluded the *Tribune*: "We are not in favor of any law compelling a Copperhead to marry a negress, unless under circumstances which might compel him to marry a white woman or go to prison; but we insist that if the Copperhead or anybody else is anxious to enter into such union it is not for the Legislature to forbid him, or his fellow creatures to pronounce him a violator of nature and of God."³³

³³ *New York Tribune*, March 16, 1864. Greeley's eccentric position—or lack of position—may be seen in a sentence from this editorial: "If a man can so far conquer his repugnance to a black woman as to make her the mother of his children, we ask in the name of the divine law and of decency, why he should not marry her."

At Greeley's stand the anti-Lincoln press threw up its hands in horror. "Pursuing the natural course of radicalism," sneered the *New York Journal of Commerce*, "the editors of several of the abolitionist sheets have recently been seized with a strong desire for the introduction of amalgamation into social and domestic life of their and other radical families."³⁴ "The fact is—and the *Tribune* cannot disguise it," ranted Bennett's *Herald*, "that the radical party wants a war cry. They tried free-love and it failed. Then they tried abolitionism, and it served their purpose for many a long year. But now the war has deprived them of that shiboleth. . . ." Disgustedly the *Herald* cited a news item in the *Anglo-African Review* concerning "a colored man, named Joseph H. Card . . . joined in the holy bonds of matrimony to a 'white lady from London'; almost frantically it described the 'Practical Progress of Miscegenation in South Carolina'."³⁵ To the racist tirade of the *Express*, the *Tribune* replied that when "Richard M. Johnson married a negro, and raised a large family by her, no Democratic stomach was revolted." For the *Express*, the "horrible consequences of white and black mixture" were fearful—in the North; "but down in Dixie no such qualms exist; there the breeding of a brawny and salable mulatto boy, or of a saddle-colored girl, for the brothels of New Orleans, is something to brag of. . . ."

We have among us in this city at this very time the mulatto daughter of Brigadier-Gen. Huger and the mulatto son of Brigadier-Gen. Withers, both the fathers being now in important commands in the Rebel army—the mothers undoubtedly in slavery or the grave.

"We have also recently had slave children here," concluded the *Tribune*, "much whiter than the editors of *The Express*—fair, blue-eyed children, with bills of sale in their pockets. . . ."³⁶

³⁴ Reprinted in *Liberator*, April 8, 1864.

³⁵ *New York Herald*, March 26, 1864.

³⁶ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 17, 1864; *New York Herald*, March 17, 1864.

Two days later the *Tribune* followed up its demand for a scientific approach to the matter of miscegenation with a London report on a lecture by Professor T. J. Huxley.

Prof. Huxley . . . read extensive extracts from Dr. James Hunt's pamphlet, entitled "On the Negro's place in Nature." Some paragraphs in the dedication of that pamphlet, taken from the letter of a Confederate lady to the author, were read, and excited great laughter among the eminent gentlemen present . . . in which the lecturer joined. When the great laughter . . . had ceased, Prof. Huxley said that he felt it his duty to protest against such baseless and ridiculous assertions, which might be conceived in the spirit of party, but were certainly not in that of science.³⁷

In the maelstrom of controversy, the *New York Times* occupied an anomalous position. The *Herald*, frothing at the mouth, under the title "The Beastly Doctrine of Miscegenation and Its High Priests," had charged it with being "a bright mulatto on the subject of miscegenation." Raymond in turn had accused the *Tribune* of "advocating miscegenation" and Greeley had indignantly denied it.³⁸ Charges and countercharges filled the columns as March petered out — while the identity of the pamphleteer continued to intrigue the combatants.³⁹ "Holmes or Wise Greeley have coined the new word," sang one Horace Otis of Watertown, New York, in a hundred-line poem in the *Day-Book*:

Beautiful word, and more beautiful thought!
None but the wise have its origin sought; . . .
Fill with mulattoes and mongrels the nation,
THIS IS THE MEANING OF MISCEGENATION.⁴⁰

³⁷ Hunt's pamphlet, *The Negro's Place in History* was published by Van Evrie in the United States. The *National Anti-Slavery Standard* of March 26, 1864 reprinted an attack on the pamphlet from *The Christian Ambassador*.

³⁸ Reprinted in *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, March 26, 1864.

³⁹ And still does. Cedric Dover, in his eloquent *Know This of Race* (London, 1939), 96, is taken in much as some of the Abolitionists were. After a short discussion of this "anonymous pamphlet issued in 1864," he remarks that its "unsurpassed wisdom" makes him wish he "knew the author's name. He deserves the praise of posterity."

⁴⁰ *New York Day-Book*, April 16, 1864.

Was it perhaps Wendell Phillips⁴¹ or Theodore Tilton who had penned the tract? The *Herald* played with the idea that the mysterious author was none other than twenty-year old Anna Dickinson, who had been fired from her job in the Philadelphia mint three years before for accusing McClellan of treason. Miss Dickinson had since become one of the more popular Abolition orators—her sex, youth and fiery eloquence combining to draw large crowds. In mid-January she had addressed the House of Representatives—Lincoln came down to hear her speech—and had been roundly applauded. A fortnight later she was scheduled to repeat her address at Cooper Institute. “She was somewhat late in making her appearance on the platform,” wrote the New York correspondent of the London *Times*, retailing Democratic gossip to the British public, “and to pacify her audience (mostly composed of women),” advertisements of *Miscegenation* “were handed round for their perusal—a circumstance which suggested to many that the lecturer was either author of the book or peculiarly interested in its sale. . . .”⁴²

⁴¹ Phillips was probably a logical guess to some who remembered his yeoman service in behalf of the Irish fight for freedom and his successful effort to enlist Daniel O’Connell and Father Mathew in the abolition struggle. (See Oscar Sherwin’s excellent discussion of this phase of Phillips’ career in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, cited above.)

⁴² Who actually distributed these leaflets it is impossible to determine. Possibly Croly and Wakeman arranged it. Miss Dickinson was later the author of several tracts and a novel, *What Answer?*, in 1864, concerning the tragic love of a quadroon, Francesca Ercildowne for a white man, Will Surrey. The main theme of the novel is summarized by a fictional news item appearing in the Civil War press: “MISCEGENATION, DISGRACEFUL FREAK IN HIGH LIFE. FRUIT OF AN ABOLITION WAR.—We are credibly informed that a young man belonging to one of the first families in the city, Mr. W.A.S.,—we spare his name for the sake of his relatives,—who has been engaged since its outset in this fratricidal war, has just given evidence of its legitimate effect by taking to his bosom a nigger wench as *his wife*. Of course he is disowned by his family, and spurned by his friends, even radical fanaticism not being yet ready for such a dose as this.” (Anna E. Dickinson, *What Answer?*, [Boston, 1868], 190.) Van Evrie’s *Day-Book* of February 27, 1864 carried the following notice: “A Reply to Miss Dickinson.—We understand that Miss Emma Webb, a talented and accomplished young lady, who has traveled extensively in

By the middle of March, Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby, Paster at the Church uv the Noo Dispensashun—of whom Lincoln would say, “For the genius to write like Nasby, I would gladly give up my office”⁴³—had commented on the miscegenation issue. “Alluz preech agin the nigger,” he counseled a Democratic student of the ministry, “a youth uv much promise who votid twict for Bookannon. It’s soothin to a ginooine, constooshnel Southern-rites Dimekrat to be constantly told that ther is a race uv men meaner than he is. . . . Preech agin amalgamashen at least 4 Sundays per munth. A man uv straw that yoo set up yerself is the eesiest nockt down, pertikelerly if you set him up with a view uv nockin uv him down. . . . Lern to spell and pronownce Missenegengenashun. It’s a good word. . . .”⁴⁴

* * *

So far the *World* had not uttered a word on this controversial subject of its own creation, although Croly and Wakeman had inserted an advertisement in the *Liberator*

the West India Islands, and knows practically the evil effects of Abolitionism, will reply to Miss Anna Dickinson at the Athenaeum, in Brooklyn, on Friday evening, March 4th. . . .”

⁴³ *Divers Views, Opinions, and Prophecies of Yoors truly Petroleum V. Nasby* (Cincinnati, 1867), 182-186. F. B. Carpenter, who painted Lincoln, relates that just previous to the capture of Richmond, Lincoln said to him: “I am going to write ‘Petroleum’ to come down here, and I intend to tell him if he will communicate his talent to me, I will swap places with him!” (*Ibid.*, ix). At the close of the war, George S. Boutwell, Commissioner of Internal Revenue and later Secretary of Treasury, said that crushing the Rebellion could be credited to three forces: the army, the navy and the Nasby letters. (Jack Clifford Hayes, “David Ross Locke, Civil War Propagandist,” *North-west Ohio Quarterly*, XX [January, 1948], 5.)

⁴⁴ D. R. Locke, *The Moral History of America’s Life-Struggle*, (Boston, 1874), 15. At Columbus, Ohio, in 1859, where Lincoln in a speech had gone “out of his way to affirm his support of the law of Illinois forbidding the intermarriage of whites and Negroes,” Locke “asked him if such a denial was worth while. . . .” Lincoln replied: “The law means nothing. I shall never marry a Nigger, but I have no objection to any one else doing so. If a white man wants to marry a Negro woman, let him do so,—if the Negro woman can stand it.” (Cyril Clemens, *Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby* [Webster Groves, Missouri, 1936], 27.)

of March 4, quoting Wendell Phillips and stressing the fact that their pamphlet treated of "the relations of the Irish and the Negro." Now a strange thing happened. On March 24, the newspaper whose managing editor had been the principal author of *Miscegenation*, unabashedly made a full-length editorial attack on it. "Some time since there was published, in this city," blandly began the *World*, "a curious anonymous pamphlet, entitled 'Miscegenation: the Theory of the Blending of the Races, applied to the American White Man and Negro'. . . . A writer who seriously advocates the intermarriage and cohabitation of white men with negroes, and white women with negroes, has little claim to notice, on his own account, by journals which make it their chief business to mark and interpret the current indications of public sentiment." What can be the motive of such a writer? Why his anonymity? The answer is given in curious, carefully constructed circumlocutions.

Any man who chooses can write and cause to be printed whatever freak may come into his head; the existence of the production is evidence of nothing but the idiosyncrasy of the writer. If he gives his name, pride of singularity or fanatical devotion to a strange whim may afford a ready explanation of his course; if he publishes anonymously, he is probably feeling the public pulse, if serious, or expecting a profitable market for a piquant oddity, if he has not at heart the cause he ostensibly advocates.

Why bother then to give valuable space to a "piquant oddity"? "In either case, or in any case," continued the editorial, "he deserves only the passing attention due to contributors of public amusement, *unless* the interest awakened by his publication, and the indorsement it receives from some portion of the community, shall rescue him from the charge of singularity, and prove that he is the exponent of a widely-diffused sentiment, or at least the occasion of its manifestation." The indorsement the pamphlet receives "or the opposition it excites . . . makes it an index of public sentiment."

Furthermore, stated the *World*, the *Tribune* article was indicative of the favor the new doctrine was meeting in Abo-

lition quarters. "It is so extensively sanctioned by the leading negrophilists of the country, and by the prominent organs through which their views find expression, that we feel bound to call attention, not to the pamphlet (which is of little account taken by itself), but to the strongly developed tendencies of abolition public opinion which the pamphlet has brought out in bold relief." The *World* did "not propose to enter the lists with the *Tribune*, or any other advocate" of miscegenation. To the contention of the *Tribune* that the subject could only be treated by physiologist, ethnologist, historian, theologian or economist, the *World* replied that by that doctrine not even incest could be discussed until citizens should have "mastered half the sciences in the encyclopedia." If marriage is recommended for a white man with a black woman begetting his children—then precisely the same solution "might be asked in relation to incest, or any other abomination which the *progressists* have not yet dubbed with a euphemistic name." Opinions of this sort were "the logical outgrowth of the extravagant negrophilism" which had "its carnival of blood in this cruel civil war." "We cannot discuss these abominations," piously concluded the *World*. "We merely record and call attention to the *fact* that the leading Republican journal of the country is the unblushing advocate of 'miscegenation,' which it ranks with the highest questions of social and political philosophy."

The *World*, indeed, through Croly and Wakeman, had done its work—and well. Miscegenation, without doubt, had become a central campaign issue—a darling issue for the Copperhead Democracy. Throughout the land, in sharp polemic, right up to the November balloting—although the *World* alone among the Democratic sheets would speak in whispers on the subject—the national press would bandy word and issue about in an unending saturnalia of editorial, caricature and verse.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ In May, during Grant's Wilderness campaign, the *World* went through

By May, the miscegenation controversy had travelled north, south and west of New York City. In March, the New Hampshire *Patriot*, under the title of "Sixty-four Miscegenation," had concocted the obscenity that sixty-four Abolitionist school-mistresses of New England, teaching at Port Royal, had given birth to mulatto babies. Democratic newspapers far and wide spread the story and the Republican press was kept busy exposing the "atrocious calumny" as a "Copperhead slander."⁴⁶ In early April, Garrison's *Liberator* devoted its entire first page to editorial excerpts on the subject from the nation's press and a month

a crisis which perhaps helped to produce its comparative silence. "A few hours of dejection, leaving their effect behind," wrote James Ford Rhodes, "were caused by the publication, May 18, of a proclamation purporting to come from the President, which, admitting by implication the failure of Grant's campaign, appointed a solemn day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, and called for 400,000 men. It was a cleverly conceived and executed forgery, intended for stock-jobbing purposes, and only by certain happy accidents did it fail to appear in nearly all of the journals in New York City connected with the associated press. It was printed in the New York *World* and New York *Journal of Commerce*, Democratic newspapers, which had assailed the administration with virulence. Their editors strove earnestly to correct the error into which they had fallen innocently, and made adequate and apparently satisfactory explanations to Dix, the commanding general of the department, but before these were transmitted to Washington, the President had ordered their arrest and imprisonment and the suppression of their journals. A lieutenant with a file of soldiers seized their offices, and held possession of them for several days, but the order of personal arrest was rescinded." (*History of the United States* [New York, 1906], IV, 467-468.)

⁴⁶ *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, March 26, 1864. This is not an isolated instance of Copperhead fraud. The *Sunday Mercury*, rival on weekends of Bennett's *Herald*, pursued the campaign in its own way by means of forgeries. In its columns for March 18 appeared two personal notices, one of which reads.

Attention All Ladies — "Hunky Boy," every inch of a soldier, and alive and full of fun and miscegenation . . . solicits correspondence of all unmarried ladies between the ages of sixteen and sixty.

The names signed to the notices are Albert E. Dunwoodie, Sergeant, and Oscar D. Leonard, both of Company B, 55th Massachusetts (Coloured) Volunteers, Folly Island, South Carolina. The letters are fabrications. The rolls of the 55th do not carry these names either in Company B or in any other company. (*Record of the Service of the Fifty-Fifth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry*, Cambridge, 1868.)

later inveighed against a “certain class of people, seeking to bring opprobrium upon Republicans and Union men” by accusing them of “advocating what is termed ‘miscegenation.’” The *Boston Journal* traded brickbats with the *Courier* and the sound of battle echoed in the towns. The *Cape Cod Republican* warred with the *Barnstable Patriot*—while the nearby *Yarmouth Register* observed that Bennett and his fellow Copperheads had at last found something “sufficiently *smutty* for their tastes” in a “dull pamphlet on the old theme” thrown together by some fool in New York.⁴⁷

“Amalgamation has nothing to do with emancipation,” protested the *Philadelphia Press* in March. “Those who are so loudly opposing it are wasting their trouble upon a cause which has no advocates.” Naive brother Republicans were not helping matters: “We can only wonder at the folly of the few anti-slavery journals that have permitted themselves to be used by such mischief makers as the *Herald*.”

The new word miscegenation is not more strange to our ears than is the idea it embodies to our creed. It remains to say that the colored men who are entitled to speak for their own race, have never advocated amalgamation as a thing to be expected or desired. . . .

“It is no time for political miscegenation,” observed the *St. Louis Union*, arguing against the anti-Lincolnism of the radical Republican wing. “We need not be at all surprised to see an amalgamation ticket made up with Fremont for President, and Vallandigham for Vice-President.”⁴⁸ The Pennsylvania Democratic press went at *Miscegenation* hammer and tongs, the *Philadelphia Age* crowing coarsely over a fulsome article that had appeared in the *Detroit Free Press* under the title of “Miscegenation in Detroit,” while the *Washington (Pa.) Examiner* noted that the “celebrated anonymous work” was “remarkably consistent for an Abolition publication,” although the effeminate con-

⁴⁷ *Liberator*, April 8, 1864, May 13, 1864.

⁴⁸ *Liberator*, April 8, 1864.

sumptives" to whom it pleaded did not realize that miscegenation mean physical, mental and moral ruin.⁴⁹ According to the West Chester *Jeffersonian*, the Emancipation Proclamation was "a thoroughgoing program for 'miscegenation'" — a word which the editor began to cherish.⁵⁰ "Boston will, we do not doubt, furnish forth a devoted band of zealous miscegenators," ranted the Cincinnati *Enquirer* in a long lascivious editorial. "Those reverend clergymen who have given their sanction to the plan, and who see the movings of the divine spirit in the suggestion will not hesitate to put their hands to the miscegenation plow, and beget seals to their ministry. . . ."⁵¹ In the gubernatorial election that spring in Ohio, Clement R. Vallandigham ran from Canada. At campaign rallies throughout the Buckeye State, "a popular feature was a procession of young women bearing placards inscribed, 'Fathers, Save Us from Negro Equality.'"⁵²

By June, *Miscegenation* had been reprinted in London and in July the *Westminister Review* commented seriously on it.⁵³ "Much has been said of late," wrote the Abolitionist

⁴⁹ Ray H. Abrams, "The Copperhead Newspapers and the Negro," *Journal of Negro History*, XX (April 1935), 131-152. The *Examiner* acknowledged its indebtedness to Van Evrie's *Negroes and Negro "Slavery"* in preparing the editorial, and Van Evrie reciprocated by reprinting the notice in the *Day-Book* for May 14, 1864.

⁵⁰ Roy H. Abrams, "'The Jeffersonian,' Copperhead Newspaper," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LVII (July 1933), 260-283.

⁵¹ Reprinted in *New-York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*, April 9, 1864. Philip S. Foner states that this paper was "for a time the official organ of the Archbishop of New York and had a wide circulation among Irish-American workers. . . ." (*History of the Labor Movement in the United States from Colonial Times to the Founding of the American Federation of Labor* [New York, 1947], 269.)

⁵² Wood Gray, *The Hidden Civil War, The Story of the Copperheads*. (New York, 1942), 150.

⁵³ New Series, XXVI, 223-224. The "anonymous author of a very curious book, entitled 'Miscegenation,' originally published in New York and now reprinted in London, is of a very different opinion from Dr. Broca; he holds that crossing, or miscegenation as he terms it, is necessary for the production of a perfect type of man, and declares that the future American of the United States is to be a eugenic hybrid between the white and the black."

Reverend Dr. Moncure D. Conway in an anti-slavery volume published in England in July, "concerning the old horror of the amalgamation of the blacks and whites as it comes in the new dress of *Miscegenation* . . . let me remind the English reader, that nobody in the Northern States has proposed that the blacks and whites shall be *compelled* to intermarry. The proposition is simply that the laws against such marriages which yet remain in some of the Northern States shall be removed. Consequently, that portion of the English press which has been so distressed on this subject may calm itself with the reflection that, were the theory of the wildest miscegenist adopted tomorrow, the relation between the blacks and whites in respect to marriage would be simply conformed to what it is in England and France to-day."⁵⁴

* * *

By midsummer also, the noisome Dr. J. H. Van Evrie, to the right even of Vallandigham in his uncompromising Calhounism, had brought out anonymously, as a counterpoise to *Miscegenation*, a refurbished edition of one of his old books. Its title was *Subgenation: The Theory of the Normal Relation of the Races*; its subtitle—*An Answer to "Miscegenation."*⁵⁵ The invented word *Miscegenation*, in the opinion of Van Evrie, was accurate as applied to "persons of the *same* race" but a misnomer as applied to the different races of American society. As a matter of fact

⁵⁴ M. D. Conway, A Native of Virginia, *Testimonies Concerning Slavery*, 2nd ed. (London, 1865), 75. Conway went on to say: "Moreover, it is well to remember that 'Miscegenation' is already the irreversible fact of Southern Society in every thing but the recognition of it. . . . No, the trouble is entirely in the political caste of that Negro blood. . . . 'But,' it is said, 'the Abolitionists themselves are not willing to marry, or have their children marry, Negroes.' No one wishes to marry, or to have a son or daughter to marry, an *unfortunate* person—and such the American Negro is. Moreover, he is often uncultivated. But, apart from this, the majority of Abolitionists would not object to such an alliance."

⁵⁵ Its New York publication was announced in the *Day-Book* of July 16, 1864.

slavery could only exist as a relationship within a single race or between equal races and the word was misapplied when used to denote a relationship of servitude between a *superior* and *inferior* race. "The simple truth is—There is no slavery in this country; there are no slaves in the Southern States."⁵⁶ To capture that truth linguistically, Van Evrie aped Croly in inventing a new word—*subgenation*, "from *sub*, lower, and *generatus* and *genus*, a race born or created lower than another; *i.e.*, the natural or normal relation of an inferior to a superior race. . . ." For Croly and Wakeman's half-truths and loose generalizations, Van Evrie substituted his own. "The author of 'Miscegenation,' in his vile aspersions against the white women of the South, has won for his name an immortality of infamy—should it ever come to light,—far beyond that achieved by any human being."

The equality of all whom God has created equal (white men), and the inequality of those He has made unequal (negroes and other inferior races), are the corner-stone of American democracy, and the vital principle of American civilization and of human progress. . . . Then, in the face of the world, we should announce that the grand humanitarian policy of progressive and civilized America is to restore subgenation all over the American Continent. . . .

Van Evrie had his political point to make also. Thousands of Democrats in the North believed in the doctrine of subgenation—Vallandigham, Seymour, Wood, Cox among them—but had "not the courage to say it." "Miscegenation is Monarchy; Subgenation is Democracy. . . . When Lincoln issued his Miscegenation Proclamation he proclaimed a monarchy." The real question before the country was "Subgenation *vs.* Miscegenation." Indeed, the "Peace men must rouse themselves, sweep away the War leaders of the Democracy, nominate a candidate for President who shall bear upon his banner Peace and Subgenation" and usher in "*the*

⁵⁶ In 1856, *DeBow's Review* had criticized *Webster's Dictionary* because it defined a slave as "a person subject to the will of another, a drudge." (F. Garvin Davenport, *Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War* [Chapel Hill, 1941], 178.)

adoption by the North of the Confederate Constitution!"⁵⁷

Why Van Evrie chose to remain anonymous in this volume may be understood from its treatment by General Lew Wallace, Provost Marshal of Baltimore, who, according to the Copperhead press, closed a bookshop selling the

⁵⁷ *Subgenation*, 51, 56, 65. Van Evrie quotes Agassiz against Pritchard to demolish the "great luminary of the single-race theory" and pretends to be very rationalistic in attacking the Bible as an authority on scientific questions, citing Galileo and Hugh Miller (the American geologist) in his arguments. Later in the book, however, he drags in the stock-in-trade Biblical arguments for slavery. Professor Draper's physiology is attacked, and the downfall of the Carthaginians, "the Yankees of the Mediterranean," is given as an example of racial corruption. "In Boston the number of births among the negro and mongrel population is not equal to deaths." Mexico, country of "the degenerate miscegen," was conquered "by a few brave Frenchmen." The United States committed an unpardonable sin in not holding Mexico "and restoring subgenation there, prepare it gradually for a Democracy."

That Van Evrie's views have by no means perished is painfully obvious. Suffice to cite a few passages from a "scientific" work of thirty years ago by Edward M. East and Donald F. Jones, which reiterates the biological doctrine of *Subgenation*: "The world faces two types of racial combination: one in which the races are so far apart as to make hybridization a real breaking-down of the inherent characteristics of each; the other, where fewer differences present only the possibility of a somewhat greater variability as a desirable basis for selection. Roughly, the former is the color-line problem; the latter is that of the White Melting Pot, faced particularly by Europe, North America and Australia. The genetics of these two kinds of racial intermixture is as follows: Consider first a cross between two extremes, typical members of the white and of the black race. . . . The real result of such a wide racial cross, therefore is to break apart those compatible physical and mental qualities which have established a smoothly operating whole in each race by hundreds of generations of natural selection. If the two races possessed equivalent physical characteristics and mental capacities, there would still be this valid genetical objection to crossing, as one may readily see. But in reality the negro is inferior to the white. This is not a hypothesis or supposition; it is a crude statement of actual fact. The negro has given the world no original contribution of high merit. By his own initiative in his original habitat, he has never risen. Transplanted to a new environment, as in the case of Haiti, he has done no better. In competition with the white race, he has failed to approach its standard. But because he has failed to equal the white man's ability, his natural increase is low in comparison. The native population of Africa is increasing very slowly, if at all. In the best environment to which he has been subjected, the United States, his ratio in the general population is decreasing. His only chance for an extended survival is amalgamation. . . . It seems an unnecessary accompaniment to humane treatment, an illogical extension of altruism, however, to seek to elevate the black race at the cost of lowering the

pamphlet and summoned the proprietor to explain. "It was for the heinous and inexplicable crime of selling a pamphlet called 'Subgenation,' in answer to the beastly brochure on 'Miscegenation,' which so disgusted all decent people, except the philanthropical elect, some months ago," howled the *Day-Book*.⁵⁸

white. . . . Our first conclusion may be said to be a decision against the union of races having markedly different characteristics—particularly when one is decidedly the inferior. . . . Our second thesis is seemingly paradoxical. It asserts that the foundation stocks of races which have impressed civilization most deeply have been produced by intermingling peoples who through one cause or other became genetically somewhat unlike." (*Interbreeding and Outbreeding Their Genetic and Sociological Significance* [Philadelphia 1919], 252-255.)

John H. Van Evrie deserves a going-over in his own right. He was born in 1814 (died in 1896) and received a medical degree somewhere. Whether he practiced is problematical; most of his time seems to have been spent as a pseudo-scientific, screwball propagandist of Copperheadism in New York. He was co-publisher (Van Evrie, Horton & Co.) of the *New-York Day-Book (Caucasian)* which, advertising itself as "The White Man's Paper," had been denied mailing privileges in 1862. His *magnum opus* was a 400 page book titled *Negroes and Negro Slavery; the first, an inferior race—the latter, its normal condition*, published simultaneously in Baltimore and Washington, D. C. and reprinted in 1854 and in 1861 in New York by his own publishing firm. The edition of 1864, with its title changed to *Subgenation* is basically the old text with specific argument re Croly thrown in. Anonymity was protection from charge of treason. The volume was republished in 1866 with the *Subgenation* title; then, since the word had not caught on as *miscegenation* had, in 1867 and 1870 the original text came out with a title better adapted to Secessionist needs in the Reconstruction period: "*White Supremacy and Negro Subordination or, Negroes A Subordinate Race, and Slavery Its Normal Condition*. In this text neither the word *miscegenation* nor *subgenation* is used. In 1868, Hinton Rowan Helper, in his revolting *The Negroes in Negroland; The Negroes in America; and Negroes Generally* cited Van Evrie as an authority. In 1863, Van Evrie, Horton & Company published S. S. Cox's "Puritanism in Politics."

Rushmore G. Horton, Van Evrie's partner, was another particularly venomous Copperhead. In 1866, he wrote and published *A Youth's History of the Great Civil War in the United States from 1861 to 1865*, which repeated in primer style all the "arguments" of *Subgenation*. Horton's *History* quickly ran through a few editions and is still popular in certain quarters. In 1925 a revised edition was edited and published by Lloyd T. Everett and Mary D. Carter, dedicated "to those friends of Freedom, the Copperheads of the North—both of earlier and later times."

⁵⁸ October 15, 1864.

Van Evrie schemed tirelessly to turn "miscegenation" to Copperhead use. On July 9 in the *Day-Book* appeared an advertisement for "Political Caricature No. 2," titled "Miscegenation, or The Millenium of Abolitionism," at 25c per copy and cheaper in quantity—"a capital hit upon the new plank in the Republican platform," representing "society as it is to be in the era of 'Equality and Fraternity.'"

Sumner is introducing a strapping "colored lady" to the President. A young woman (white) is being kissed by a big buck nigger, while a lady lecturer supposed to be "The Inspired Maid" [Miss Anna Dickinson] sits upon the knee of a sable brother urging him to come to her lectures, while Greeley, in the very height of ecstatic enjoyment, is eating ice-cream with a female African of monstrous physique, declaring that society at last had reached absolute perfection. In the background is a carriage, negroes inside, with white drivers and footmen; a white servant girl drawing a nigger baby, and a newly arrived German surveying the whole scene exclaiming, "Mine Got, vot a guntry! Vot a beeples!"

"It ought to be circulated far and wide as a campaign document," concluded the advertisement. Newspapers that copied the blurb and sent in a marked copy would receive four copies of the picture by mail.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ This caricature was put out by J. Bromley and Company of New York. Other elements of the caricature emphasize its insidious intent. A "white servant girl" remarks, "and is it to drag nagur babies that I left old Ireland? Bad luck to me." A Negro suitor implores a demure white lass, "Lubly Julia Anna, name de day, when Brodder Beecher shall make us one?" To a "strapping 'colored lady'" being introduced to him by Sumner, Lincoln says: "I shall be proud to number among my intimate friends any member of the Squash family, especially the little Squashes"; to which she replies, "I'se 'quainted wid Missus Linkum, I is, washed for her 'fore de hebenly Miscegenation times was cum. Dont do nuffin now but gallevant 'round wid de white gem'men! he-ah! he-ah! he-ah!" On October 22, 1864, the *Day-Book* advertised another political caricature put out by Browley: "The Greatest Hit Yet—The Miscegenation Ball At the Headquarters of the Lincoln Campaign Club, corner of Broadway and 23d st., N. Y. on the evening of Sept. 21, 1864." In "mazy dance," so goes the description of the picture, "with fat, black wenches, in silks and satins, are dignified, grave, white politicians on the sofas, squeezing and ogling thick-lipped Phillises. . . ." The Republican Party answered promptly with the aid of Currier and Ives. In a cartoon on the Chicago convention of the Democrats, the nominees McClellan and Pendleton are portrayed as "The . . . Political Siamese Twins, The Offspring of Chicago Miscegenation," spurned by two Union soldiers.

Thus through this summer of gloom for the Northern cause the Copperhead press kept up its attack on the "miscegenation" front. The concentration point for the attack—especially as Election Day approached—was New York, a decisive city in a decisive state. In New York had occurred the draft riots of the previous July;⁶⁰ in New York, *Miscegenation*, with its deliberately provocative clap-trap on the necessary and inevitable amalgamation of Negro and Irish, had been born. Correctly manipulated, figured the sachems of Tammany and Mozart Hall, the miscegenation issue could not fail to win the labor and Irish vote for "little Mac."⁶¹

When in May, Lincoln, recalling these riots, counseled a workingmen's group that "the strongest bond of human sympathy outside the family relation should be the one uniting all working people, of all nations, tongues and kindreds," the Democratic press was not slow to give his words an anti-labor, anti-Irish twist. "Mr. Abraham Lincoln has deliberately insulted the white working classes of the United States," ranted the *Jeffersonian*. "He classes labouring white men with negroes. . . . In this brief sentence we have the new doctrine of 'miscegenation' or amalgamation officially announced."

The most advanced school of Abolitionists now take the position that our citizens of Irish birth are inferior to the negro, and that

⁶⁰ "The Democratic press never tired of stressing the labor competition to be anticipated by white laborers from free Negroes." (Gray, *op. cit.*, 90). Also see Foner, *op. cit.*, 269-270, 320-324, which ably summarizes the monographic material on the subject.

⁶¹ A year before, in August 1862, a Brooklyn mob had attacked a factory in which Negroes were working and had tried to fire it. The *New York Evening Post* hit the nail on the head in its comment: "In every case Irish laborers have been incited to take part in these lawless attempts; and the cunning ring-leaders and originators of these mutinies, who are not Irishmen, have thus sought to kill two birds with one stone—to excite a strong popular prejudice against the Irish, while they used them to wreak their spite against the blacks." (Allan Nevins, *The Evening Post—A Century of Journalism* [New York, 1922], 305.) According to the census of 1860, there were in New York City 203,000 persons of Irish birth out of a total population of 813,000.

they could be vastly improved by the intermixture with the negro. The "working people" to whom Mr. Lincoln refers, are, of course, the Irish, for it was upon them the responsibility of the riot was thrown . . . it is the direct tendency of Abolitionism to reduce the white laboring classes of the country to negro equality and amalgamation. . . .

"We did not expect, however," concluded the *Jeffersonian*, "to find Mr. Lincoln come out and openly advocate this monstrous doctrine. . . ." ⁶² The climax had been reached, according to the *New-York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register*: the "beastly doctrine of the intermarriage of black men with white women" was now "openly and publicly avowed and indorsed and encouraged by the President of the United States. . . . Filthy black niggers, greasy, sweaty, and disgusting, now jostle white people and even ladies everywhere, even at the President's levees." What next would happen in "this cruel, Abolition, miscegenation war?" asked a Philadelphia correspondent of the *Register*. "But a few years ago, Henry Winter Davis was having Irish Catholics murdered in the streets of Baltimore. . . ." ⁶³

It is not strange, therefore, that during the last days of September as electioneering grew hotter and hotter, the Central Campaign Committee of the Democratic Party circulated a long leaflet titled "Miscegenation and the Republican Party," the main argument of which was directed to the workingclass of New York City. ⁶⁴ The leaflet, an ambitious and comprehensive attempt to make political capital of "the publication, in the early part of 1864, of a very curious pamphlet, entitled 'Miscegenation,'" reprinted the replies of the Abolitionists to Croly and Wakeman's letter,

⁶² Quoted in *New-York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register*, May 21, 1864, under title of "Abe's Philanthropy."

⁶³ *New-York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register*, April 23, 30, 1864. When this newspaper ran out of original invective, it simply reprinted excerpts from *Miscegenation* with appropriate headings, as in the issue of June 11, 1864.

⁶⁴ *Weekly World*, September 29, October 27, 1864. This leaflet, later advertised as "Miscegenation Indorsed by the Republican Party" and printed as "Campaign Document No. 11," was sold at "all Democratic Newspaper Offices at \$1. per 1000 pages."

together with extensive quotations from the national anti-slavery press. After damning Sumner, Phillips, Tilton, Stowe, Emerson, Beecher and others, the leaflet went on to lambaste the women-folk of the Union League of New York for sending off the Twentieth U. S. Colored Regiment with a message of "love and honor from the daughters of this great metropolis to their brave champions in the field." This was "a practical example of miscegenation"⁶⁵ Its main shot, however, was aimed against the President, who "in his turgid and awkward way," acknowledging the support of the Working Men's Democratic Republican Association of New York, had advised the laboring classes to "beware of prejudices, working disunion and hostility among themselves." Before this "bogus association," stated Campaign Document No. 11 with horror, "Mr. Lin-

⁶⁵ On April 30, 1864, the New York *Tribune* printed a letter to the editor, signed T, in which the writer discussed "the only case of practical miscegenation" he had ever known." Near Oluscatee, Florida, in 1858, he had entered the residence of a large plantation. Its mistress, an "unmistakeable mulatto woman," age about 40, stout, comfortable-looking and "exhibiting evidences of considerable cultivation in her manner and conversation" had received him. A small child was with her; the other children were at Northern schools. The husband entered—"coarse, brutish"—treated them civilly but coldly, taking no notice of his wife. She was the child of a Jamaica planter. Her husband, a sailor, had agreed to marry her for ten or twenty thousand dollars. The plantation was a prosperous one. The light complexions of the children enabled them to "pass" in the North. "Thus, it seems," concluded T, "that in the most Southern of Southern states, miscegenation has been tolerated for 20 years, and that it has been considered proper not only for whites to buy and sell blacks, and their own mulatto children, but even to sell themselves into domestic servitude for a sufficient consideration."

On July 23, 1864, the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, under the title of "The 'Patriarchal' System, 'Miscegenation' in Perfection," carried a letter from a soldier of the 140th Pennsylvania Volunteers stationed near Richmond, Virginia. The soldier had visited a plantation and had spoken with many of its ex-slaves who were the children of the planter. One woman, a mother, had confessed to being the planter's child. Her moronic son stood nearby. "I asked the mother of this boy if Mr. Scott was his father. . . . The incestuous old beast! *This idiot son—the child of his own daughter and grandfather to his own children!* . . . Do you know how these skin aristocrats rave over the new theory of miscegenation. . . . [here] was the very worst form of incestuous amalgamation."

coln took especial pains to place working negroes and white men on an equality.’⁶⁸

For the ultra-Copperhead Van Evrie, Campaign Document No. 11 was not enough. With the election a month off, there was no time “to read long speeches and pamphlets.” What was “put before the people should be short, pithy and pointed”—and Van Evrie proposed to do just that. The *Day-Book*, carrying notices and reports of union meetings as one of its regular features, had for long oriented itself to the special problem of winning New York’s workers to Copperheadism. And in this field its demogogy was confusing and clever. “The banker, lawyer, preacher, or other non-producing classes,” it continually explained to its workingclass readers,

need not fear ruin from the “abolition of slavery,” but the producing classes, the mechanic, laborer, etc., had better cut the throats of their children at once than hand them to “impartial freedom,” degradation and amalgamation with negroes.

To clinch this argument, in the last crucial days of the campaign Van Evrie decided to bring out his own “Campaign Broadside No. 1—The Miscegenation Record of the Republican Party,” aimed more specifically than the official Campaign Document No. 11 at the strategic workingclass of

⁶⁸ To bolster its argument, Campaign Document No. 11 cited a request of Henry Clay in 1848 to his biographer, the Rev. Walter Colton, to write a pamphlet showing that the “ultras go for abolition and amalgamation, and their object is to unite in marriage the laboring white man and the black woman, and to reduce the white laboring man to the despised and degraded condition of the black man.” During the campaign, the Democratic Party also circulated reprints of political addresses made by some of its prominent members. One of these, a speech by Supreme Court Justice Jeremiah S. Black, delivered at the Keystone Club in Philadelphia on October 24, 1864, contained the following passage: “It happens, by the permission of God’s providence, that two distinct races of human beings have been thrown together on this continent. All the mental characteristics as well as the physical features and color of one race, make it lower in the scale of creation than the other. . . . The Abolitionists look upon all this with perfect horror. They assert everywhere, in season and out of season, the natural right of the negro to political, legal and social equality. Their theories of miscegenation are too disgusting to be mentioned.”

New York and its Irish core.⁶⁷ After exhuming from *Miscegenation* one of its key provocations—

The fusion between Negro and Irish *will be of infinite service to the Irish*. They are a *more brutal* race and lower in civilization than the Negro. . . . Of course we speak of the laboring Irish.

—the hydrophobic doctor flew at Lincoln's throat. The President had insulted "every white workingman by including him in the category of negroes, or, in other words, calling him a nigger!" By ignoring "all distinctions of color among the laboring classes," by calling them all "working people," Lincoln had recommended "amalgamation of the white working classes with negroes! In other words, white workingmen should love a negro *better than anyone except a relative!* . . ." The need of the moment was to ram this idea into the heads of wavering people.⁶⁸ "Millions of these little documents ought to be distributed at once," urged Van Evrie. "Democratic Clubs, Committees, etc., should order at once."

Nor was Van Evrie alone during the concluding weeks of the campaign in his desire to reach the Irish-Catholic workingmen with this rabid message. "What is a "Miscege-na-tor"?" began a forty-eight page Copperhead pamphlet by George Francis Train. He is an

. . . Abolitionist (altered Democrat), Black Republican . . . Sneers at Catholics, and calls naturalized citizens d——d Irishmen.

The "campaign cry of Copperhead" was "white Man on the Brain, to distinguish its class from Miscege-na-tor, or Nigger on the Brain." The platform of the Republicans was

⁶⁷ *Day-Book*, October 1, 1864. These leaflets were for sale at \$1. per hundred. For the *New-York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register*, which evidently oriented itself to the more backward members of the Irish-Catholic workingclass of New York City, "the real secret, aim and object of Abolitionism" was an "instinctive effort . . . to destroy the natural order of society . . . by poisoning the masses with negro equality." (May 21, 1864, reprinted from the *Jeffersonian*.)

⁶⁸ It must be admitted that the attitudes of certain Abolitionist and labor leaders towards emerging workingclass militancy provided fertile ground for Copperhead seed. Writes Foner: "The Abolitionists did little to overcome the

Subjugation.
 Emancipation.
 Confiscation.
 Domination.
 Annihilation.
 Destruction, in order to produce
 Miscegenation!⁶⁹

“Who is Thad Stephen [sic]?” asked another Copperhead pamphlet entitled *The Lincoln Catechism*—and answered: “An amalgamationist from Pennsylvania, who honestly practices what he preaches.”⁷⁰

fears of the workingclass regarding the so-called dangers of Negro emancipation. In fact they did a good deal to convince many workers that they were concerned only with the welfare of the Negro slaves and considered the problems of free labor as insignificant. In the first issue of the *Liberator* William Lloyd Garrison denounced the trade union movement as an organized conspiracy ‘to inflame the minds of our working classes against the more opulent.’” In 1847 the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, stated that no true Abolitionist could have any sympathy for those who denounced wage-slavery as an evil. Even Wendell Phillips in 1847 saw no need for unions. Although Phillips changed his views and Frederick Douglass supported unions, this trend of indifference to wage-workers’ problems continued in the Abolitionist movement. Thus Horace Greeley denounced Abolitionists who refused to treat workers decently and turned down an invitation to an anti-slavery convention because of the indifference of many of the delegates to problems of the Northern workers. Sarah Bagley, although ardently anti-slavery, felt herself forced to denounce some Abolitionist leaders for a similar indifference. The fact that in the election of 1860, the Republican Party had widely circulated Helper’s *The Impending Crisis*—which attacked Irish-Americans as supporters of slavery—helped to provide a susceptible audience for the Democratic propaganda of 1864. (*Op. cit.*, 270-271, 295). In 1863, facing English audiences, Henry Ward Beecher “laid all blame for the New York draft riots on the Irish Catholics, as though to say that America had the same Irish problem as England. . . .” (*Sandburg, op. cit.*, II, 515).

⁶⁹ Anon. [George Francis Train], *A Voice From the Pit*, (Washington, D. C. [?], 1864), 3, 4, 5.

⁷⁰ Anon., *The Lincoln Catechism Wherein the Eccentricities & Beauties of Despotism Are Fully Set Forth. A Guide to the Presidential Election of 1864*, (New York, 1864), 24. On the next page the catechism asked, “Who is Anna Dickinson?” and answered, “Ask Ben. Butler and William D. Kelly.” The Republicans replied in a *Copperhead Catechism* by “Fernando the Gothamite,” which was copyrighted and perhaps written by Montgomery Wilson. (Joseph Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books relating to America* [New York, 1869-1936], IV, 529.)

Croly and Wakeman did not wait long to take advantage of the new opportunity offered by the President's address to the New York workingmen. They were now to play their last card. On September 29, a copy of *Miscegenation* was dispatched to the White House, accompanying it a letter to Abraham Lincoln. "I hereby transmit a copy of my work on 'Miscegenation,' " began the anonymous author, "in the hope that after you have perused it, you will graciously permit me to dedicate to you another work on a kindred subject, viz: 'Melaleukation.' "

In the one work I discuss the mingling of all the races which go to form the human family. My object in the new publication is to set forth the advantage of blending of the black and white races on this continent. From the favor with which "Miscegenation" has been received—a great many thousand copies having been sold, and its leading ideas having been warmly indorsed by the progressive men of the country—I am led to believe that this new work will excite even greater interest.

So much for preamble; the main point follows: "I am tempted to make this request from the various measures of your administration looking to the recognition of the great doctrine of human brotherhood, and from your speech to the New-York workingmen, in which you recognize the social and political equality of the white and colored laborer." Allow me, concluded the gracious writer,

to express the hope that, as the first four years of your administration have been distinguished by the emancipation of four millions of human beings, the next four years may find them freemen raised to the condition of social equality, and becoming an element of the future American race.⁷¹

One can imagine how Croly's mouth watered as he watched the mails for a reply. But Lincoln did not rise to the bait. Nevertheless, in a ceaseless torrent of invective right up to the November balloting, the President's message to the New York workingmen was twisted and befooled by the defeat-sensing Democratic journals, as they strove to keep the miscegenation issue in the fore of the campaign. At a pro-McClellan mass meeting, the *World*

⁷¹ MS in Library of Congress.

reported a speech by one Colonel Max Langenschwarz, who urged the Republicans to "add to emancipation, to confiscation, and to miscegenation, a policy of polygamy," so that "a man could have a yellow wife from China, a brown wife from India, a black wife from Africa, and a white wife from his own country, and so have a variegated family and put a sign over the door: 'United Matrimonial Paint Shop.'"⁷² About nine in the evening of Election Day, wrote the New York correspondent of the pro-Northern London *Daily News*, "I went to Tammany Hall"—

The hall was densely packed by a most unsavoury crowd . . . a large proportion evidently Irish. . . . "Captain" Rynders, a mob leader of great reputation and influence . . . was engaged in accusing the republican party of an intention to persecute the catholics as soon as they had subjugated the slaveholders. . . .

This was the same Rynders whose gang some years before had driven the dauntless Phillips from a New York lecture platform.

From this he passed rapidly to abuse of the negro . . . anything so ribald and disgusting I have never heard in a public assemblage. He rang the changes for twenty minutes on the smell of the negroes, and on their lips, nose, and "wool," and interspersed it with denunciations of the "miscegenators," recurring incessantly to the passion which he ascribed to the republican leaders for "nigger wenches."⁷³

Thus the Democracy hammered at the miscegenation "issue" up to the very last minutes of the campaign. Yet the ugly crusade was destined to fail. The withdrawal of Fremont from the presidential race, together with the bright news from Sherman in Atlanta and Farragut in Mobile Bay, reversed what had seemed to Lincoln in August a terribly ominous trend. True enough, in New York City the Copperhead campaign was something of a success. In 1860, Lincoln had received 33,000 votes to his opponent's 62,000, while now he received only 36,000 to McClellan's 78,000.⁷⁴

⁷² Sandburg, *op. cit.*, II, 581.

⁷³ London *Daily News*, November 26, 1864.

⁷⁴ Lincoln's majority in New York State was uncomfortably small—7,000 votes. On the other hand, Seymour, who had been elected Democratic governor in 1862, was defeated by the Republican, Fenton, in 1864.

Nevertheless in the country at large Lincoln received all but twenty-one of the electoral votes, while "Sunset" Cox of Ohio, the chief Congressional accomplice of Croly and Wakeman, lost his seat to the Republican, Samuel Shellabarger.

* * *

That the celebrated pamphlet on *Miscegenation* was a colossal hoax was not first revealed in America. In mid-October, a fortnight before the election, the New York correspondent of the pro-Southern London *Morning Herald* mailed off a dispatch that would be printed as a feature article in its issue of November 1.⁷⁵ "As this letter will not return in printed form to the United States before the presidential election will have taken place," it began, "it will do no harm where harm might otherwise possibly be done, to give the history of one of the most extraordinary hoaxes that ever agitated the literary world."

In the beginning of the spring of the present year, a pamphlet was published in this city, bearing the novel and rather barbarous, as far as pronunciation goes, title of "Miscegenation" . . . it was gravely put forth as embodying the only practical solution of that *questio vexata*, the disposal of the negro. Although the theme discussed with such apparent solemnity is not a savory one, the book was very cleverly written, and was full of scientific facts and learned quotations which gave it an air of great plausibility. Several very large editions of the work were sold in the United States; and eventually it found its way across the water, was reprinted by Trubner & Company, and received prominent comment in several English literary journals. Among others, the *Westminster Review* noticed the book with a great deal of gravity, and spoke of it as being a very curious work.

The fact is, continued the dispatch, the pamphlet "was written by two young gentlemen connected with the newspaper press of New York, both of whom are obstinate Democrats in politics, and was got up solely with the view

⁷⁵ Headlines for the article were: "THE GREAT HOAX OF THE DAY! The Great Miscegenation Pamphlet Exposed—The 'Moon Hoax' in the Shade—Who Wrote the Book—How it Came into Notice—Letters of Indorsement from Leading Progressives."

of committing, if possible, the orators and essayists of the Republican party to the principle it enunciated, that of the complete social equality, by marriage, of the white and black races." No one suspected that it had been written by "people who abhor the doctrine it sets forth." It had "swindled" everybody. The authors of *Miscegenation*, "employing the arguments of the Republicans," had "dextrously managed to make it appear that an amalgamation or miscegenation of the two races was not only desirable but inevitable." To familiarize themselves with the subject, these two "obstinate Democrats" had "crammed" their subject at the Astor Library.⁷⁶ They had quoted "Pritch-

⁷⁶ At the Astor Library, Croly and Wakeman might have come across the following passage in William J. Grayson's *The Hireling and the Slave, Chicora, and Other Poems* (Charleston, S. C., 1856), 71, which could have furnished pointed suggestions in the elaboration of their theme:

Not such his fate Philanthropy replies,
His horoscope is drawn from happier skies;
Bonds soon shall cease to be the Negro's lot,
Mere race-distinctions shall be all forgot,
And white and black amalgamating, prove
The charms that Stone admires, of mongrel love,
Erase the lines that erring nature draws
To severe race, and rescind her laws;
Reverse the rule that stupid farmers heed,
And mend the higher by the coarser breed;
Or prove the world's long history false, and find
Wit, wisdom, genius in the Negro mind;
If not intended thus, in time to blend
In one bronze-colored breed, what then the end?

In June 1864, the right-of-Copperhead New York *Old Guard* (136-137), reviewing Grayson's poem for the second time, deplored the fact that the "crowd" ran after "that hyena in woman's clothes, Anna Dickinson," while *The Hireling and the Slave* had not "been once named by a northern newspaper." (Brother Basil Leo Lee, *Discontent in New York City* [Washington, D. C., 1943], 146-147.) In 1863, the *Old Guard's* editor, C. Chauncey Burr, predicted that after March 4, 1865 drawings and paintings would be put on exhibition in Washington, including one of a "white man embracing a Negro wench. An immodest picture, dedicated to Charles Sumner." Burr alluded frequently to "Negro-blooded" Republican leaders. "A western author has issued a pamphlet adducing evidence to show that Old Abe is part negro," he wrote; ". . . Hamlin and Sumner, to the scientific eye, show the presence of Negro blood. . . ." (Sandburg, *op. cit.*, II, 135-137.)

ard, Draper, and other learned authorities." But their "true object" was to bring "the Republican party into conflict with the strong anti-negro prejudice existing in the North." Of course, it had been "an admirable weapon to use against the Republicans and the Democrats were not slow to avail themselves of it."

The machinery employed to get the hoax into circulation was very ingenious. Before it was issued, proof copies were sent to all leading abolitionists, male and female, of the country, from Senator Sumner and Secretary Seward down to Abby Kelly Foster, the crinolined abolition ranter. Many of the hare-brained spiritual mediums of the land—and there are a score or more of these ethereal individuals in every northern village—were furnished with advance sheets of the work, and all "mediums" and more material-minded abolitionists were requested to furnish their views upon the subject to the author.

"The bait was swallowed with avidity," observed the *Morning Herald's* correspondent, gleefully enumerating the replies of Pillsbury, a "brilliant of the abolition clique" and of the rest. Through "the dextrous manipulation of the authors," the pamphlet had been "introduced in Congress," where Cox had made "a brilliant and forcible speech against the theory."

Nor were the abolitionists the only ones deceived. Even S. R. Fiske, one of the editors of the *New York Herald*—which greatly prided itself upon its sharpness—had penned a four-column refutation, which was reprinted by the *Leader*. Indeed, it had been "a decided hit." Although Mr. Charles Congdon, "one of the cleverest writers on the editorial staff of the *New York Tribune*, had squinted at it very strongly, so impressed" had he been with the theory that he had written two or three articles on it. Yet the plot had not been altogether a success. Although the *Anti-Slavery Standard* and the *Independent* had espoused the ideas of *Miscegenation*, the "bulk of the Republican party, however, composed as it is of very shrewd politicians, constantly on the alert for traps of that sort, whether innocently set by their own radical brethren or by the wicked 'Copper-

heads,'” had realized that “whether the book was to be viewed with distrust or not, and however consistent its doctrines might be with their record and character, its public endorsement would kill them politically, and so they wisely said very little about the matter.”

“Miscegenation,” according to the *Morning Herald*, threw the “Moon Hoax,” perpetrated by J. Locke immediately after the completion of Lord Ross’s great telescope, into the shade. Moreover, it was “very likely that the writers of the book will never be discovered, but like the author of the world-famous ‘Junius’s Letters,’ will remain unknown to fame, a puzzle to American bibliographers as the ‘Letters’ have been and are to the shrewdest minds of England.” *Miscegenation* had constituted “one of the most amusing chapters of the present political campaign,” and the *Westminister Review* and other journals “must own up, as a Yankee would say, to being very decidedly ‘sold.’” Indeed the effect of the pamphlet would not “die with the mystery of its origin.”

The conclusion of the dispatch was bloodthirsty, in the Van Evrie style. There were “but two solutions” to the problem:

either we must have a war of races, which would inevitably result in the extirpation of the negroes; or we must incorporate them with ourselves, in the succeeding generations by marriage. Either horn of this dilemma is frightful. . . . No sane man supposes that our people will ever marry the negroes out of existence; there remains, then, war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt, till every vestige of the African race disappears from the continent.

Thus would the abolitionists be punished for “their mad attack upon the patriarchal system of the South. . . .”⁷⁷

That Croly was in cahoots with the correspondent of the *Morning Herald* may be seen by the latter’s dispatch of a

⁷⁷ This section of the *Herald* exposé was expurgated from the *World* reprint. Possibly the tone was so personal and vindictive that not only might it have been impolitic to print it after Lincoln’s smashing victory, but also it might have revealed, for those who cared to investigate, the fact that the *World* was originally responsible for the hoax.

week later. "The authors of 'Miscegenation'—the literary, or rather politico-literary hoax of which I have given you a full description—have asked, in a letter, the permission of the President to dedicate their book to him. This 'dodge' will hardly succeed; for Mr. Lincoln is shrewd enough to say nothing on the unsavoury subject."⁷⁸ Meanwhile he awaited with interest the exposure of the fraud in the States. Indeed, "the wrathful denunciation of the Republican journals and politicians who have endorsed the doctrines of the book, and whose letters and articles are in the possession of the authors, will be amusing."⁷⁹

"When this exposé reaches the United States," the

⁷⁸ Andrew Jackson in his campaign of 1828 had to contend with the problem in a more personal way. In a letter to General R. K. Call on August 16, 1828, he wrote: "The whole object of the coalition is to calumniate me, cart loads of coffin hand-bills, forgeries, & pamphlets of the most base calumnies are circulated by the franking privilege of Members of Congress, & Mr. Clay. Even Mrs. J. is not spared, & who, from her cradle to her death, had not a speck upon her character, has been dragged forth by Hammond & held to public scorn as a prostitute who intermarried with a Negro, & my eldest brother sold as a Slave in Carolina. This Hammond does not publish in his vile press, but keeps the statement purporting to be sworn to, a *forgery* & spreads it secretly . . . was not my hands tied, & my mouth closed, I would soon put an end to their slanders. . . ." (*Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, XXIX [April 1921], 191).

⁷⁹ London *Morning Herald*, November 9, 1864 The English press, of course, fought the American Civil War, on its side of the water. "The *Standard* [owned by the same party as the *Morning Herald*] gained much in circulation in the early 'sixties through the popularity of slashing letters by a Copperhead correspondent in New York." (Henry D. Jordan, "The Daily and Weekly Press of England in 1861," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXVIII [July 1929], 308.) On the other hand, pro-Northern English newspapers were at times vigorously critical of the American Copperhead press. For instance, the New York correspondent of the London *Daily News*, discussing the McClellan-Lincoln campaign wrote: "His [Lincoln's] fondness for comic anecdotes, some of them rather coarse . . . furnishes a constant theme for vituperation to some of the foul-mouthed publications in existence, such as the *World*, which has probably no equal in the newspaper press of any country for scurrility." (London *Daily News*, September 27, 1864). Compare with this the opinion of a recent biographer of Joseph Pulitzer: "The hysteria of Greeley, the ferocity of the abolitionists and the horrors of reconstruction are well visualized against the cooler, conservative and, at this distance, sensible attitude of the *World*." (Don C. Seitz, *Joseph Pulitzer, His Life and Letters*, [New York, 1924], 118.)

Morning Herald had stated "it will be the first that will have been made regarding the matter." Two weeks after Lincoln had been returned to the White House, the *World*, in all its innocence, spread the story of the "Miscegenation Hoax" prominently over its pages. Its technique, as always, was clever. No confession was made of its own connivance in the fraud. The London *Morning Herald* article was reprinted (with the deletion noted above) accompanied by an editorial stating that a New York correspondent of the London *Morning Herald* had "just revealed the fact that the 'Essay on Miscegenation,' which excited so much attention, sympathetic and antipathetic in this country during the recent election, was simply a clever Democratic quiz perpetrated upon the owlish leaders of the abolitionists!" The editors of the *World* treated the whole affair drolly—but revealed unwittingly that they had all along known who the perpetrators were: " 'Scared by the sound themselves had made,' the wicked wags, its authors, left events to their natural course; and from their anonymous castle of safety watched with delight the almost divine honors paid to their Abbot of Misrule."

The *Herald*, the *Leader* and other Democratic journals had "gravely assailed the abominable doctrines of 'Miscegenation,'" observed the *World* (omitting to mention that it too, in complete hypocrisy, had done likewise), and the "gospel of miscegenation" had been "glad tidings of great joy" to the "intellectual voluptuaries of fanaticism." The "doctrine of 'Miscegenation,' conceived as a satire," had been "received as a sermon."

. . . the barbaric character of the compound word "miscegenation" was gladly overlooked even by Boston purists and the *Westminister Review*. . . . The name will doubtless die out by virtue of its inherent malformation. We have bastard and hump-backed words enough already in our verbal army corps.

Miscegenation had "passed into history," concluded the *World*. "The hoax and the hoaxed, the quiz and the quizzed,

will live forever in the grateful midriff of a nation. . . .'⁸⁰

The correspondent of the London *Morning Herald* had looked forward with amusement to the exposé of the hoax in the United States. The rout of the Copperheads however robbed him of his amusement. Nevertheless the *Herald* had to save face. "The exposure . . . of the miscegenation hoax, with which two young Democrats humbugged the political world here, has created no little excitement in literary circles throughout the Northern States. The *Herald's* exposure, republished in the *World* newspaper of this city, has been copied everywhere, and the victims of the joke are compelled to bear a great deal of chaffing."⁸¹ This was merely pap for the *Herald's* readers. As a matter of fact, in the excitement created by Lincoln's decisive triumph, the Republicans in their joy and the Copperheads in their chagrin paid little attention to the exposure of the fraud.⁸² "Any one of ordinary shrewdness," commented the editor

⁸⁰ Compare this fulsome glee with the righteous wrath of the *Weekly World* in its issue of September 15, 1864 under title of "Beware of Republican Forgeries": "Violent articles from the Charleston *Mercury*, and papers of that sort, abusing northern laborers, and ridiculing and insulting northern Democrats, were copied here by Republican papers as representing the true sentiments of the southern people. . . ."

⁸¹ London *Morning Herald*, December 6, 1864.

⁸² *Boston Journal* (Evening Edition), November 21, 1864. The London *Morning Herald's* correspondent, however, continued to grind the axe. In the issue of December 13, 1864, which printed a plug for Mrs. Croly's (Jennie June's) *Talks on Women's Topics*, he spoke scornfully of a jubilee gathering of young colored girls, celebrating Lincoln's victory: "What with the contrast produced by the light dresses, coal black countenances, and irrepressibly curly wool, the unmiscegenetic spectator found it difficult to control the muscles of his face."

S. S. Cox, in his memoirs, recalling his "Miscegenation" speech of February 17, 1864, confessed that he was duped by the pamphlet which "afterwards turned out to be apocryphal. It was written by two young men connected with the New York press. So congenial were its sentiments with those of the leading Abolitionists, and so ingeniously was its irony disguised, that it was not only indorsed by the fanatical leaders all over the land, but no one in Congress thought of questioning the genuineness and seriousness of the document." Cox goes on to compare the pamphlet to Archbishop Whately's *Historic Doubts Concerning Napoleon*. (*Eight Years in Congress*, 352.) He was probably trying to lie his way out of connivance with Croly and Wakeman.

of the Republican *Boston Journal* a few days after the exposé, “might have divined” that it was “a political pasquinade.” He was “surprised to find in the columns” of some of his contemporaries “labored attempts to combat arguments and illustrations which should have been treated only with ridicule.” Although it had to be “confessed that the cunning authors . . . succeeded in obtaining for its doctrines a wide notoriety,” the book had done little harm. “The fact is that the doctrine of miscegenation is not a practical question here at the North, and the public wisely concluded that it was safe to leave the matter with the Southerners who have been trying the experiment and testing the theory upon a large scale for a number of years.”⁸³

There were some Copperhead diehards. One curious item of the aftermath was an illiterate and uncouth eight-page pamphlet that appeared in New York City shortly after the election bearing the title *What Miscegenation Is! and What We Are to Expect Now that Mr. Lincoln Is Re-elected*, authored by one L. Seaman, L.L.D. and dedicated sarcastically to Henry Ward Beecher. This pamphlet, chock-full of misinformation, was probably published immediately after the election but before the *World* had exposed its own hoax. Miscegenation—a “word not recognized by Webster, Johnson, or Worcester, and yet in general use”—was, according to Seaman, “coined in New England, and for the times.” *Amalgamation* had “done very well for a time as a hobby but it soon lost its effect, and

⁸³ A few days later Wendell Phillips, in a lecture at Portland, Maine, said: “Again, no nation ever became great which was born of one blood. It is like the intermarriage of cousins. Spain is an unmixed nation, and she has sunk to a third-rate power. France blends a dozen races, and she leads the van. We should look therefore upon the colored race as we look upon the Irish and the Germans. . . My goal is a homogeneous nationality which shall weld Boston and New Orleans, New York and Charleston into one thunderbolt, and make us able to control the continent. Then the nations of Europe will respect us.” (*Portland (Me.) Transcript*, November 26, 1864, reprinted in *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, December 10, 1864.) This is not Phillips at his best. Uncritical acceptance of quack “science” and of “manifest destiny” sometimes blurred his usually clear vision.

something new was needed to take its place. Accordingly the agitators got their heads together and invented the word 'miscegenation' as best suited to refine their cause, and at once declared themselves 'Miscegenationists.' "

A large and flourishing society soon sprang up under the appropriate title of the "Modern Order of Miscenegationist." The first society being formed in Boston, others sprang up rapidly throughout the State of Massachusetts, and from thence the contagion spread throughout all New England . . . was wafted from Maine to Oregon. . . .

Thus, "not only New England but many of the Western and North Western States" had stood "in solid phalanx for Miscegenation, and with Lincoln triumphantly re-elected the 'ladies of Washington' " had "commenced to friz their hair *a la d'Afrique*." ⁸⁴

David Ross Locke, whose abolitionism carried over into the Reconstruction period, continued to poke fun at the straw-man of miscegenation. In a pamphlet of 1866 describing Johnson's swing-around-the-circle, Petroleum Vesuvius Nasby, now "A Dimmicrat of Thirty Years Standing," again climbed into the ring to comment publicly on our "noble President" . . . insulted by a bloody and brutal Radical and Miscegenationist." ⁸⁵ A little later in the year Nasby returned to the theme in a dispatch from "Confedrit X Roads (wich is in the Stait of Kentucky)":

"Mrs. P.," sed this Illinoiy store-keeper, which his name it wuz Pollock, "do yoo object to miscegenation?"

"Misssee— what?" replied she, struck all uv a heap at the word.

⁸⁴ The Democratic papers did not give up their "miscegenation" harangues after Lincoln's election; thus the *Manchester (N. H.) Daily Union* on July 1, 1865, in correspondence from Concord: "The intelligent contraband is already on the way to New England. . . . Last evening, a colored man hailing from Carolina, with some gift of the gab, and big lungs, addressed a large crowd near the corner of Park and Main Streets. The Abolitionists were delighted. . . . He advocated miscegenation, and intimated that a mixture of the white and black races would make a most splendid race for this country. Finally, several soldiers pitched into him, and bade him 'dry up.' "

⁸⁵ *Swinging Round the Circle; or, Andy's Trip to the West. Together With A Life of its Hero* (New York, 1866), no pagination.

“Miscegenation — amalgamation — marrying whites with niggers.”⁸⁶

Throughout 1867 and 1868 postmaster Nasby continued his reports to the nation. “My brethern,” preached one Bigler to the unreconstructed Democratic laity,

“I’d advise yoo all to abjoor Dimocrisy. Up North, the minit the nigger gits a vote, you are forced to legal missegenashun; down South, the affinity Dimocrisy hez for niggers hez bleached out the race to the color uv molasses. There’s no hope for you, save in Ablishinism, which hez the happy fakulty uv doin justis to em without marrying em!”

“It didn’t make no difference,” concluded Nasby—

They didn’t know what he wuz talkin about. The word “missegenashen” struck em with amazement, from wich they didn’t recover till we left. In speakin to such aujences, men must be keerful uv the words they youse.”⁸⁷

In the presidential election of 1868, Locke supported Grant. In the South, Sister Sallie’s *The Color Line* had succeeded the Reverend Josiah Priest’s ante-bellum *Bible Defence of Slavery*. Widely circulated in the Gulf States during the entire period of Reconstruction, the new “White Line Bible” thundered again at “the doctrine of the abolitionists, the free-lovers, the amalgamationists, the miscegenationists and the pseudo-philanthropists,” who believed that “all mankind of every blood and color on the habitable globe, are of Adam’s race, and are *brothers and sisters nationally*.”⁸⁸ “The Dimokrasny never hed afore it

⁸⁶ D. R. Locke, *The Moral History of America’s Life Struggle*, (Boston, 1874), 261.

⁸⁷ Petroleum V. Nasby, *Ekkoes from Kentucky Bein a Perfect Record Uv the Ups, Downs, and Experiences uv the Dimocrisy, Doorin The Eventful Year 1867 Ez Seen by a Naturalized Kentuckian* (Boston, 1868), 278-279. This Nasby pamphlet was illustrated by Thomas Nast.

⁸⁸ Sister Sallie, *The Color Line, Devoted to the Restoration of Good Government, Putting An End to Negro Authority and Misrule, And Establishing A White Man’s Government in the White Man’s Country by Organizing the White People of the South*, (n.p., n.d.), 60. The copy of this pamphlet in the Boston Public Library has been marked by James Redpath (1833-1891), publisher of W. W. Brown’s *The Black Man* and author of *Echoes of Harper’s Ferry* (1860), “By Rev. Thompson.”

sich brilliant prospecks,” observed Nasby, “or the promise uv a victory so easily won. We hev an abundance uv material to draw from. Ther is waitin to fall into our ranks all uv the followin classes.” Foremost in the North were “All them wich dont want ther dawters to marry niggers, and wich demand a law to perfect em agin em.”⁸⁹

* * *

Neither Wakeman nor Croly ever admitted having a hand in writing the *Miscegenation* pamphlet.

Wakeman, indeed, only lived a half dozen years after its appearance. In 1868 he was appointed stenographer to the New York Senate and in July of that year served as official reporter of the National Democratic Convention held in New York City.⁹⁰ The first inkling of his connivance in the pamphlet was given in his obituary printed in the paper which had abetted the fraud. “His humor on paper,” noted the *New York World* of March 21, 1870, “was conspicuous in the celebrated Miscegenation hoax, of which he was part author.” Did Croly write the obituary?

Croly’s part in the *Miscegenation* hoax—evidently the principal one—has remained a kind of well-kept secret to the present day. And this is rather curious and significant, for he was a well-known figure in his time—prominent newspaperman, magazine owner and editor, contributor to periodicals, author of books and a pioneer founder of American positivism.⁹¹ One wonders how his sleazy role in the affair was kept quiet. He himself had coined the new word

⁸⁹ Petroleum V. Nasby, *The Impendin Crisis uv the Dimocracy* (New York, 1868), 17.

⁹⁰ *Official Proceedings of the National Democratic Convention Held at New York, July 4-9, 1868.* (Boston, 1868.)

⁹¹ “His journalistic career of thirty-five years covered the whole period of the Civil War, and at all times was of the busiest kind.” (*New York World*, May 1, 1889.) He was “one of the best known journalists in this country.” (*New York Times*, May 1, 1889.)

which had given a label to the issue. "I think Mr. Croly was responsible for the invention of the name," wrote his wife nine years after his death; he claimed it "added a new, distinctive, and needed word to our vocabulary."⁹² So it did; but Croly never came forward to claim the honor of invention. Moreover, neither in obituary, wherein his numerous works were usually listed, nor in biography written before or immediately after his death, was *Miscegenation* ever mentioned.⁹³ The *Dictionary of American Biography* lists him as the principal author of *Miscegenation* but is unaware of the fact that the pamphlet was a hoax—labels him uncritically as an independent, fearless, unorthodox, iconoclast and reformer.⁹⁴

While he lived, no one—with the exception of the bibliographer Sabin—ever accused him of authoring the pamphlet, and to his dying day, 25 years later, Croly never admitted authorship or mentioned the word miscegenation in any of his voluminous writings. The word had entered the language for good, and others were employing it; he himself, dabbling in the Noyesian theory of stirpiculture and continually discussing subjects in which it might conveniently have been employed, always used the old term he had condemned—amalgamation. The shameful secret was hugged close; Mrs. Croly, who, in an obituary on her husband's death had not disclosed it, later discussed the matter feebly and defensively, and, at that, only when forced to it. "Tho' it [the pamphlet] was written partly in the spirit of joke [farce?]," she wrote years later at the turn of the century, "it was not a hoax, and was not palmed off upon the public eye as one . . . I remember the episode perfectly, and the half joking, half earnest spirit in which the pamphlet

⁹² MS letter from Mrs. Croly, Dec. 15, 1900, in Boston Atheneum.

⁹³ *New York Times*, *New York Daily Tribune*, *New York World*, May 1, 1889; *General Alumni Catalogue of New York University, 1883-1905* (New York, 1906).

⁹⁴ Brother Basil Leo Lee mentions the pamphlet in passing and evidently accepts it as *bona fide*. (*op. cit.*, 163).

was written.’⁹⁵ Her apology is pitiful and guilty; for the facts challenge it.⁹⁶

Croly’s career after 1864 was a varied one. His whole life, linked up as it was with many important aspects of the American scene in the second half of the nineteenth century—the Civil War, the growth of American sensational and graphic journalism, the history of American philosophy, the development of the New York City real estate interest—deserves a book of its own. What few sketchy facts are given now are only designed to complete the picture of the “miscegenation” phase of his career.

Following the election of Grant to the presidency, the relationship of managing editor Croly to owner-editor Marble of the New York *World* became one of running feud—if not in principle, then in circulation-building tactic. When the *Times* fought Tweed, Croly begged Marble either to follow suit or to be neutral, but the *World* supported Tweed. When Marble supported Greeley against Grant for a second term—and Greeley was defeated—Croly handed in his resignation.

Meanwhile he had been busy. In 1867, with C. W. Sweet, he had founded the *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, a weekly paper dedicated to the real estate interest, which for the next six years he owned and managed with his friend.⁹⁷ By 1868, having gained a reputation as a party stalwart, he wrote the campaign biography of Seymour and Blair for the Democratic Party. Typical campaign hack-work it is, on its first pages striking a note reminiscent of the writer’s earlier unsigned effort for the Democracy: “The contest has opened very bitterly. Nor is this surprising. There are

⁹⁵ MS letter in Boston Atheneum from Mrs. Croly, dated Dec. 15, 1900.

⁹⁶ In an obituary on Mrs. Croly’s death in 1901, St. Clair McKelway wrote: “Their union was not made any less congenial by marked dissimilarity of convictions on cardinal subjects.” The language here is equivocal. According to one interpretation it might explain Mrs. Croly’s reticence on the *Miscegenation* question. (*Memories of Jane Cunningham Croly*, (New York, 1904), 215).

⁹⁷ *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, XLIII (May 4, 1889), 613-614.

vast material interests at stake. A question of race-superiority is involved. . . .'⁹⁸ During these years he was also an occasional contributor to the periodical press,⁹⁹ and in 1870 founded and edited a typographically bizarre magazine called *The Modern Thinker*, in which he indulged his predilection for anonymity by writing articles under various inverted pseudonyms and initials. It is worthy of note that one of the contributors to this magazine—which gave up the ghost after its second issue—was none other than the duped Abolitionist, Albert Brisbane. Although the “new thought” and positivist articles that filled its pages discussed stirpiculture, eugenic socialism and Noyesism, the word miscegenation never appeared.

By this time, Croly had become an enthusiastic partisan of August Comte’s positivist religion of humanity and together with T. B. Wakeman (father of George, the collaborator of *Miscegenation*) was actively organizing Comtean churches in New York City. In 1871, under the name of C. G. David, he published in New York a handbook for the new movement titled *A Positivist Primer*, a collection of “Familiar Conversations on the Religion of Humanity.”

A year after his resignation from the *World*, Croly helped to found the illustrated New York *Daily Graphic*, where he served as editor-in-chief until 1878, resigning in that year because of interference by the owners. He had severed connections with the *Real Estate Record* in 1873 upon taking up his job with the *Graphic* and now after a two year lay-off from journalism and despite poor health he resumed his work with his friend Sweet. For the next nine years, up to a week before his death, he was the *Real*

⁹⁸ D. G. Croly, *Campaign Lives of Seymour and Blair*, (New York, 1868). The biography begins as follows: “In the compilation of this work I have had the following aims in view: . . .To deal honestly by my readers, making no unfair appeals to passion or prejudice, giving currency to no doubtful statements merely because they might damage the Republican party or its Candidates. . . .”

⁹⁹ *Northern Monthly*, February 1868; *Galaxy*, November 1869.

Estate Record's chief editorial writer.

During these years Croly conducted a column for the *Record* under the heading of *Our Prophetic Department* and in 1872 attained a small-scale fame by predicting the crisis of the following year and naming Jay Cooke and Company and the Northern Pacific as the first victims.¹⁰⁰ In 1888, shortly before his death, most of these columns, edited and expanded, he collected into a book entitled *Glimpses of the Future*.¹⁰¹ It is an interesting, if not greatly important book, and treats of everything under the sun in the author's typical pseudo-logical, hare-brained style.¹⁰² On its opening pages Croly states that the "most serious difficulty in speculating as to the future is the liability to imagine Utopias. From the 'Republic' of Plato down to Edward Bellamy's 'Looking Backward,' all writers have indulged their fancy for ideal social states."¹⁰³ Some of the ideas promulgated in the dialogues of this book (with new anti-Semitic ideas thrown in) establish links with the racism of the *Miscegenation* hoax.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ John Howard Brown, ed., *Lamb's Biographical Dictionary of the United States* (Boston, 1900), II, 259.

¹⁰¹ David Goodman Croly, *Glimpses of the Future, Suggestions as to the Drift of Things* (New York, 1888).

¹⁰² It might be included as one of the flood of prophetic and Utopian volumes of the period. See Vernon Louis Parrington, Jr., *American Dreams, A Study of American Utopias* (Providence, 1947), which, however, neither discusses the volume nor lists it in the bibliography.

¹⁰³ *Glimpses of the Future*. 5.

¹⁰⁴ In 1863 Croly had written: "The time is coming when Russian dominion will stretch to the Atlantic Ocean. Nor should such an event be dreaded. What the barbarians did for demoralized and degenerate Rome, the Russians will do for the effete and worn-out populations of Western Europe. These will be conquered. Their civilization, such as it is, will be overthrown; but the new infusion of a young and composite blood will regenerate the life of Europe, will give it a new and better civilization, because the German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English will be mixed with a miscegenetic and progressive people." (*Miscegenation*, 10) Twenty-four years later in *Glimpses of the Future* the same kind of prediction was made: "A great source of strength to the Russian power is its ability to absorb and assimilate the races it conquers. . . . The blending of races, which has been going on in Russia for three hundred years or longer, is something remarkable." (p. 35) That

Croly's was the sensational type of journalistic mind that liked to claim "firsts." He boasted of "discovering" George Wakeman, G. A. Townsend, J. B. Stillson, A. C. Wheeler (Nym Crinkle), Clinton Stuart, H. E. Sweetser and St. Clair McKelway. He claimed to be one of the first to "bring before the American people prominently the matter of minority representation," on the basis developed by Hare and Mill, in his *Galaxy* article. He was proud of being one of the founders of the Real Estate Exchange,

this is not the only traceable link may be seen by a few other racist quotations from *Glimpses*, which are here subjoined:

. . . We can absorb the Dominion . . . for the Canadians are of our own race . . . but Mexico, Central America, the Sandwich Islands, and the West India Islands will involve governments which cannot be democratic. We will never confer the right of suffrage upon the blacks, the mongrels of Mexico or Central America, or the Hawaiians." (pp. 22, 23).

The census of 1880 showing the disproportionate large increase of the blacks was a surprise, for the whites had the advantage of increase by foreign immigration, and it was supposed that the freed slaves would show a heavy mortality, in view of their habits and indifference to the well-being of their offspring. . . . I presume the race of mulatoes is dying out. Some few will intermingle with whites, but the bulk of them will become darker in hue as each generation passes by, for the irregular alliances between blacks and whites are not by any means as frequent under freedom as during slavery. Hence the dividing line between the two races will yearly become more marked. If the blacks left to themselves become as degraded as in the West India Islands, the time may come when they will be treated as badly as the Chinese and Red Indians are now, even to the extent of depriving them of their political privileges. Practically this is the case to-day over a large section of the South. The white race is dominant and will keep their position, no matter how numerous the negroes may become. (pp. 23, 24).

Mr. Newlight—. . . the doctrine of human rights applied to the whole human family does not work. Free institutions are only fitted for the Caucasian race, and have not proved workable, except among the English-speaking races.

Sir Oracle—. . . The negro to-day is the same as he was at the time of Sesostris. He makes no progress except under the tutelage of the white. Left to himself he sinks back into barbarism, as witness Hayti.

Mr. Newlight—. . . Froude shows that the West Indies are becoming barbarized; that any change which permits the blacks to dominate over the whites will end in the destruction of all civilization. . . . (pp. 133-134).

. . . there ought to be some agreement for organizing a system that will

which displayed its flag at half-mast in his memory.¹⁰⁵ But he never boasted of his most lasting discovery—the word, *miscegenation*.

The assessments of his mind and character made by his friends and relatives a few weeks after his death are interesting. The eulogia always contain reservations. “His faults were those of a nervous temperament, combined with great intellectual force, and a strength of feeling which in some directions and under certain circumstances became prejudices,” wrote his wife, whose pen-name, Jennie June, had become a household word in the country and who had achieved an ampler fame of her own as a pioneer of the women’s club movement in America.¹⁰⁶ “Mr. Croly won an honorable position in New York journalism,” observed his brother-in-law, the Reverend John Cunningham. “He was a conservative democrat of the strictest sort, a radical in religion, and had but little appreciation of the deeper forces at work in society and in national life.¹⁰⁷

Although Edmund C. Stedman praised him unqualifiedly, the memorial notices of many of Croly’s former colleagues of the press were full of cutting reservations. Mr. Croly was “brought up in an atmosphere of politics,” noted J. D. Bell. “His culture failed of being broad enough fully

compel the savages of Africa to do some regular work. . . . Africa will never be redeemed, except in two ways: either the natives must be forced to work, or they must be killed off to give place for the races who will work. . . . (p. 135).

. . . Cuba, Jamaica, and Hayti ought, in the fulness of time, to belong to the United States. But our people will not be willing to hand them over to the tender mercies of the degraded colored people in those islands. Universal suffrage is a farce when exercised by savages . . . everything is going to the dogs in those beautiful and fertile islands because of the progressive degradation of the free negroes. . . . So far as industry and civilization are concerned, the emancipation of the slaves in the West India Islands has proved disastrous in every way. (p. 137).

¹⁰⁵ *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide*, XLIII (May 4, 1889), 615-616.

¹⁰⁶ *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide, Supplement*, XLIII, (May 18, 1889), *passim*.

¹⁰⁷ John Cunningham, D.D., “A Brother’s Memories,” in *Memories of Jane Cunningham Croly* (New York, 1904), 7.

to tolerate differences of opinion. . . . In his utterances he was often very radical, but in his practice he was always thoroughly conservative. . . . All the arrangements that Mr. Croly made were thoroughly practical—suited to the time and occasion. He made the most of his opportunities.” Croly had a “tendency to make one think of principles as a device rather than as a duty, of reforms as a hobby rather than as a mission, of opinions as assets in a schedule,” observed St. Clair McKelway, who had joined the *World* in 1866 and later became editor of the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle*. “The man lived monogamy, voted Democracy, and believed Positivism.”¹⁰⁸

Yes, Croly believed positivism — and Copperhead racism, too. Eight years after his *Miscegenation* hoax, he dedicated his *Positivist Primer* to the “only supreme being man can ever know, The Great But Imperfect God, HUMANITY, In whose image all other Gods were made, And for whose service all other Gods exist, And to whom all the children of men owe Labor, Love, and Worship.” Evidently, Comtean positivism, Croly’s religion of humanity, was not broad enough to admit the Negro as equal.

SIDNEY KAPLAN.

University of Massachusetts.

¹⁰⁸ *Real Estate Record & Builders Guide, Supplement*, XLIII (May 18, 1889), 702.