Northwest Ohio Quarterly

Volume 23

Issue 3

How Morrison R. Waite Came To Be Nominated Chief Justice Of The United States

Edited by MRS. MATHEW S. MORGAN

The name of Morrison R. Waite is a familiar one to everyone in Northwestern Ohio. Waite's greatest achievement was to preside over the Supreme Court of the United States from 1874 *to* 1888. *He was appointed to that office by President Ulysses S. Grant. The following articles seek to explain how this modest, comparatively unknown man, came to be nominated. The first account is from the January* 24, 1885 *issue of the Toledo* Blade *which reproduced it from the New York* World. *Waite's serious illness in* 1885 *occasioned the telling of these interesting facts. The* Blade *item was headlined: "Chief Justice Waite—A Bit of Unwritten History—How an Opportune Mention of His Name by Mr. Delano Secured His Appointment." Mr. Delano was Columbus Delano, Secretary of Interior in President Grant's cabinet. It should be added that Mr. Waite had distinguished himself in* 1871-72 *by the brilliance of his service as counsel for the United States at the arbitration tribunal which met in Geneva, Switzerland to adjust the American claims against England for Civil War damages committed by Confederate raiders on northern shipping.*

A number of gentlemen were recently discussing current topics in the smoking room of the Gilsey house. They were visitors to the city, but had all been prominent in official life in the national capital not many years ago. From one subject to another they drifted, calling up interesting reminiscences and relating their experiencecs of Washington life in a period when the Republican party touched the highest point in its power. Name after name was mentioned of men who had wielded great influence and molded legislation and influenced executive action and policy, but are now forgotten. The serious illness of Chief Justice Waite was mentioned. It furnished the text for much gossip about the man who, comparatively unknown, had been jumped over the heads of can-

didates of celebrity and strong backing to succeed Salmon P. Chase as the head of the judiciary branch of the national government.

"It was the queerest appointment that was ever made during Grant's two terms," said a man who hails from Ohio. "Everybody was surprised and none more so than men from our state, where he lived. I never could find out how his appointment was secured, for Grant did not know him personally, and no one from Ohio was working for him."

"Waite was as much surprised as any one," said another gentleman. "I remember meeting him just after he was confirmed. His father had been chief justice of Ohio, his grandfather held a similar position, I think in Connecticut, and the whole family were lawyers and eminent at the bar. He lived in Toledo, and had more than once been offered the support of powerful combinations for the congressional nominations, and even for governor, with almost a certainty for success. For he refused to permit his name to be used in such a connection. To intimate friends he more than once remarked that his ambition was to become chief justice."

"Waite was 'made' by a man now living who has assisted more men to rise than almost any other I know of. He certainly 'boosted' a greater number of comparatively obscure men into prominence, and power, and position than any other during Grant's eight years in the White House," said an ex-auditor of the treasury. "And that man, to the best of my knowledge, never received much more than the thanks of the men he assisted and that meant nothing. It is notorious that most of the men who profited from his interest in them, not only forgot the service, but, at one time or another, gave him a kick and turned out to be his enemies. I don't know whether Waite ever did anything in opposition to him, but I have been told he never thanked him for securing his appointment."

"You don't mean to say that ex-Sec. Delano got Grant to nominate Waite do you?" asked the Ohio man.

"You have made a good guess," said the ex-auditor. "Columbus Delano's advice to Grant secured Waite's appointment. When secretary of the interior, he was one of the most trusted members of Grant's cabinet. Delano was a very conservative man for a politician. While he never

forgot his friends, he frequently went out of his way to assist in placing men in prominent positions for the sole purpose of strengthening the administration and making the departments more efficient. I think it was at his suggestion that the President appointed Morrison R. Waite one of the Counsel for the United States before the Alabama Claims commission. Waite was then practicing law in Toledo. He was associated with William M. Evarts in presenting the claims of our government against England at the Geneva arbitration. It was understood at that time that he did most of the work, while Evarts got the credit. But his arguments and services were highly complimented by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, of England.

"Grant was greatly perplexed over the appointment of a successor to the late Chief Justice Chase. Caleb Cushing's nomination was rejected by the Senate. "Laudaulet" Williams had been the president's choice, but the exposures killed him, and Roscoe Conkling had premptorily refused the nomination. There was great delay in sending a name to the Senate. Grant was bothered from morning until night by the friends of men from all sections of the country, many of whom would have adorned the office. There were more who possessed no qualifications for the position, but were strongly backed politically. One day when Sec. Delano called at the White House he found the president out of sorts. He had already listened to the claims of several favorite sons, urged by as many delegations. Mr. Delano had called to consult him in reference to an important matter relating to the Interior department that demanded prompt attention.

"Never mind a trifle like that," said Grant. "This appointment of chief justice is worrying the life out of me. Sit down, see if you can't think of some man fitted for the position who has not been mentioned. Every man whose name has been presented is bound to be defeated of confirmation. I am tired of sending in names and listening to the claims of so many others who want their names to go before the senate. You are almost the only one who comes in to see me who hasn't some candidate to urge." Delano had enough to bother him, but he saw that he was expected to name some one and suggested Morrison R. Waite.

"Who is this Waite; an Ohio man?" asked Grant.

"Don't you remember Mr. Waite, who was counsel at Geneva?" inquired the secretary.

"Yes, of course I do. Do you know I liked his appearance very much when I met him after his return?" Delano answered the numerous queries of the president. His astonishment was great when Grant asked: "Do you think Mr. Waite would accept the justiceship?"

"Delano mentioned Waite's refusal to accept nominations for all offices, and his ambitions longing to attain the position of chief justice. Delano afterward told me that when Waite's nomination was sent in, that same afternoon, he shared in the general surprise. It is true he had made out a strong case for Waite, because he saw that Grant was interested in the man, whom he had met but once."

"Did he ever know how much he was indebted to Delano?" asked one in the group.

"I understood that Grant gratified his curiosity by explaining why he hit on him, and Delano's suggestion and recommendation. But I don't believe Waite ever thanked the ex-secretary. If he did, it was very recently," asserted the narrator. "But it was just Delano's luck. He dropped out of public life because men whom he pulled out of obscurity mounted still higher by climbing on his shoulders. The funniest part of it all was that Delano, by assisting in defeating Salmon P. Chase, who attempted to secure the presidential nomination when Lincoln was a candidate for the second time, helped him into the chief justiceship. Chase and Delano were the rival leaders of the Republican party in Ohio, and when the former assumed that position, Delano's political success began. Chase's successor was appointed through him when had another Ohio man been appointed, Delano would have gone to the senate. His official life practically began when one chief justice assumed the position and closed with the appointment of his successor."

The second article is from the Blade *of June* 21, 1886. *It was headlined: "Accident Makes Fortune. The speech which made M. R. Waite, Chief Justice—An Incident Which Resulted Well." It gives a different version of Waite's appointment.*

How Morrison R. Waite Came to be Nominated Chief Justice of the United States

Two or three men were gathered in a prominent attorney's office this morning, discussing various topics of the day, in the course of which reference was made to the good luck which attends some men through life, often enabling them to secure high positions. Several illustrations had been made when Major Todd, who was one of the party, said: "Within my own personal observation, I have had what I consider a fair example of this procuring of power and influence through accident or a train of accidental circumstances. When the Army of the Tennessee held its annual reunion in this city several years ago, I was chairman of the committee on invitations, and had much to do with arranging toasts and inviting men to make responses. Of course, these men were chosen from all over the country and included the greatest soldiers of the day. We thought that one man from Toledo would be all that we could appoint, and accordingly picked out Gen. [James B.] Steedman. After we had made up our list, we still had one place to fill. We took a ballot which resulted in a tie between William Dorsheimer, of New York, and M. R. Waite of this city. We canvassed the matter for several days and finally cast a vote which decided the matter in favor of Mr. Waite.

"[General W. T.] Sherman was toastmaster at that reunion and Gen. Grant sat at his right. The list of toasts had been for the most part taken up, only three or four being left. As it was late in the evening many of those present began to feel the effects of the sherry and the champagne. [Gen. John] Pope had just responded. He made a florid speech, full of big words and meaningless phrases which fell upon the banqueters with a dull sickening thud. Every one was disgusted. At this moment Waite's toast was announced. It was, 'Peace hath her victories no less renown'd than war.' It was exceedingly *apropos,* as Waite had but a few months before acted as one of the Geneva Award commission. He replied in a good, logical, clear-cut, lawyer's talk which contrasted well with the speech which had preceded. Instantly the attention of all present was directed to the speaker. At the moment, I was sitting directly back of Sherman, conversing with him about the arrangements. Grant leaned over towards Sherman and said: 'Who is that man?'

" 'That is M. R. Waite, one of the Geneva Award Commission,' replied the general.

"Waite never made a more telling speech. It was right to the point. I do not think that either Grant or Sherman had been introduced to him, but in less than three months he was appointed Chief Justice by Grant."

The Practice of Medicine in Toledo at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century

By Dr. Nathan Worth Brown

At the turn of the century the practice of medicine in North America, in Ohio, and in Toledo underwent a revolution in its own field as profound as in any of our great political conflicts. The established customs of medical treatment were rocked to their foundations. For hundreds of years medical practice had been confined to the treatment of symptoms—the causes of disease had been obscured by ignorance, and treatment was based entirely on the experience of past generations. The discovery of bacteria—germs—as the cause of many prevalent ailments shook the medical profession from its complacent lethargy. Proof that the parasites of malaria were transmitted from man to man by the Anopheles mosquito started a general campaign of mosquito elimination and the chills and fever of the Maumee Valley began their retreat. Typhoid bacilli were found in human excreta, in contaminated water supply and in the discharges from typhoid carriers who had themselves become immune. With this information communities were soon able to eliminate the typhoid hazard. The spirochete of syphilis was discovered and found to be destroyed by Ehrlich's 606—Salvarsan. Childbed fever was found to result from contamination by the streptococcus and preventable by asepsis and antisepsis. Yellow fever, like malaria, was found to be transmitted, not by contact, but by the bite of a special breed of mosquito, the Aedes Egypti. This discovery removed the greatest obstacle to the completion of the Panama Canal in 1915. The tubercle bacillus was found and suitable measures were taken to prevent the dissemination of these vicious germs. South African sleeping sickness was found to be carried from animal to animal and from animal to man. Malta Fever germs were found in cattle and sheep and their transmission to man through milk and milk products was demonstrated. Antitoxins were developed for some diseases, notably diphtheria, tetanus and rabies, and many lives saved thereby.

All of these discoveries came at or near the turn of the century, the old theories of medical practice were thrown to the winds and an en-

tirely new basis of therapeutics established. Public health and welfare movements were stimulated. Health laws, the obligatory reporting of contagious diseases and isolation, were instituted. In all of these movements physicians, individually and collectively, played an important role. No longer could the ignorant doctor go his own way, disregarding these advances in medical science. Higher standards were established and the educational qualifications of physicians were investigated. Ohio established its Board of Medical Examiners in 1902; (my own three day examination in 1903 took place in Columbus—I was No. 189). Quacks were prosecuted, and many unqualified practitioners forced to close their offices. Medical organization took an active part in promoting the health and physical welfare of the city. There were three of these societies before the year 1900; The Toledo Medical Association, the Lucas County Medical Society and the Toledo Homeopathic Society. In 1903 the first two united and became the Academy of Toledo and Lucas County. This organization took an active leadership in the health campaigns of the city and in cleaning its own professional skirts. I recall a meeting of the Wood County Medical Society which after an investigation found that most of the deaths from child-bed fever came in the practice of one physician. He was called before his confreres and in reply to questions as to his technique he stated that his hands and instruments were always clean and that it was not necessary to wash *before* delivery—as he cleaned hands and instruments *after* each confinement. No disciplinary action was necessary. His obstetrical practice terminated automatically.

At the turn of the century surgical cleanliness, with all its details also became a standard procedure, and operations in private homes began to decline. The hospital with its elaborate methods of cleanliness and sterilization became a necessity. The importance of laboratory tests for diagnosis, the use of the X-ray, newer and safer methods of producing anesthesia, the use of oxygen and blood transfusions, the study and diagnosis of heart disease, first with the polygraph and later by electrocardiography, all contributed to make hospitalization a requirement in the treatment of serious or obscure diseases.

Our hospitals are a great credit to the city. Their high standards have contributed in making Toledo the center of medical interests in Northwestern Ohio. It is interesting to consider their origins and early developement.

St. Vincent's: St. Vincent's was established by a group of grey nuns of the Order of St. Vincent de Paul, who came to Toledo from Montreal in 1855. In 1858 they purchased two acres of land on Cherry Street and built a small building where orphans and a few adults, destitute and sick, were cared for on a charity basis. In 1876 a substantial brick building was erected, part of which is incorporated in the present hospital. St. Vincent's has grown with the city, numerous additions have been made from time to time and it now accommodates 310 adult patients and 60 children. At the turn of the century it was the only hospital in Toledo with laboratory facilities. I recall that in 1905 or 1906, fresh from the laboratories of Cleveland, I aided their work by acting as make-shift pathologist. Its facilities for highly specialized work in all branches of medicine are now unexcelled.

Toledo Hospital: In 1874 a group of women, members of the Y.W. C.A., purchased an old frame residence at what was then 171 Union Street. This street is now called North 12th Street and the building was close to Bancroft. Here they conducted the "City Hospital of Toledo" which was incorporated in 1876, and the name of the institution changed to "The Protestant Hospital Association of Toledo." A gift from Mr. W. J. Finlay made possible the purchase of the Ketcham homestead at the corner of Bancroft and Cherry Streets and the erection in 1893 of a substantial 50 bed hospital. The demands on the hospital were so great that in 1901 a 50 bed wing was added and the name again changed to "The Toledo Hospital." In 1925 an energetic campaign for additional funds and endowment was started which resulted in the purchase of a large tract of land on North Cove Boulevard opposite Ottawa Park on which was erected buildings which, completely equipped, represent an outlay of $2,500,000. The list of trustees and donors includes many of the leading families of the city. Its present capacity is 325 including 50 basinets.

It is of interest to find that since 1874 there have been 102,638 paeients admitted and treated at Toledo Hospital.

Riverside Hospital: In 1883 under the auspices of the W.C.T.U. a mass meeting was called to meet at the First Congregational Church for the purpose of starting a reformatory for unfortunate girls. A home was secured (I believe on Magnolia Street) called "The Retreat, a Home

for Friendless Girls." It was furnished and maintained entirely by donations and subscriptions. In 1893 the present property on Summit Street was purchased. A few years later a new charter was obtained, a new wing added and the name changed to "The Retreat Maternity and Foundlings' Home." New additions were necessitated by the ever-increasing demands, and the people of Toledo responded generously to the frequent requests for additional support. In 1913 the name was changed to "Maternity and Children's Hospital." In the early twenties it was again changed to "Women's and Children's Hospital." More recently the service of the hospital has been enlarged to include male patients and it is now a well-equipped general hospital under excellent management, filling a long-felt need in that section of the city. Its capacity is approximately 150 beds.

Robinwood Hospital: This began its existence as a private hospital in a large residence in the 2300 block of Robinwood Avenue and operated by Dr. Kirkley, one of Toledo's prominent physicians at the turn of the century. This was in 1896. Fire destroyed the building in 1898. Dr. William Gillette purchased the lot, rebuilt the home and established Robinwood Hospital. Its popularity encouraged Dr. Gillette and in 1906 a large brick building was erected at the corner of Robinwood and West Delaware, and Robinwood Hospitad moved into more commodious quarters. In 1921 the Lutheran Church began negotiations for the purchase of this hospital. These were completed in 1926, and the institution under its old name is conducted by a Board appointed by the Lutheran Churches of Toledo.

Flower Hospital: In 1905 the Women's Home Missionary Society of the Toledo Methodist Churches leased the large residence on Robinwood Avenue which was occupied by Dr. Gillette's Robinwood Hospital, and took over its management under the name of "The Deaconess Home and Hospital of the Central Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church." In 1908 Steven W. Flower donated his property and home at the intersection of Collingwood and Cherry Street to the Deaconess Home and Hospital as a memorial to his wife. In 1910 a 25 unit hospital was built and the Deaconess Hospital moved to the new location. In 1913 additions were added to the original building which raised its capacity to 90 beds. In 1926 the name of the institution was changed to "The Flower Hospital" and its capacity further increased. This past

year still another wing has been added giving 40 additional private rooms and space for new operating and service quarters. Its present bed capacity is 168 adults and 37 children.

Mercy Hospital: The Sisters of Mercy of Grand Rapids, Michigan, recognizing the great need for additional hospital facilities in Toledo, sent a group to confer with Bishop Schrembs. The Bishop entered enthusiastically into the proposal. A site was purchased on Madison Avenue at 22nd Street and the erection of the buildings was begun in 1918. The hospital has since been expanded and now accommodates 289 adults and 60 children. Its equipment is excellent and the Sisterhood is to be congratulated on the remarkable progress made in developing such a high-grade institution.

St. Charles Hospital: The same Sisterhood has recently purchased property in East Toledo and a new 200 bed hospital is now under construction. This will fill a long felt need for hospital service in East Toledo.

Maumee Valley Hospital: At the turn of the century there was an Old Folks' Home in South Toledo—out on Arlington Street—where the old and decrepit spent their last days supported by the County. It was in fact the "Poor House" of Toledo. To care for the sick among these folks a part of the first floor was set up as a hospital ward. Later the whole floor was occupied and soon there was need for surgical dressing and operating rooms. Gradually the whole building was taken over, those who were not patients being housed in outside quarters. As the population of Toledo increased so did the demands on what had by then become the "County Hospital." Funds were obtained from the city and county for the erection of a new hospital which they now have in addition to a very fine nurses home. The hospital has every facility for the best medical services. It is equal, as it should be, to any of our other hospitals. The most recent addition is the Roche Memorial Hospital especially designed and equipped for the care and treatment of tuberculosis. We have every reason to be proud of this group of hospitals operated especially for the poor and needy of our city and Lucas County. The number of beds in the General Hospital is 325; ambulatory patients in other buildings 190; in the County Home 200; in Roche Memorial Hospital 175 which makes a total of 900 patients. A unique feature is

the method of furnishing professional services for the patients. An excellent staff, comprising the best physicians in the city, has been selected. They serve entirely without remuneration, but the hospital places an amount of cash each month to the credit of the Academy of Medicine, equivalent to the amount which might be fairly charged by the doctors. This money is used by the Academy for educational purposes by bringing distinguished physicians to the city to give the highest type of instructional addresses. Sessions of three days each are given several times a year and the whole community benefits of having better informed physicians at its beck and call.

Although Toledo has no medical college, the opportunities for postgraduate and advanced medical education are almost unlimited. Started in 1907 by the Academy of Medicine with instructional lectures each week, the program has been greatly expanded by all of the larger hospitals. Every month each hospital has its Staff Meeting at which medical problems and unusual cases are reported and discussed. Twice a month, and in three of our hospitals every week, clinical-pathological conferences are held. Every week the Academy puts on an educational program and once each month the society is addressed by an out-of-town guest. Ward rounds also are held every week at the Maumee Valley Hospital for the examination and demonstration of interesting or unusual cases. Instruction in laboratory work, in X-ray diagnosis and in electrocardiography are given in several hospitals and excellent research facilities are provided by the special research department at Toledo Hospital.

Toledo has good reason to be proud of its standing as the medical center of Northwestern Ohio, and of the high regard in which the profession of this city is held throughout the country. Many offices of national importance have been held by Toledo doctors—a large number of contributions to medical literature have come from the physicians of this city and at least two text books have been published by our own doctors. Some are listed in "Who's Who in American Medicine," and many, perhaps thirty or forty, have successfully passed the National Board examinations in their own specialties, thus receiving national recognition as outstanding specialists.

I cannot help but think of the surprise and pleasure which would overwhelm our predecessors could they return today and see the result of their

labors in organizing and developing these fine hospitals and of their untiring efforts in promoting the highest standards of medical practice in their own home town.

Address before the Toledo Association of Historical and Ancestral Societies by Dr. Nathan Worth Brown—September 21, 1950.

SOURCES

Academy of Medicine, Constitution and By-Laws, 1907.
History of Toledo Hospital; Notes from Mr. Benfer, Supt.; 1950.
History of St. Vincent's Hospital; 1855-1944.
Annual Report of The Maternity and Children's Hospital; 1913-1914.
Flower Hospital Handbook; May 1950.
Conversation with Supt. of Robinwood Hospital; September 1950.
Conversation with Assistant Administrator, Mercy Hospital; September 1950.
Conversation with Admitting Officer, Maumee Valley Hospital; September 1950.
Personal Knowledge and Early Experiences.

The Old Stage Door*

By Marion S. Revett

Prior to 1850, Toledo had nothing which could by any stretch of the imagination be called a theater. In those days, the hinterlands were so starved for entertainment that any roving band of show-offs was more than welcome. There was no need for actors to worry about acoustics, a guaranteed salary, or a percentage of the box office receipts. All they required was a hotel assembly hall, a school auditorium, or an empty storeroom with a raised section at one end and plenty of chairs, and they could make enough money to pay their bills, eat, and even have something left over to get them to the next town.

In 1850, Thomas Dunlap of Toledo built the first centralized hall where all types of entertainment could be given. Located on the east side of Summit, approximately where Orange Street dead-ends into the main thoroughfare, UNION HALL (with some effort) could seat one thousand persons. Mr. Dunlap did not deliberately build Union Hall for the benefit of Jenny Lind. Toledo needed a hall, and Mr. Dunlap liked the investment. The Hall was opened in June. Jenny Lind did not arrive in America until September; but when the news got about that she was coming, Mr. Dunlap and his friends formed a "Jenny Lind Citizens' Committee."

Subscriptions were raised to publicize Toledo and its new Hall, and the Committee promised nobly that not all of the one thousand seats, at $10.00 per ticket—Jenny was getting $1,000 a night—should be sold to Toledoans. Certainly music lovers from Milwaukee, Detroit and Chicago would also want to hear her, and their welcome was assured. Excursion trains would bring folks in from miles around; hotels would make ready for the great influx of visitors; in short, the Citizens' Committee had everything under control but Jenny. She said, "No."

In spite of its disappointment, Union Hall was a popular place for three years. Theatrical troupes took leases upon the building and played through their repertoires and back again, until every last actor had re-

*Title of an early twentieth century song by Paul Dresser.

ceived a "benefit" and every dime was wheedled from the populace. A few weeks later another troupe, with substantially the same repertoire, started the routine all over again.

Theatrical business was so good that competition reared its ugly head. MORRIS HALL, built at the northeast corner of Summit and Jefferson, opened in 1853. Mr. Dunlap was left with ventriloquists, local fire department bands and a Hindoo Rajah, while Morris Hall booked the first class troupes which could afford the higher rental. Ole Bull, Maurice Strakosch with Max Maratzek, Amalia Patti, the best of the Minstrel shows and touring theatrical companies, all went up (the river) to Morris Hall.

Mr. Dunlap stood it for almost two years, and then built in 1855 Toledo's first real theater—a two-story wooden frame building with the stage right down on the first floor. Located on the east side of Summit between Oak (Jackson) and Orange Streets, STICKNEY HALL was officially dedicated by Louis Mathias and his Toledo Musical Society on October 9, 1855. The following week Adelina Patti, then aged twelve, with Paul Julien, a 13-year-old violinist, and August Gockel as their accompanist, brought out Toledo's most cosmopolitan audience. Price of admission was fifty cents. Twenty-seven years later Patti was asking (and getting) $5,000 per night and ten percent of the gross.

In the six years that Stickney Hall led the field, Sigismund Thalberg, Henri Vieuxtemps, Karl Formes, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Horace Greeley, Lawrence Barrett (then, in 1856, in his third year of the profession) and many other great names came to visit. Mr. Dunlap's Union Hall was destroyed by fire in 1860, and while Stickneys was busily trying to book everything into one building, a Mr. A. M. White, of New York City, quietly came to town and built a new and modern theater one block south of Mr. Dunlap on the west side of Summit between Adams and Oak, and near Adams.

Mr. White couldn't have chosen a more inauspicious time to open a new theater. The Civil War and WHITE'S HALL broke open within sixty days of each other, and after that there wasn't enough entertainment to go around. Mr. Dunlap gave up. He sold Stickneys in 1862 to an old-time showman named O. W. Blake and his partner, James A. Hayes. Stickney Hall was renamed the "Opera House," Variety shows

were brought in, and the two worldly gentlemen immediately originated a policy of twenty cents admission: 15c for a ticket and 5c toward a drink or cigar "on the house." Spirits were also sold before, between and after the performance, and the SRO sign was often in evidence. Officially, the theater and its personnel were ignored until the time came for a renewal of city license. Then some kind citizen sent a letter to the Editor, describing the goings-on at the "Opera House," and the spark of civic indignation was ignited. Immediately, all right-minded Toledoans (Temperance), the *Blade* editor, and the pulpit en masse, began condemnation proceedings.

"There will be vice enough IN SPITE of law, without encouraging it BY LAW," howled the *Blade*. ". . . abate this public pest. Not a single reason can be urged for its continuance. The only argument we have heard used was that if those who attend it were not entertained there, they would spend their nights in the saloons or 'cribs' on the Flats."

Because the Toledo *Commercial* accepted Stickney's advertising, the *Blade* labeled its competitor "an organ of the 'Free and Easy'," and for the next two months editorial insults flew between the two journals like snowballs in a school yard. Blake and Hayes kept perfectly neutral and reaped the rewards of sensationalism. They even bought a "card," as advertisements were then called, in the *Commercial* to invite the *Blade* editor to their theater where "entertainment given here is . . . chaste and unobjectionable . . . witnessed by ladies and gentlemen. Scarcely a night passes but the private boxes may be seen full of ladies."

That was exactly what was worrying the reformers! Choosing the opening night of a new playbill, the editor took the dare and plunged into the mire of Stickneys' reputation. With mounting horror he saw, and reported in the next issue:

"Two performers, representing a negro and negress, assuming to be husband and wife appear on stage; a baby with one side of its face white, the other black, is brought in . . . negro demands explanation from woman protesting it is not HIS. At last she reluctantly attributes paternity to Wendell Phillips. This 'brings down the house' . . . 'ladies in private boxes,' 'first citizens present' unite in rapturous applause of so 'chaste and unobjectionable a performance'."

Wendell Phillips had been lecturing the country on the subject of "Anti-Slavery."

The journalistic feud ended suddenly when all *Blades* were delivered, one evening, with a handbill enclosed suggesting they go "without fail" to the Free and Easy show the coming week. The *Commercial* accused its competitor of "either a wanton and unjustifiable attack on the Opera House . . . or has acted the part of traitorous guardian of public morals by circulating tickets of invitation among pure-minded females and innocent children . . ."

The *Blade* was confounded; the only handbills in their papers on the evening in question were invitations to a STRAWBERRY FESTIVAL for Engine Company No. 7. The saboteur was never identified, and the *Commercial* couldn't have been kinder. Giving its confrere the benefit of the doubt it had, nevertheless, found "four different copies left by three different carriers, containing the handbill; that was the evidence upon which they had made the assertion." Even when old Stickneys was sold to another manager and morally fumigated by the presence of many fine names in minstrelsy and vaudeville, the *Blade* was never convinced. When the building was sold at $10,500 for stores in October, 1866, editorial comment was "to be used for better purpose than representations of the (il) legitimate drama." The *Blade* had the last word!

WHITE'S HALL was a lady. Managed for years by Dennis Coghlin (later owner of the Coghlin Block which now houses Grinnell Brothers), the theater for a decade proudly presented all that was best in entertainment. During the first months of the war, it was used by the Congregational Church for services while the old church on St. Clair Street, built in 1844, was being razed and a new building constructed. For one year, there was little entertainment at White's; then came Adelaide Phillips, James E. Murdoch, Emma Waller, "Timothy Titcomb" (J. G. Holland), "Artemus Ward" (Charles F. Browne), "Josh Billings" (Henry W. Shaw), the Eastman College Orchestra and Cornet Band from Poughkeepsie—the largest traveling group, with 28 musicians, which had until then played Toledo—Henry Mollenhauer, the cellist, Ernst Perabo, Carl Schurz, Clara Barton, Camillo Urso, Anna De LaGrange, Stelle Bonnheur, Frederick Hassaurek, a great German-American patriot, Edwin Booth, "Mark Twain," Edwin Forrest, Christina Nillson, and then Vieuxtemps again (with reserved seats $3.00 and $4.00 and box office receipts

$2,305 for his one performance), Tony Pastor, Jerry Cohan (father of George M.), Janauschek, the great tragedienne, and Lydia Thompson.

White's Hall was "cozy," as the *Blade* often called it. Seating but six hundred, those fortunate enough to secure tickets reaped a benefit in entertainment seldom seen in Toledo, even in a generation of palatial houses accommodating two thousand or more persons. When Wheeler's Opera House opened in 1871, Whites took second place in bookings for four years and then slipped to third place with the opening by Mr. R. J. Lent of his new ADELPHI Theater, in 1875. It was built on the east side of Summit Street, between Orange and Lynn, and advertised first-class vaudeville at ten cents a ticket, but was never too popular. Like the short-lived Morris Hall, the Adelphi has no personality whatever to gleam through the intervening years and give it life. It opened and closed periodically, depending upon business or lack of it, and inaugurated a "Smoke If You Like" plan later adopted by all burlesque houses. The Adelphi was finally sold to a Chicago theater group and then, in 1884, was remodeled into stores. The *Blade* was curt: "It has outlived its usefulness."

A few months after the closing of the Adelphi, White's Hall was redecorated, remodeled and opened by two Detroit men, Sam W. Brady and Charles H. Garwood. They made no effort to hire expensive "name" productions. Their policy was one-a-week shows at 10c-20c-30c admission; but their shows were always clean. Their PEOPLE'S THEATER coined money with numerous Horse Operas in the traditional "they went that-a-way" festival of blank cartridges, so dear to the hearts of the balcony crowd. Dialect comedians, vaudeville, gory Who-dunits so thorough that when the regular cast had been annihilated, local supernumeraries, hired for the occasion, also fell mortally wounded at every performance. Standing-room-only was a regular thing, and often the first class shows at Wheelers went begging (once there were exactly 56 people in the latter's theater.)

In 1889 the NEW PEOPLES, at the southwest corner of St. Clair and Orange, was built around an ex-pork-packing plant, a large brick building which when remodeled became a truly beautiful theater seating 1800. When White's Hall "Peoples" closed its doors, there was genuine regret. She had remained a lady, thanks to the astute and understanding management of Sam Brady. Later Neuhausels enlarged their store and took

old White's Hall into the dry-goods business. In 1892, Neuhausels was partly destroyed by fire and White's Hall became an obituary item with all the respect of a departed friend.

Wheeler's Opera House burned at 1 a. m. March 17, 1893. In November of the same year, Toledo's A. M. Woolson made plans to build a new Opera House on his property at St. Clair and Jackson. He had hired architects, lined up his circuit with the Miles group out of Cincinnati, and was ready to begin building when George Ketcham announced that he, too, would build an Opera House of his own, on property at the corner of St. Clair and Adams Streets. Toledo was not large enough to sustain two such important theaters, so Mr. Woolson bowed out. The VALENTINE Theater opened in 1895 and that little lady, at 56, is still going strong. She was at her best in the first twenty-five years of the new Century—the Golden Era of Theater which we shall never see again.

Midwestern: The Founding of Oberlin (2)

By Alfred Vance Churchill

1. *Criticisms and Animosities*

The new institution was attacked from every side. The stand against slavery had made bitter enemies. The admission of colored students seemed to add insult to injury. Opposition was aroused by the stand on co-education and the higher education of women. Other features offered grounds for criticism, most of them equally unreasonable.

The appointment of Finney as head of the Theological Seminary was strongly objected to. Finney's theology, later accepted almost everywhere by orthodox Protestanism, was liberal—even radical—in its time; so much so that its author was branded as a heretic. Finney represented the new School theology, like Lyman Beecher and Albert Barnes who were actually tried for heresy.

So Oberlin theology, which was Finney's theology, was naturally suspect. In certain quarters it was more than suspect, it was repudiated with scorn and hatred and great fear. The President of the University of Michigan did not conceal his opinion that it was "almost devilish." Pastors were officially warned by synods not to receive Oberlin men as Orthodox ministers or to admit them to communion. The American Board refused to send out graduates of the Seminary as missionaries. They even warned their own missionaries "not to associate with them on terms of too great intimacy, lest they be poisoned by their influence." In 1847 the Board recalled two excellent missionaries from Siam because they held Oberlin doctrines. In 1840 two brothers, seniors in the Seminary and pupils of Finney, made application for a license to preach. It was rejected. "On the mere general grounds that we were not ready to repudiate Oberlin ideas," says Fairchild, in his five-page autobiography, "we were refused even an examination with reference to licensure." And that was our Fairchild—mild, sane, and eminently conservative. Such at-

tacks were not confined to private conversation or to official conferences, but found expression in the public prints and in scurrilous pamphlets.

Other critics objected to manual labor, which Shipherd and Stewart had made an essential part of their plan. Professors were to be supported, as we have seen, from fees paid by the students. The young men were to earn these tuition fees on the college farm and in the college shops; the young women were to work at household tasks, "the spinning wheel and the loom."

Manual labor had other advantages, which, to the minds of the Founders were hardly less important. Manual labor would have a moral value through inculcating the spirit of equality and the honor due to honest toil. Above all, it would help to keep the mind clear and the body strong. This was a matter of prime importance to men who had only too often seen lives injured or wrecked through lack of exercise, in a day when the "sallow tinge of dyspepsia was the uniform testimonial of a life of study."

In view of these things, says the Circular of 1834, "all of both sexes, rich or poor, are required to labor four hours daily." The pay generally ran from four to seven cents an hour, though it had been known to rise as high as twelve. But this was not so bad when tuition stood at fifteen dollars a year; incidental expenses two dollars; and board one dollar a week. (The women's expenses were still less, but they got less pay.)

The manual labor scheme was not half as ridiculous as it sounds. Moreover it was not in the least original. There were dozens of manual labor schools both in New England and the West. Some educators hoped to see the plan adopted in all colleges. It was in operation at Bowdoin, at Andover Theological Seminary, at Lane Seminary, a few years later at Mount Holyoke, and later still at Wellesley. It was in use at many academies, Phillips Academy for example, not to mention Pawlet to which the Founders were indebted for several of their "original ideas." The fact is that manual labor, at the beginning, did exactly what Shipherd asked of it. Without it he could never have founded his school and hundreds of students would have gone without education.

The trouble was that it could not last. As long as there was land to be cleared and buildings raised, work could be found for all. After that

the plan began to fail. The College did what it could. Good men were found to supervise the various departments. But before long student-labor was a drug on the market and a burden to the institution. It cost them nearly twice the market price for every bushel they raised. The Trustees made desperate efforts. They even went in for silk-culture which was a fad of the times. They purchased and set out 60,000 mulberry plants. But they got few trees and no silk—"not so much as a single cocoon for the College museum."

So, before many years, students had to depend on other means of support, like teaching in the winter vacation (which was made the long vacation on purpose); and the College had to look to other sources of income for salaries. To deride Shipherd for the failure of the scheme was something more than injustice. He took the tool that offered itself; if it broke in his hand, there was no cause for derision.

It is not suggested that Shipherd made no mistakes, or that the College and Colony never laid themselves open to accusations of narrowness and foolish action. We may be permitted to smile when we read of a sort of mass meeting called to consider the question of the most suitable color for painting. After serious debate it was decided by a majority vote (not without objections) to paint the town red, red being the cheapest and most durable color available. But it was soon seen that this was a law more honored in the breach than in the observance. Three dwelling-houses were thus adorned. After that enthusiasm waned.

Then, too, strong opinions were held on the matter of suitable clothing. Shipherd had drawn up a Covenant which was signed by many of the early settlers. This was not a body of laws, enforced by penalties, but rather a statement of principles. The Covenant had this article regarding dress. "That we may add to our time and health money for the service of the Lord, we will renounce all the world's expensive and unwholesome fashions of dress, particularly tight dressing and ornamented attire."

We are not informed what the women folk thought of this provision. We know neither the day nor the hour when the Devil got into the town with his first corset and hoop-skirt. There were plenty of hoops and other worldly fixings in the attic of the house on West College street that my father bought for our home in 1859. They made a priceless adjunct

to the children's wardrobe in games, charades, and theatrical adventures.

Presumably the stronger sex had less trouble in living up to the ideal. Some of them pushed their principles to an extreme which we must now deplore as fanatical. The reader shall be informed about the foibles of these brethren in order that the picture may be complete and that truth may prevail. Certain individuals felt strongly on the subject of buttons. They thought that all buttons should be frowned upon, except those of purely utilitarian purpose and function. There were those here and there who spent time and thought during the Sunday sermon, when they might have been better occupied, counting the buttons in the neighboring pews.

Another form of self-denial, that appealed to perhaps half a dozen of the Colonists, led to the practice of uncovering the feet in summer. One man of relentless conscience went bare-foot even to church. He was not molested.

The fact is that the people of the Colony were accustomed to act according to their judgment in all ordinary matters. Finney set a charming example both of liberality and good taste in dress. He was against tight lacing, or anything that would injure health; he liked simplicity and opposed luxury. But he believed in beauty. He loved a beautiful gown. Not infrequently would he speak to a member of his flock of his pleasure in some felicity in the color or cut of her dress, or perhaps in the arrangement of her hair. It was not so much a compliment as a candid expression of pleasure.

Finney counted it one of the many blessings of the Sabbath observance that it gave men and women occasion to clean up and put on their best clothes. He thought the care of the body was a Christian duty; that its neglect was a dishonor to God. ("What! Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?")

Another ground of criticism by outsiders—and a number of insiders—was the stand taken on the subject of diet. It is a fact that some quaint notions were entertained on that head. They had come from the East; they were not original in Oberlin nor peculiar to it. The country was ablaze with reforms and dietetic reform took its place among others. At Dartmouth, Dr. Mussey was preaching a vegetarian diet. In Williams College the majority of students, in 1831, adopted the "principle of ab-

stinence from tea and coffee and the use only of food the simplest in every respect." At Amherst, Dr. Hitchcock, a Professor in that institution and later its President, held, in his *"Dyspepsy Forestalled and Resisted"* (published in 1830) that sedentary persons should not use animal food more than once a day, and that cold water was the only suitable drink. He showed that the proper quantity of food per diem was from twelve to sixteen ounces of solid and fourteen to twenty-four of water, according to occupation and constitution. His students "were gravely weighing out their fourteen ounces" as prescribed. Vegetarianism was widely advocated and was held by many to be the only "scientific" solution of the problem. Graham, perhaps the most popular dietician in the country, would have neither fish, flesh nor fowl on his table.

Shipherd, who had come in contact with these ideas through his association with Dr. Mussey and his pupil Dr. Dascomb, became convinced of their value. There is some excuse for him. Finding that they suited his ruined stomach he was naturally prejudiced in their favor. Finney too, who had lost his health from overwork, read Graham's *Physiology and Dietetics,* and after a while found himself, as he described it, "in complete bondage to Grahamism." But it was not for long . . . So this "reform" came to Oberlin along with others, and was tried out, with various unfortunate results.

There was one man in the institution to whom the idea made a special appeal. The argument for health may or not have had influence with Stewart (I doubt if Stewart was ever afflicted with "dyspepsy") but he was not slow to seize on the economic advantage of a "scientific diet." His honest heart must have beat faster when he thought of the money he could save through the establishment of a strict vegetarian regime. His position in the institution had been changed; he was no longer Treasurer. If he had been only Treasurer—or even President—the consequences might have been less disastrous. Unfortunately he was now Manager of the College boarding-house!

Stewart took advantage of his position. There was an orgy of frugality. He had a talent for cook-stoves, but not for cooking, and the food he provided was not only plain but bad. He went to unbelievable extremes. It is even related, says Leonard, "that on one occasion when a barrel of flour had been made into bread so sour and solid that no boarder could swallow it, the loaves were dried and broken, and returned

to the mill to be ground over. Then mixed half and half with fresh flour a second baking was bestowed with a mottled aspect resulting and an indescribable taste. The same thing was attempted a second time, when the miller refused to do his part, saying his business was to grind wheat and not bread." A letter from Fairchild's hand in 1839 says,—"One poor fellow died this morning. He was a dupe of Dr. Hitchcock's system of 'Dietetics'."

Catastrophe was at hand. You understand that the actions which brought it on were not prompted by stinginess or avarice? No, it was not avarice. Stewart differed fundamentally from the grand *avares* of history and fiction, because he was hoarding for no selfish end but "for the glory of God." Never mind—the result was the same.

Of course the students revolted and most of the Faculty and Colonists were in sympathy with them. Disappointed and deeply grieved, Stewart at last offered his resignation. They let him go. He left the institution to which he had devoted so much time and effort and so many prayers, and went back to his cast-iron cook-stove; on which he spent the rest of his life and amassed a fortune . . . Let this final word be spoken to his everlasting honor. Although to his mind Oberlin had failed to live up to her ideals and covenants, he loved her still. He never ceased to pray for her welfare, and during the rest of his life continued to provide her with funds from his earnings. Poor Stewart—poor "practical," great-hearted Stewart!

After these misfortunes, efforts were made to establish vegetarianism on a more reasonable basis; not for the sake of economy but on the grounds of health. An able pupil of Graham, the editor of his journal, was brought on from Boston and took charge for a while. And then the movement died. The funeral took place March 15, 1841, when a document was signed by leading Colonists stating that the experiment had now been "sufficiently tested in the boarding-house of the institution, and that the health of many of those who board there is seriously injured and suffering . . . by the use of diet which is inadequate to the demands of the human system as at present developed."

On the whole the College had behaved very well. Those who laughed overlooked the fact that the ideas tried out there were not a native product—that they were abroad in the land. They forgot that the institution

was governed by a powerful religious motive besides the health motive; for the Colonists believed that every cent they saved might go to rescue some lost brother or sister from hell. It seemed to them possible to calculate—almost to the dollar—the cost of saving a soul. But leaving motives aside, the College had again demonstrated its liberality. The reduced diet was at no time compulsory. A table was always set for those who did not wish to conform to it . . . And after all the whole thing was soon abandoned. Oberlin had too much good sense to keep on with it.

We ought not to leave this topic without mentioning the subject of beverages. Tea and coffee were not allowed on the College table until nine years had passed, during which the only drinks were water, milk, and a kind of substitute for coffee made of roasted grain. Tea and coffee had been renounced by the students of Williams College, Hudson, Lane Seminary, and other institutions. The feeling against them would seem to have arisen in the first place from a desire to avoid the products of slave-labor. Johann Friederich Oberlin had refused, on this ground, to touch coffee and would take no sugar; "for every granule of it (he said) is tainted with the blood of the unhappy slave."

In our Colony, in the early years, there was a strong sentiment against tea and coffee. There were extremists, no doubt, who thought it "wicked" to use them; I knew some of these later on. But such fanatics were in the minority, and I believe their importance has been exaggerated. What says the Covenant? "Avoiding . . . even tea and coffee as far as practicable." That phrase probably represents pretty well the attitude of the Colony. The wording allows considerable latitude. Leonard, it is true, tells about one man who was brought before the church for tea-drinking. He had signed the Covenant but now he refused, with quite unnecessary bluster and publicity, to stick to it. If he was actually "disciplined" I am inclined to think it was for breaking his word and then acting foolishly about it, rather than for drinking tea.

In any case it is certain that the leaders of the Colony in the early days felt that they must abstain from "all stimulants" including tea; and among them for a time was Finney. Finney, however, as a staunch upholder of the liberty of the individual conscience, would never have forced his personal views on others. He did not even sign the Covenant, regarding it as "too specific in its prescriptions."

There is a story of Finney's total abstinence period that must be related here. One day a good brother called at the house and was shown into Finney's study. What was his horror on seeing the great preacher in the very act of raising to his lips a steaming—a fragrant cup of the forbidden brew. "Is it possible—do mine eyes behold—my nostrils breathe? — Brother Finney — oh my brother!" "Brother," replied his embarrassed victim, "I can assure you my tea is very weak." That Finney—sublime theologian and matchless logician—could descend to such feeble casuistry! I can hear my father's almost inaudible laughter (deep, loving laughter) as he thought on this and told me the story.

Another unhappy controversy that brought about the resignation of a first-rate teacher was on the question of "Heathen Classics." This too was an ancient question, nor did it originate in Oberlin. There were scholarly men throughout the country—presidents and professors in colleges—who felt that the Greek and Latin classics might have a deplorable influence on the morals of young people. Besides that the vast majority of college professors, having been educated for the ministry, naturally felt that Biblical literature was being neglected in favor of profane authors. (Hebrew was obligatory at Harvard until 1824.) It seemed to them that Bible Greek and Hebrew might well replace at least part of the work in the "classics."

Oberlin was of course in sympathy with this point of view. There was no thought of abandoning the ancient materpieces; but they had actually introduced Bible Greek and Hebrew and were thinking of expurgating some of the "Heathen Classics" and getting rid of those portions that tended "to debase and pollute the mind." When President Mahan arrived, in 1835, it appeared that he held strong views on the subject and he was at once invited to lecture on it.

Now the common practice in the community was to air all important subjects of controversy in public debate. This had been done in such questions as the admission of colored students, of vegetarian diet and many others. So with this question. The Rev. Seth Waldo, Professor of Language, defended the regular courses. The discussion, says Fairchild, "continued several days, engaging the attention of the whole community." One evening a student who hated Latin took an old Vergil, "being careful to keep a better one safe," got some students together, and lighting a bonfire solemnly burnt the book. After which ebullition they

went to work on tomorrow's lesson in Vergil as usual. "The burning of the Classics at Oberlin" was widely published and was "accepted very generally, not unnaturally, as a declaration that such studies were to be repudiated . . . No such result followed. The course of study remained unchanged."

But Professor Waldo's mind was disturbed. "He apprehended that he should not be able to realize at Oberlin his views of education and at the next meeting of the Trustees he tendered his resignation." It was a real misfortune, and entirely unnecessary.

Aside from these hostilities, natural in their time, the enemy eagerly seized on various peculitarities of the institution, failing to understand them and treating them in a spirit of ridicule or obloquy. The Colony was accused, for example of advocating communism. It is possible that Shipherd himself would have been glad to see the communistic principle adopted. He would have felt it a grand expression of human brotherhood. Had not the Disciples "had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every man had need?" But Shipherd, though it is true that two or three times he was compelled to cut a Gordian knot, had nothing of the dictator in his gentle nature. Anyway he was far too wise to force his views on the Colony. Schemes for social reform were springing up everywhere and communistic sentiment was abroad in the land. Within twenty years, twice that number of communistic enterprises were to come into being, of which Brook Farm, which had the sympathies of Emerson and Hawthorne, is doubtless the most famous and Oneida Community the most significant. But the friends of our Colony had no cause for anxiety. There was never any communism at Oberlin.

Before closing this chapter we must not fail to consider Oberlin's attitude on the doctrine of "Christian Perfection." Nothing, perhaps, in her history brought more trouble at home, or more disastrous criticism from her enemies.

The doctrine was not new; it had been taken over from Wesley and the Methodists, and far from being peculiar to our institution it was agitating the minds of Protestant believers throughout the world. These were years of reform in religion as in other fields. New converts of the "great revivals" were numbered in scores of thousands. The obligations

of Christians, and standards of the religious life, were being re-examined by many anxious hearts.

Now there seemed to be Scriptural authority for the doctrine that the Christian might attain to a life without sin. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." Were not these the words of the Master himself? And would Christ have enjoined a duty on his followers, knowing it to be impossible for them? "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able."

Such a doctrine was certain to appeal to ill-balanced and ignorant brethren of the flock. What is hard for us now to understand is the hold it had on a better class of minds. There were able men in all or nearly all the Protestant denominations throughout the country who felt it to be profoundly important. In general such men limited themselves to upholding the sinless life as a goal to be striven for. But there were many good people who held that Perfection was attainable and even that they had attained it.

So Oberlin took up the doctrine of Christian Perfection with her accustomed seriousness and—it must be admitted—made a good deal of it. It was the subject of public and private debate for weeks and months. Cowles, the editor of their official organ, the *Oberlin Evangelist,* continued to write about it for years. Among those whose time might—as it seems to us—have been better employed, were Mahan, Finney and Morgan, the spiritual leaders of the community. I used to think that these men upheld Perfection only as an ideal to be striven for, like "hitching your wagon to a star." But it was something more than that. Finney, in deep distress of mind over the low standards then prevailing in the church, had a profound conviction of the necessity of a higher consecration on the part of professing Christians. "I was as strongly and unequivocally pressed by the Spirit of God," he writes, "to labor for the sanctification of the church as I once did for the conversion of sinners." On the other hand I am sure that neither Finney nor Morgan would ever have dreamed that he himself had attained the ideal. Finney never said he had attained it, and he "did not encourage any to announce themselves as living in a permanent state of entire consecration." He exclaimed that he "would creep on his knees all the way to the Atlantic Ocean" to see a man who was without sin; which, in my view, implies that he had never witnessed such a phenomenon. If there really was a "saint" in

Oberlin, I imagine it would have been Father Shipherd; and Marianne Dascomb said "there were specks, even on *his* halo."

In fine, Finney found himself in a puzzling situation. He could not bring himself to uphold any standard of the Christian life lower than the ideal one, and he felt that through the abundant grace of God there must be a rational hope of attaining it. Probably few readers nowadays will be interested in the question. But those who care to look into it will find, I think, that the Oberlin position was impregnable.

The views of Morgan and Cowles were practically identical with Finney's. Both were men of exceptional modesty. They regarded the doctrine as of fundamental importance, but I have yet to hear that any of them professed personal sanctification. President Mahan, on the contrary, underwent a remarkable experience during which it seemed to him that he received "the Baptism with the Holy Ghost." Fairchild gives us Mahan's own expression of it as a "coming out of darkness into the light . . . the passing from a state of imperfect obedience to perfect obedience—perfect not in the sense of freedom from mistakes and involuntary imperfections, but in freedom from voluntary failures . . . The view was essentially that of the Wesleyan experience of perfect love . . ."

I think there is no doubt that along with great qualities Mahan had an erratic streak. With him, Sanctification became a fixed idea. He preached it in season and out of season. In fact he spent most of his life, from this time on, in preaching and writing about it. His published works hitherto had dealt with various philosophical subjects but henceforth he wrote on little else than Christian Perfection. Whereas his Master had uttered one sentence on the subject, Mahan made thousands.

President Mahan was a bold and self-assertive character. He must have told his experience to his friends, for it soon became common knowledge. Before long similar experiences were shared by numerous citizens and students and by several of his colleagues. Mahan's excessive zeal in the matter seems to have alarmed the Trustees and offended some of the Faculty. It began, also, to pall on a community of citizens who were sober men on the whole and used to exercising their individual judgment. Besides that, as Fairchild seems unwillingly to admit, the President had made a good many enemies. "Some of his colleagues felt at times that his strong aggressiveness awakened unnecessary hostility

against the College. . . . An infelicity which often attends great strength of purpose and character was sometimes suspected in him, namely, a greater facility in conviction than in conciliation." In 1850, after fifteen years of excellent service as President, Mahan, hoping (I feel sure) that it would not be accepted, tendered his resignation. They let him go.

How such a doctrine as Sanctification would be seized on and swallowed by a rabble of hare-brained fanatics and canting hypocrites is easy to imagine. These liked nothing so well as to bear public testimony that for months or years they had lived without sin; to the astonishment of their hearers, who, without such testimony, would never have suspected the fact. It was these people, not in our town alone but throughout the country, that made the doctrine ridiculous. Nor is it difficult to think how such pretensions would be received by a sinful and scoffing world.

Oberlin's attitude aroused the bitterest criticism, not only from profane sources but from large sections of the church. The sweetness and light that characterized Cowles' utterances on the subject and Mahan's splendid logic and masterly exegesis, which whipped the enemy on their own ground, were overlooked. The hearts of the enemy were filled with a deadly odium theologicum, a species of hatred hardly to be credited by those who have encountered it only in books of mediaeval history. "Oberlin Perfectionism," says Dr. G. F. Wright, "became for a long time a byword of reproach. Not only were ministers silenced for preaching it, but church members were excommunicated for holding it."

In my time enthusiasm for the doctrine had died out. A small group of the sanctified still held prayer-meetings in their homes and told each other their experiences. From time to time one of the survivors would testify in public. But that was all. The prejudice of outsiders had died out too—almost but not quite. I once heard a sardonic train-conductor on the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern call out the station of my native town in these words, — "O-ber-*lin* — O-ber-*lin*—City of the Saints —OBERLIN!" The words conveyed no meaning to my mind.

While ridicule was unwarranted, and the criticisms against the institution were for the most part unjust and prompted by black prejudice or green-eyed jealousy, nevertheless Oberlin laid herself open, at certain points, to the charge of narrow-mindedness. Dancing was held to

be a sin; the theater was darkly frowned upon; works of fiction were for the most part condemned, and games of chance or skill forbidden—even to checkers and chess—in the early days. At one time a fine of fifty cents was imposed on boys caught playing marbles in the street. Card games were the worst of all and billiards were an invention of the Evil One to lure young men into places of ill-repute.

There was a deadly antipathy against tobacco in any form. By the time I was in college this feeling had relaxed to a certain extent (though President Fairchild found its use "essentially indecent") and I knew a few really fine men—church members too—who smoked in a quiet way without interference. But in my childhood the only prominent citizens who smoked, openly and without shame, were Marx Straus the clothier, who was thought of as a "foreigner," and Judge Steele. Now Steele, though universally respected, was an "unbeliever" who could never be converted—by Finney or any other.

In spite of all this I still maintain that the College on the whole was liberal, decidedly so in comparison with the majority of colleges of the time. We have considered her position with regard to the admission of colored students, the higher education of women, and in the matter of co-education, of dietetics, and of classical studies. We have observed her refusal of communism and Grahamism. Millerism got no hold on her, and in fact she looked askance at the whole flock of isms that filled the air at that time. She had leanings toward Congregationalism, but her sectarian bias was of the slightest. There was never any objection to receiving members of other denominations, whether into the church, the Faculty, or the Board of Trustees. No special form of baptism or worship—no prescribed rites—were at all insisted on. Salvation was made to depend, not on forms, but only on the relation of the soul to God.

In was in fact her independence in religious matters, rather than her creed, that made Oberlin hated by her foes. Finney would not permit a doctrinal pledge—either written or spoken—to bind his theological graduates when they entered the ministry. On the contrary they had been "taught to maintain a Christian freedom of spirit in the formation and utterance of their opinions." When Dascomb was invited to a Professorship he made it a condition of his acceptance (though a good man and a devout) "that he should not be called on to conduct chapel exercises." The condition was accepted. Such liberality was unusual among the

small sectarian colleges where, says C. A. Beard, "denominational orthodoxy, rather than high competence, was the prime consideration." This thing of allowing a man to teach who would not pray in public—it was really "no way for a Christian college to act!" And tolerating Trustees on the Board who did not belong to your denomination—"it wasn't business." How could you ask the Congregational churches for funds if you didn't stick to your Congregationalism? But the College had no official connection with Congregationalism or with any ecclesiastical organization, yet it continued to thrive. Which made it hard for critics to keep their tempers.

Now that time has healed the wounds of criticism we can see that fault-finding was to be expected, and that part of it was justified. What is hard to comprehend is the rancor and injustice that accompanied it. The enemies of the College went to extreme lengths. They published false statements and malicious pamphlets. They even tried to take away her charter. The Hon. Josiah Harris, Ohio State Senator, who as he himself stated, was "no abolitionist, nor a disciple of Oberlin," who only wished "to see the right of all protected on the principle . . . of equal and exact justice to all men," writes to his wife in a letter dated Thanksgiving A. D. 1842. He speaks of the numerous attempts made in a previous session by the foes of the College to get her charter repealed, and of the "thousand unfavorable rumors circulated against her by lobbyists without any evidence of their truth." He fears that, though the attempt to revoke the charter failed at the last session, it may be successful in this one. He is prepared to fight for justice to his constituents, even though they may think differently from himself on most subjects. "You can have," he says, "no conception of the opposition and prejudice existing against Oberlin in the Legislature."

It will be seen by any one who cares to investigate the facts that the enmity and malice of the outside world have not been exaggerated here. But time wrought its changes in these feelings. At the meeting of the National Council of the Congregational Churches at Oberlin in 1871, the moderator was able to say,—"We stand here at the grave of buried prejudices."

2. *Education of Women—Coeducation.*

There was an outcry when it became known that women were studying at the College on an equal footing with men. The admission of colored students had been less of an innovation than it was felt to be; Bowdoin and Princeton had already received them. The admission of women on the contrary involved a shocking break with tradition. That was really scandalous. People had perhaps forgotten the culture of an older time, when Hypatia taught philosophy and was a president of schools in the most enlightened center of the ancient world; or that of France a thousand years ago when the learning of Heloise was the delight of scholars; or that of the Renaissance when a lovely lady—(what was her name, now?)—at the age of twenty-five lectured on mathematics in a famous university and was fain to hide her beauty behind a screen so that the thoughts of young men might not be diverted from her argument.

From the beginning, and against almost universal prejudice, women were free to enter Oberlin. She was the first institution to offer them the higher education on the same basis as men. The feeling against this was not limited to the uncultured West. "It was well into the 19th century," says Calhoun, "before New England thought education for girls desirable." Even in the best families only reading, writing and arithmetic were taught them, in rare cases drawing, music and dancing. In 1788, Northampton, Massachusetts which by the irony of events was to become the seat of Smith College, voted not to spend any money on the education of girls. There were, of course, private schools and seminaries for "females"; but no college had been founded for them, nor was there any place where a woman could get a college education.

Now Shipherd believed in the education of women. Besides that he wanted proper wives for the teachers and preachers that were in training for the Midwest. He was convinced that those wives-to-be should have equal opportunities with the men. In a circular of March 1834 he states, as one of the grand objects of the institution, "the elevation of female character, by bringing within reach of the misjudged and neglected sex all the instructive privileges which have hitherto unreasonably distinguished the leading sex from theirs." This has been called "Oberlin's Magna Charta for womankind."

He says instruction will be given in "the useful branches taught in the best female seminaries," but he promises that the higher classes will be permitted to enjoy the privileges of such professorships (in all departments) as shall best suit their sex and prospective employment." There is no mistaking the tone of this statement. It is a clear call for the educational emancipation of women.

In 1836-7, it is true, a separate curriculum was offered to women. Even that was a full four years course—a year longer than the best female seminaries—with mathematics, science, history, philosophy and New Testament Greek; but no degree was allowed for it. On the other hand women were received into the regular Classical Course as soon as they wanted it, in full equality with the men. In 1841 three women were graduated and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts, the first women in this country, perhaps in the world, to receive that degree. The names of two of them—Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown (Blackwell)—were later to be famous. In 1847 two young women were even received into the Theological Seminary—an unheard of innovation.

For a time Oberlin was standing alone but not for long. In 1837, two hundred years after the first men's college in New England, Mary Lyon secured an endowment for Mount Holyoke. This was established amid opposition and controversy. In Oberlin, on the contrary, the situation developed by itself. The College had made a momentous—an epoch-making decision—hardly realizing that it had done so.

That boys and girls should go to the common school together was accepted by the world and seemed natural enough. Shipherd and Stewart were inured to the idea that young men and women might pursue their studies together. This was the plan at Pawlet where they had studied, and it was common in other academies. When they included it in their scheme they did not offer it as a reform or as anything new. Indeed the only novelty was its introduction in an institution of higher learning.

Nevertheless, it raised a howl of indignation. Women were not strong enough, physically or mentally, to stand the formidable strain of studying together with men—the same subjects in the same classes. And that intimate association of the sexes—at the most impressionable age — it would surely be the death of manners and morals! Oberlin took that

risk and found no palpable evil resulting. From the first, men and women sat at the same table and attended classes together. The women's department was not distinct from the other. The catalogue of 1838 expressly states that "Whenever the course of study permits of it, the young ladies attend the regular recitations of the College Department."

So there was really no theory of co-education, and no discussion. Oberlin had solved a great question without even raising it; and again an idea of her Founder was vindicated.

3. *Sinners, Cranks and Unclassified.*

There will be time enough for cranks and sinners later on, yet may I pause to present here a specimen or two and give a taste of their quality.

There was Sister Pierce, ("ol' maid Pierce" we boys called her, I grieve to say) who went to Finney by night—like Nicodemus—and told him God had appeared to her three times in a dream and said to her that she was to be his wife. "Sister!", said Finney in a dramatic whisper, "Sister—'twas the Devil!" Falling sick, this pitiable creature was visited by good ladies of the church who ministered to her needs and gave her a bath; but judging from certain circumstances that she had never previously undergone this experience, they feared it might result in her death. And so, in fact, it did.

Again there was fine old Deacon Godem, much beloved and a man of exemplary life, so far as I have ever heard, in every way except one. In public his language was all right; but when he was ploughing he used "naughty words" to his horses. I can not hope that this fact will excite the same interest in the modern reader as it did in me and my playmates. We hid ourselves among the bushes in the angle of the rail-fence at the end of the furrow, and waited to hear the old Deacon invoking hell and damnation and the name of his Maker. We listened with tense sinews and bated breath. We had rarely heard an oath. Never from the lips of a professing Christian.

Meet Deacon Cobb who loved God but hated little children—perhaps because he could never have one—and chased me and my little sister out of his wood-lot with a pitch-fork, yelling at us with the voice of a savage.

And may I present Sister Luney whose love for the soul of her young daughter made her hold the child's hand on a hot stove-top to cure her of lying and save her from hell. I remember how many days the little thing was absent from school.

Meet Brother Powers. A "Perfectionist" he was, and a leader among those who had received "the Baptism with the Holy Ghost." He would get up in prayer-meeting and testify how, by the infinite grace of God, he had now been enabled to live for the space of eighteen years—nineteen years—twenty-two I think it was, the year I left home for good—"wholly free from sin." Adoniram Powers had deprived himself and his family of everything that makes life pleasant. He would have thought it wrong to wear an unnecessary button on the back of his coat or to kiss his wife on Sunday. He thought it wicked to jest. "Jesus Christ," he said to me, "never jested." He thought it was a sin to drink coffee.

This Brother was a mighty man of strength, up every morning before daylight working his farm; but he got to spending his nights with Sister Gurley in a grove outside the village, engaged in prayer and in other rites that did no honor to his Lord. Brought before the bar of the church for immorality Brother Powers was excommunicated at last. He died very soon afterwards. To live down such disgrace was beyond even such strength as his, after he had held a position so exalted in his own little world.

Yet some of these Perfectionists were sweet, and honest, and humble, and good. There was Sister Rawson, lover of flowers, whose yard was one glowing mass of hollyhocks, and dahlias and daffodils, of peonies and phlox; of tulips and bleeding-hearts and primroses and day-lillies and tiger-lillies; whose garden held the first place in her heart after her Saviour; (He too had loved flowers. Was He not called "the rose of Sharon" and "the lily of the valleys"?) whose garden would have been her greatest pride, only that pride was a "sinful feeling."

Sister Rawson had lived a long time without sin, yet she was not above temptation. When naughty boys trampled on her beloved garden and stole her flowers she had to struggle hard with the Evil One. She admitted this to my father. "I am glad to *give* them posies. I don't mind so much Professor, when they take them—even without asking—over the fence or through the pickets. But when those boys break through the

fence, and trample on my garden, and *steal* my flowers—well—Satan just tries to enter my heart and I am sorely tempted—tempted to impatience and uncharitableness. It takes lots of grace to resist—oh it does, Professor—lots and lots of grace!"

Sister Jewell was not a Perfectionist. She made no pretence to spiritual excellence and her only claim to our attention is the deed recorded below. Sister Jewell was a tower of strength in a frail little body. Occupied one day with her household cares she heard the screams of children out in the barn and flying to the rescue with her own unaided strength hoisted a huge wagon-box that had fallen from its chains and was crushing the life out of a little one. She saved the child. When her husband and the farm hands came home at noon they would not believe her story because it always took several men to lift that box. But they finally gave in when she said that God had helped her.

I should like further to present Brother Sampson the blacksmith, late ornament of the English prize-ring. Converted under Finney's preaching, Sampson was now a model Christian, except perhaps for one failing. He had not succeeded in shaking off certain trains of association with his former life. When exalted in prayer and making use of a terminology only too familiar to him, he would use it more or less as he had done in his life of sin. In short he swore in his prayers—swore formidably—using expressions that were deeply distressing to his brothers and sisters in the Lord. Withal he was an honest and estimable man and an excellent smith.

Meet Brother Pease. A worthy soul; doer of many good deeds and some strange ones; who, as he lay on his death-bed, old and tired and waiting for God to take him to Himself, whiled away the long hours planning his own grave-stone and epitaph. This is what he wrote:—

Under the sod
And under the trees
Here lies the body
Of Hiram Abif Pease
However there's nothing
Here but the Pod
The Pease are shelled out
And gone up to God.

H. A. Pease, born in 1797, was one of the first settlers of Oberlin Colony. He was a wagon-maker. I remember the old man very well and the stone too. It stood for some time—epitaph and all, finished and ready—in the shop of R. K. Jones, our village marble-cutter. As the Pease family had pronounced objections to the poem, the stone was never set up. The story of it became a classic in our part of the world.

In 1887 when the safety bicycle supplanted the high wheel, Brother Pease, at the age of ninety, purchased one of the new machines and learned to ride. Before long he had a fall and I think broke a few ribs. Learning of this, kind President Fairchild decided to make him a visit; which was only natural, considering that they had come to Oberlin Colony in the same year and that the old man had once been his Sunday School teacher. Entering the room with his usual cheerful urbanity, our good President was greeted by a weak and querulous voice in these words: "Heh! guess ye thought ye was goin' to bury me *this* time—didn't ye?—well, *it ain't the season to plant Pease!*"

The reader understands—I trust—that these character sketches are authentic in every particular except that the names in some cases have been changed. I have tried to represent the sinners and queer people faithfully, without palliation but without emphasis. The inhabitants of our village were a fine lot—a rare lot—as unlike the frontiersmen of fiction as it is possible to be. There were exceptions of course. I remember three or four old skin-flints who maintained more or less precarious and shaky positions as "pillars of the church" and "fathers in Israel," but were really pious cheats—stingy and dishonest in small, mean ways. They did not scruple to "deacon" their produce, placing the best fruit and vegetables at the top of the barrel; to boast that they had the finest hay in town and then deposit a mouldy load in your own barn-loft; to pile a scant cord of wood in your wood-house in such a way that it would look like generous measure; to trade you a spavined horse asserting it to be in the pink of condition.

Once in a long while—only two or three times in my day—some brother would "fall" and have to be expelled from the church. Fairchild records the terrible moral lapse, about 1848, of another Perfectionist, a man who had been prominent in all college and church activities, especially in those connected with "social purity," whose crime he can not bring himself to name.

Simple justice to my native town constrains me to add that physical cruelty was very rare. That atrocious punishment of a child for lying is absolutely unique in my experience. I hesitated to record it. I have never known a really "cruel parent" in my life. Such a character as the step-father in David Copperfield as played by Basil Rathbone, though only too plausible, is quite outside my ken.

Enough has been said to show that, besides the general high average, there were fine people with queer streaks and queer people with fine streaks; while others still were just odd creatures that provoked merriment and gave spice to life—the kind that have been common in human experience since the dawn of time and will continue to make laughter and talk till the stars are cold.

(Glancing over this chapter I find that my chronology is a bit uncertain. Writing of people all of whom seemed old to me, I have fallen into the mistake of grouping them together in time. I knew them all except two, but I can not in all cases be sure how long they had been living in the village. Perhaps no further correction is necessary.)

The President's Page

Declaration of Independence
(July 4, 1776)

In the previous edition of the QUARTERLY, reference was made to the adoption of the Declaration. The Preamble and the Declaration were reprinted. The statement of the specific grievances against the Crown were omitted and are set forth herein as follows:

"To prove this, (the Tyranny of George III), let facts be submitted to a candid world. — He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good. — He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended he has utterly neglected to attend to them. — He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only. — He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures. — He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people. — He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within. — He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands. — He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers. — He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries. — He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their sub-

stance. — He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures. — He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power. — He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation: — For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: — For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States; — for cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world; — For imposing Taxes in us without our Consent; — For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury; — For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences; — For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule in these Colonies; — For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Government; — For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever; — He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us. — He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burned our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. — He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation. — He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands. — He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions. In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms; Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people. Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from

time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends. —

It will be noted that a number of the acts denounced were restrained or prohibited in the Constitution particularly the Bill of Rights contained in the first ten amendments.

LEHR FESS

running the line. That made the Ohio people mad, and they pressed [*sic*] an act appropriating $100,000 to sustain a call for military forces to prevent this Michigan invasion. The Legislature was called together and passed a bill, but a clause was put in the bill which provided for a suspension of the act until Governor Lucas could send a Board to Washington to present our case to President Jackson.

A few days after this clause was put in the bill the Governor called me to go and see President Jackson about the impending war, and see if he would not prevent the conflict by an order to Mason. I told Lucas I thought Ohio was too big a thing for one man to represent, and he thought so too and named David S. Disney and Noah H. Swayne, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and off we went to Washington.

It was very hot weather at the time—I believe in the latter part of July —but we travelled over the mountains, and arrived at Washington. We then called on Old Hickory (applause) and told him we had come there to see about the Michigander business. The old man got up, received us cordially, and putting out his pipe and placing it on the mantle-piece, said, "Well, what do you want me to do?" We explained the matter to him, and, after talking a few minutes, he said, "Well, gentlemen, come to me to-morrow morning with what you want on paper." He then bowed us out and it was not long before we had all we wanted put down on a very small piece of paper. Calling the next morning we gave it to him. He was a great man in all his organs and parts, and one of God's noble men. Well, he rubbed up his specs, and reading over what he [we] had written, handed it back, saying: "Take that to the Secretary of State, and tell him to copy it and put the seal of the United States upon it." We did so. It was copied, the seal put on, and three and a half days thereafter, we were back in Columbus and the Ohio and Michigan boundary troubles were settled.

2. *Checking the Records*

Checking the records shows that Governor Allen was not exaggerating. The items that the Ohioans wrote down at Jackson's request "on a very small piece of paper" involved a declaration of a truce

between Michigan and Ohio: (1) *Michigan was to discontinue proceedings under its Pains and Penalties Act against Ohio officials supposedly violating Michigan sovereignty by exercising their offices in the disputed area,* (2) *it was to make no new prosecutions under that Act,* (3) *the Ohio surveyors could run their line without interruption, and* (4) *neither side was to interfere with officials of the other exercising their official functions in the disputed area. The Secretary of State, John Forsyth, did exactly that in his instructions to Governor Mason. The following quotations from "the very small piece of paper" and from Forsyth's reply to the Ohio Commissioners are ample proof of this. The first is taken from a "Statement of Allen, Disney and Swayne, July* 1, 1835" *in John M. Killitts,* Toledo and Lucas County, Ohio, vol. 1, p. 145:

The compromise bill of Ohio (as it is called) contemplates that this arrangement should be carried out, and that whatever has been done inconsistent with its provisions should be undone, or in other words: 1. That the pending recognizances and prosecutions under the Michigan act of February 12, 1835, should be discharged and discontinued. 2. That no new prosecutions under this act should be instituted. 3. That the Harris line shall be run and re-marked by the authorities of Ohio without interruption from those of Michigan. 4. That no forcible opposition be made by the authorities of Ohio or Michigan to the exercise of jurisdiction by the other upon the disputed territory within the time specified [until action by Congress], the citizens residing upon the territory in question resorting to the one jurisdiction or the other, as they may prefer.

The second quotation is taken from a "Statement of Secretary of State Forsyth." Killits, vol. 1, *pp.* 145-146:

. . . The President, without taking upon himself any other character than that in which he has heretofore acted, will cause an earnest recommendation to be immediately sent to the acting governor of Michigan and the other authorities of the territory, whom he can rightfully advise in the performance of their duty, "that no obstructions shall be interposed to the re-marking of Harris' line, that all proceedings already begun under the act of February shall be immediately discontinued, and that no prosecutions shall be commenced for any subsequent violations

of that act, until after the next session of Congress; and that all questions about the disputed jurisdiction shall be carefully avoided, and if occurring inevitably, their discussion shall be postponed until the same period . . .

And also the said Hollister, the said William Ewing within the said term shall teach or cause to be instructed and taught to read & write and so much of arithmetic as will include the single rule of three, and at the expiration of the said term of service, to furnish the said servant and apprentice with a new bible and at least two suits of common wearing apparel. And the said Hollister further agrees at the expiration of the said term of service to pay the said William the sum of one hundred dollars, or in the meantime and at the expiration thereof to give to the said William a competent education and knowledge of business to do and perform the business and occupation of a merchant in the manner that mercantile business is done and performed by the said Hollister at his store, as an equivalent and in lieu of the said one hundred dollars, at the option and discretion of the said Hollister as he may think proper and conceive that the said William will be more or less worthy and capable of such confidence and of doing and performing such business as aforesaid.

In testimony thereof the said William Ewing and John Hollister individually and the said Samuel Spafford as guardian of the said William have hereto set their hands & seals the day & year first above written.

Signed, sealed & delivered — *William Ewing* (*Seal*)
in the presence of J. W. Powell — *John Hollister* (*Seal*)
Ambrose Rice — *Samuel Spafford* (*Seal*)

You will note that the wages were perfectly "geared to the cost of living" in the above contract: there were no cash payments by way of wages. William just got his living and education in exchange for his work. And at the end of the 6-year term his boss could give him $100, a Bible and a couple of suits and call it square. Or, if he chose, he could skip the hundred dollars, and give him a regular job in the store instead. No "re-opening" or "renegotiation" clauses are found in this contract. In those days when you made a deal, both parties were expected to stick to it if it took the skin.

It appears that William proved so satisfactory that Hollister took him into the business, and did very well by him, following the apprenticeship. And in return, William evidently did very well for his employer.

house, mother suggested that we make him a call. The doors and windows were open and, as we stood on the stone steps, we could see through the hall into the study on our left. Finney, seated on a music stool, was pumping away at a cabinet-organ and trying, with one finger, to play "Rock of Ages!"

He rose with some effort but greeted us with his customary warmth. He informed his wife of our visit and she came in, bringing a beautiful little girl, probably a granddaughter. Mrs. Finney reminded my mother how much her husband had always loved music; how, until lately, he had sung solos and played the bass-viol, accompanied on the piano by one of his daughters. Now there was no musician left in the home and he was too feeble for the viol. So he had purchased this organ, only to find he could play with but one finger.

There sat Finney, looking like a wounded lion. Bye and bye he asked mother to play; and when we left, they entreated her to come often and make music for them. Finney followed us to the door. As we turned away, he smiled and said,—"And Etta! wear that red gown of yours?"

Being possibly the only individual now living who, with a degree of personal knowledge, has also a distinct remembrance of what was thought and said of Finney by some of his most intimate friends, I may not pass on without a further attempt to leave a true portrait of him. For he is not only forgotten by the majority, but is already as remote from us—and as hard to understand—as if he had lived in the age of Augustine or Thomas Aquinas.

Finney is not often mentioned nowadays, except by those seriously engaged in the study of our social history. The occasional references one meets with in popular literature are mostly rather sensational, and are characterized by inaccuracy. Even when the facts are right, they invariably leave a false impression of the man. The average journalist lacks the organs for apprehending the mentality and personal qualities of such human types as his.

I ran across something a few months ago, in the *Atlantic Monthly* (Feb., 1937), which will serve as a fair example. The writer, discussing the use of music by the evangelists of the eighties, gives us this:—"Dwight L. Moody . . . understood the value of music, or at least sing-