

convention, this force was an overwhelming factor subordinating all the other issues.

The emancipationists in Kentucky were themselves a divided group, ranging from a few abolitionists such as ^{Cassius} ~~Samuel~~ M. Clay, to advocates of gradual emancipation such as Underwood, Robert J. Breckinridge, and Henry Clay. On the whole the Whig party was responsible for the leadership in this movement. A system of gradual emancipation with colonization in Liberia was the plan of the conservatives in this group, immediate freedom for the negro the intention of the more radical. There had been advocates of some plan of emancipation during the formation of both the Constitutions of 1792 and 1799, and these forces had been particularly in mind when the intricate mode of revising the latter one had been adopted.

By 1847, all of the forces for reform in Kentucky were strong enough to overcome the first of the hurdles necessary to call a convention. When the question was submitted to the people, there was a vote of 92,369 in favor of calling a convention out of 137,311 qualified voters, or 67.3 per cent of the possible voters in the state.¹²⁶ The second election, in 1848, showed 101,828 votes for calling the convention out of a possible 141,620 total eligible voters, or 71.9 per cent of the total possible votes.¹²⁷ This same election gave the senate a Whig majority of 16, and the house a Whig majority of 28.

It was this Whig assembly that passed the act which authorized the Constitutional Convention to be called at last in Frankfort on

126. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky, I, 55.

127. Ibid., p. 57.

October 1, 1849, and began the struggle for delegates to be elected to that body. It was the house of representatives elected at this time that passed a resolution on February 3, 1849, by a vote of 93 to 0 that they were opposed to abolition or emancipation of slaves "in any form or shape whatever except as now provided for by the Constitution and laws of the State."¹²⁸ On February 24, this body amended the law of 1833 so that slaves for personal use could be purchased and brought into the state.¹²⁹

There were emancipation meetings in Maysville and in Louisville in February of 1849, and gradual emancipation of slaves became one of the leading topics in the newspapers. One result of this as reported in Niles' National Register for February 14, 1849, was a petition from the citizens of Hancock County, Mississippi, to the governor of that state, for an extra session of the legislature to pass laws prohibiting the further ingress of slaves from border states. Kentucky was specifically named in the complaint, stating that a huge flood of slaves was descending upon them and that it would probably increase now that slavery was of uncertain tenure in the border states.¹³⁰

George Prentice, editor of the Louisville Journal, speaking as a Whig and friend of emancipation, ran an editorial on February 21, 1849, which represented the immense vote in favor of the convention as based solely on the slavery question. He felt that the principle of emancipation had been endorsed by the majority of the people and that

128. Niles', LXXV, 108.

129. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky, I, 58.

130. Niles', LXXV, 97.

a small group of politicians in Frankfort were the source of the pro-slavery sentiment.¹³¹

This editorial was no doubt occasioned by the meeting in Frankfort on the fifth of February of the Friends of Constitutional Reform in which several Louisville men played important parts. Among these western men, John Helm, of Louisville, was chosen president. Helm was at this time lieutenant governor of the state under Crittenden and his position was certain to be pro-southern. David Meriwether, Democrat, also of that city, was one of two vice presidents. James Guthrie, Democrat, from Louisville, was appointed chairman of the committee of one from each Congressional district to report business for the consideration of the convention. As chairman of this committee, he submitted a set of resolutions which stated that the original friends of constitutional reform did not contemplate any change in the master-slave relationship, that the votes of the people had twice been ~~cast~~ ^{cast} with that purpose in mind. This body was pledged to support delegates to the Constitutional convention that would resist firmly any change in that relationship, change the term of officers to a prescribed term, restore elections of local and state officials to the people, provide for one day elections (to keep the Whigs from rounding up the stray voters in the existing three day period), restrict the power of the legislature to contract debts, insist upon some guarantee for instruction for the masses, and favor a ratification by the people before the constitution should go into effect.¹³²

Meanwhile the anti-slavery forces, largely Whig, rallied their forces for the coming contest, as well. It was expected that Clay would

131. Ibid., p. 125.

132. Ibid., p. 122.

make a strong stand for them and he was requested by them to send from New Orleans, where he was spending the winter, a statement for publication. His letter from that place did little to help the emancipationists at this crucial time. He wrote, "You obtained from me a promise to make a public exposition of my views and opinions upon a grave and important question, which, it was then anticipated, would be much debated and considered by the people of Kentucky, during this year, in consequence of the approaching Convention summoned to amend their present Constitution..." He went on to explain his views on gradual emancipation with removal of the slaves, and made his position apparently quite clear in the matter, until he concluded perhaps diplomatically but rather lamely, "I should be most happy to have the good fortune of coinciding with a majority of the people of Kentucky... [but] If it be perfectly certain and manifest that such a majority [opposed to emancipation] exists, I should think it better not to agitate the question at all, since that, in that case, it would be useless, and might exercise a pernicious collateral influence upon the fair considerations of other amendments, which may be proposed to our Constitution. If there be a majority of the people of Kentucky at this time, adverse to touching the institution of Slavery, as it now exists, we, who had thought and wished otherwise, can only indulge the hope that, at some future time, under better auspices, and with the blessings of Providence, the cause, which we have so much at heart, may be attended with better success."

133 However, as the time drew closer to the actual elections,

133. Ibid., pp. 185-187.

Clay did come back to Kentucky and worked for the emancipationists. At a meeting held in Lexington on April 14, he and Robert J. Breckinridge were the leaders in a movement to call a statewide emancipation convention to be held in Frankfort to organize their rather discordant forces.¹³⁴

This emancipation convention met in Frankfort, in the capitol building, on April 25, with delegates from twenty-four counties present. Louisville sent twenty-two delegates, making the whole number present one hundred and fifty-six. Henry Clay presided at the meeting which was composed of members of both parties. The Democratic Frankfort newspaper the Kentucky Yeoman, of April 26, said that the delegates were highly respectable and intelligent looking, many of them ministers of various denominations.¹³⁵ Nevertheless, no very definite or intelligent plan was produced by this distinguished group. To prevent division among themselves over abolition as against gradual emancipation, they avoided writing any specific platform to be written into the constitution. They also restricted the discussions of any other topics but slavery. Their only accomplishment was a recommendation that two points be insisted upon in the new constitution - the prohibition of the importation of slaves into Kentucky, and the power of the people to institute some system of gradual emancipation whenever they so desired.¹³⁶

This rather vague statement, accompanied by the association of the meeting in the minds of the people with abolitionists, was

134. C. Kerr, Kentucky History, II, 813-814.

135. Ibid.

136. Hiles', LXXV, 301.

apparently more than enough to discredit the whole movement. The election of delegates to the constitutional convention was clearly a democratic victory and a pro-slavery one. The conservatives of both parties became frightened, and united in many counties in opposition to the emancipationists. This union candidate in the majority of the cases was a Democrat.¹³⁷

In spite of the support of such prominent Whigs as Henry Clay, Joseph R. Underwood, Robert J. Breckinridge, and George Prentice, both the emancipationists and the Whig party were repudiated at the polls. At the same election in August, 1849, which ~~also~~ maintained the Congressional ratio at 6 Whigs and 4 Democrats, which sent 26 Whigs to the state senate to 12 Democrats, and which sent to the house of representatives 58 Whigs to 42 Democrats, sent to the constitutional convention a Democratic majority - 52 Democrats to 48 Whigs.¹³⁸ The Kentucky Yeoman for August 9, 1849, said that everything was in confusion, that Democrats were returned from Whig counties and Whigs returned from Democratic counties. With this Democratic editor, thinking more in terms of the goals of elective state and local officers, and curbing the executive power, and securing some permanent safeguards for the common schools, this puzzle was interpreted as a new formation of parties - those in favor of liberal reforms against the conservatives and "aristocrats."¹³⁹ Curiously enough, the pro-slavery party was thus denominated the liberal reform group and the emancipationists were called aristocrats and conservatives.

137. Breckinridge Papers for 1849.

138. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky, I, 59.

139. C. Kerr, Kentucky History, II, 835.

George Prentice, in his Louisville Journal, as a disapproving Whig commentator on the scene, deemed the convention to be a strange mixture indeed, and he pointed out unconsciously what would be more apparent later, that the leadership in the state had shifted from the Bluegrass. He felt that no good could come of any convention which resulted from such elections, where neither Clay nor Crittenden would be candidates, and where Judge Robertson, Robert J. Breckinridge, Thomas Marshall, and Charles Morehead, all Bluegrass Whigs, had been defeated in the race.¹⁴⁰ Within the state, the Democrats had achieved a position of tremendous potential power.

From the beginning it was clear that this powerful position was fully realized and that the Democrats were determined at last to change the old Whig order in the state. Joshua Bell wrote to Crittenden from Danville, in the northern part of the fourth district where the slave population for that district was largely concentrated, "The defeat in this district is overwhelming... The Democracy are outrageously insolent in their triumph."¹⁴¹

The convention which met at Frankfort on October 14, 1849, was composed of one hundred members who had been elected according to the act of the legislature approved on January 13, 1849, exactly as the representatives of the state, in the same manner and proportion and number, and were given the same salary during the period in which

140. Ibid.

141. Joshua F. Bell to John J. Crittenden, August 22, 1849, Crittenden Papers.

they were convened.¹⁴² Of this number, thirty-eight were farmers, thirty-nine were lawyers, three were classified as both lawyers and farmers, nine were physicians, two were mechanics, and there was one each classified as minister, trader, merchant, sheriff, miller, saltmaker, inn-keeper, and clerk. One delegate from the mountains gave no occupation at all. These latter delegates in the minority classifications were, with one exception, scattered in a huge circle around the center of the Bluegrass region. Only one came from a county close to the old Lexington-Frankfort region, and none came from the western third of the state. Of the thirty-nine lawyers, twenty-two came from the region outlined geologically as Lower Silurian, called the Bluegrass, the others well scattered over the rest of the state. Of the thirty-eight farmers, only ten were from the Bluegrass, but the distribution was about even over the state. This was the "strange mixture" which met in the capitol in October and began deliberations.

There was a division along party lines from the first day, with the Democratic party taking the lead under the direction of James Guthrie. The first attempt at Democratic control came in the organization meetings of the first few days. David Meriwether called the convention to order and there began immediately a discussion over the election of officers. James W. Irwin of Logan County, in district three, offered a resolution that a committee of five be appointed to report what officers were necessary. This immediately led to a protest that the meeting was

142. Robert Sutton, reporter, Report of the Debates and Proceedings of the Convention for the Revision of the Constitution of the State of Kentucky (Frankfort, 1849), p. 2. Hereafter cited as R. Sutton, Debates.

non-political and that there should be no postponement of the election so that an organization could be set up for those purposes. There were added several pleas for a non-party consideration of the various issues to be settled.¹⁴³ After a period of great confusion, of voting when many did not know what they were voting on because of unfamiliarity with parliamentary procedure, the convention proceeded to elect a president. Two candidates were presented, one Democrat, James Guthrie, and one Whig, Archibald Dixon. Both were western Kentucky men. Guthrie won by a vote of 50 to 43.¹⁴⁴ In the balloting for Secretary for the convention, when the choice was between a Bluegrass nominee and one from the west, the vote was 90 to 7, in favor of the western man, Thomas J. Helm of Barren County.¹⁴⁵

The next move was to gain control of the important rules committee. On the third day of the meeting, a resolution presented by Meriwether was adopted that the ~~present~~ ^{president} appoint this committee, to consist of seven members.¹⁴⁶ Among the men so appointed by Guthrie were Meriwether, Irwin, and Dixon.¹⁴⁷ Out of the seven, only two were from the eastern half of the state. When the rules drawn up by this committee were presented to the convention on October 4, rule number seven read, "All committees shall be appointed by the president, unless otherwise specially directed by the Convention, in which case they shall be appointed by vote; a plurality of the vote shall be sufficient to determine

143. Ibid., pp. 11-14.

144. Ibid., p. 15.

145. Ibid., p. 16.

146. Ibid., p. 19.

147. Journal and Proceedings of the Convention of the State of Kentucky (Frankfort, 1849), p. 33. Hereafter cited as Convention Journal.

the choice.¹⁴⁸ Guthrie appointed the standing committees on October 8. Archibald Dixon was made chairman of the Committee on the Executive and both Meriwether and Irwin were on the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution, and Slavery - Meriwether chairman. Prophetically, the mode of revision of the constitution and the slavery question were combined in the same committee. On this committee of ten, only one member was from the Bluegrass section, and only four from the whole eastern half of the state, three members being from the mountain and hill regions south of that section. The per cent of the slave population to the total of their counties was on the whole rather low,¹⁴⁹ but it was this committee which held firm to the old Constitution of 1799, and helped to make the mode of revision of the new one even more complicated. One delegate, after the convention had been in session for fifteen days, expressed the opinion in an open discussion that there were not more than three or four people in the whole convention in favor of emancipation and no more than fifteen or twenty who regarded slavery as wrong in the abstract.¹⁵⁰ This statement did not produce any complete denials on the part of anyone, or any commitments.

The discussion of slavery could scarcely have been avoided in any public meeting during the ~~six~~ disturbing months just prior to the final passage of the compromise bills in Congress, and with the special

148. Ibid., p. 58.

149.	Clark	38.6	{	Galloway	12.3
	Logan	33.7		Marshall	4.7
	Lincoln	33.6		Monroe	10.7
	Warren	28.9		Casey	9.8
	Jefferson	18.7	{	Floyd	2.6
	Jefferson	18.7		Pike	1.8
				Johnson	.8

150. R. Sutton, Debates, pp. 116-117.

interests involved in this group it was constantly recurring in connection with every debate. One member remarked that the "question of slavery and emancipation has been so frequently lugged into the discussions of various propositions brought before the convention, I will take this occasion again to remark that I cannot conceive that the question of emancipation has anything to do with the matter before us."¹⁵¹

The same member, from Lewis County, helped to explain somewhat the support of the pro-slavery argument by the poorer counties of the state when he revealed his own campaign tactics. He said:

Mr. Chairman, though a majority of my constituents are non-slaveholders - it was no difficult task on my part to convince them that they were as deeply interested in protecting and defending this institution, as is the slaveholder himself - I contend that it is the poor man, the native born laborer of Kentucky, who is most deeply interested in the perpetuity and preservation of the institution of slavery - for sir, once emancipate your slaves - permit the starving hordes of Europe to pour in upon us, as they unquestionably would - and the consequences would be, as was contended by the slaveholding emancipationist throughout Kentucky - that the wages of labor would be reduced, while the value of land would be enhanced - consequently the native born Kentuckian, would either be compelled to drag out an existence of poverty and dependence, or seek a home in the far west....the poor man therefore, never could acquire the means that would enable him to purchase a home for himself and family - and a system of landlord and tenancy would grow up in Kentucky.¹⁵²

The resulting provisions on a slavery and a mode of revision of the Constitution of 1850 were merely the rewriting of the old article and for the most part the wording remained unchanged. It was further provided that no slave might be emancipated unless means were furnished for his removal from the state, and that any free Negro or mulatto, either refusing to leave the state after emancipation or coming into

¹⁵¹. R. Sutton, Debates, 532.

¹⁵². Ibid., p. 533.

the state from elsewhere, would be arrested for felony and confined in the penitentiary.¹⁵³

The constitution was a Democratic triumph, indeed, and when it was submitted to the people for a vote in May of 1850 it was ratified by a vote of 71,653 for, to 20,302 against, a majority of 51,351 or 78 per cent of the votes cast.¹⁵⁴

Local officials such as sheriffs, coroners, county attorneys, jailors, county clerks and county judges were made elective, as were the Judges of the Court of Appeals.¹⁵⁵ The election period was changed from three days to one day as the ~~whig~~ reformers had wished.¹⁵⁶ To prevent the continuance of the Whig tendency to bankrupt the state for internal improvements, a debt limit was set for the state at five hundred thousand dollars, and the money so acquired "must be applied to the purposes for ~~xxx~~ which they were obtained." Furthermore, no debt could be contracted by the legislature amounting to over one hundred dollars unless at its final passage a majority of the members elected to each house had voted for it and the vote recorded.¹⁵⁷ The common schools were provided for in spite of the fact that Robert J. Breckinridge had not been elected to the convention because of his accompanying emancipation views. A common school fund was established and protected and the office of superintendent of public instruction was made elective.¹⁵⁸ The cities were admitted to representation in

153. B.P. Poore, Constitutions, p. 682.

154. F.M. Collins, History of Kentucky, I, 60.

155. B.P. Poore, Constitutions, pp. 659-663.

156. Ibid., p. 669.

157. Ibid., p. 672.

both houses of the legislature, which was a measure that the growing western cities had demanded.

When the first general election was held under the new constitution, on August 4, 1851, the Congressional districts became evenly divided between the two parties. Five Democratic and five Whig Representatives were sent to Congress. The greatest Whig support in this election was shown to be in the mountain districts four and six, and the hilly western district two. For the state legislature, the ratio in the senate was 20 Whigs to 18 Democrats, and in the house, 55 Whigs to 45 Democrats.¹⁵⁹

In the campaign for governor the Democrats stressed the new constitution as a product of their party, and the Whigs attempted to carry the campaign into a discussion of the Union and the Clay Compromise.¹⁶⁰ Both parties chose a candidate for governor from western Kentucky. Both the Democratic candidate, Lazarus W. Powell, and the Whig candidate, Archibald Dixon, were from Henderson County in the second Congressional district.¹⁶¹ This election was very close, with Dixon polling 53,783 votes to 54,613 for Powell, a Democratic majority of only 830 votes.¹⁶² Cassius M. Clay entered the race as an emancipation candidate and polled 3,621 votes that presumably would have been Whig, and would have prevented the election of a democratic governor. All of the other state officers, including Robert J. Breckinridge as superintendent of public education, were Whigs. Out of 163,096 eligible voters in the state, 111,997 votes were cast, or ~~73.2~~ 73.2 per cent.¹⁶³

158. Ibid., p. 683.

160. C. Kerr, Kentucky History, II, 843.

162. Whig Almanac, 1852, 47-48.

159. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky, I, 62.

161. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky II, 336, 681.

163. R.H. Collins, History of Kentucky I, 62.

One of the most striking changes in the political picture during this post-war period was the fact that the capable politicians among the young men of the state were entering the Democratic party and not the Whig. The most conspicuous example of this trend was the sudden appearance and phenomenal advancement of a veteran of the Mexican War, Major John C. Breckinridge, later vice-president of the United States with James Buchanan in 1856, a candidate for president for the southern Democrats in 1860, and Secretary of War for the Confederacy.

Breckinridge was admired and trusted by the men who served under him in the Mexican campaign¹⁶⁴ and he drew upon this veteran vote in part in his initial political venture in 1848, when he ran for representative in the Kentucky Legislature from Fayette County, the heart of the Bluegrass and the very center of Whiggery.

Only eleven days after his discharge from the army at Louisville on July 21, 1848,¹⁶⁵ he had received an invitation from the Democrats at Stamping Grounds in Scott County, to make an address on the coming presidential and state elections.¹⁶⁶ Shortly afterwards there began a series of special invitations to speak at barbecues held for the returning soldiers of the Mexican War.¹⁶⁷ Many of these were from counties which had furnished troops for his regiment and he was a favorite orator with them for these occasions.

164. Breckinridge Papers, 1848.

165. Certificate of Honorable Discharge as major from the United States Army dated July 21, 1848, at Louisville, Kentucky. Breckinridge Papers.

166. Invitation Committee to John C. Breckinridge, August 1, 1848, Breckinridge Papers.

167. Breckinridge Papers, 1848.

After a very effective campaign in Fayette County, Breckinridge carried this Lexington district for the Democratic party in 1849, and by the addition of a strong pro-slavery stand carried the whole eighth Congressional district in 1851, and again in 1853, against the strongest opposition candidates the Whigs could muster. By 1851 Kentucky had sent a Democratic Congressman to Washington from the same district that had been represented for so many years by Henry Clay himself. The Kentucky Yeoman of August 12, 1853, declared, with an element of truth, that the election of Breckinridge showed that "the great heart of Kentucky is democratic."¹⁶⁸

168. Kentucky Yeoman, August 12, 1853, requoted from C. Kerr, Kentucky History, II, 844.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I Manuscript Collections

The John J. Crittenden Papers, Library of Congress, contain much of the material about this period in Kentucky history upon which this paper is based. This collection, comprising twenty-eight volumes, is fullest in the period just prior to the Civil War and contains letters which were collected by the daughter of Crittenden, Mrs. Chapman Coleman, shortly after his death. Among these letters are those both from and to Henry Clay, Humphrey Marshall, Orlando Brown, Robert P. Letcher, Zachary Taylor, Reverdy Johnson, Leslie Coombs, Winfred Scott, John M. Clayton, Joseph R. Underwood, and many others both within and without Kentucky. The Breckinridge Family Papers, also in the Library of Congress, have a much greater range in both time and interests than the Crittenden Papers, since the collection is that of a family which produced many men of political significance between 1760 and 1805, the range of the manuscript. Robert J. Breckinridge was a minister as well as superintendent of public instruction for Kentucky and much of political significance is closely tied with those interests in his correspondence. Another useful collection of twelve volumes which has the main bulk of its material concentrated in the years 1849-1850 is the John M. Clayton Collection, Library of Congress. There are letters included in this collection from John J. Crittenden, Henry Clay, Leslie Coombs, and other Kentucky Whigs during the time he was Secretary of State.

In addition to the Henry Clay Papers, there are numerous letters from Clay scattered throughout the many manuscript collections in the Library of Congress, including the three collections above. The

Willie Mangum Collection, in private possession, is comparable to the Crittenden Papers in both scope and type although the value for Kentucky is considerably less. This collection is now held by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks of Washington, D.C. The Van Buren Collection, Library of Congress, seventy-two volumes, has a partial calendar published and is useful for a broader picture of the period from a Democratic standpoint. The Underwood Papers, Kentucky Library, Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green, Kentucky, contains several hundred uncataloged letters both from and to Joseph R. Underwood, who was serving his term as Senator from Kentucky during this time.

II Newspapers and Periodicals of the Period

The accepted Whig organ nationally during these years was the Daily National Intelligencer (Washington, D.C., 1830-1861). This paper circulated in the South and was read by leading Whig politicians in Kentucky. Closer at home, the Louisville Journal (1830-1868) was of great influence upon the Whig party in western Kentucky, through its capable editor, George Prentice. In the eastern part of the state, the Frankfort Commonwealth (1833-1860) was a powerful Whig paper as well as the Lexington Observer and Reporter (1850-1860).

To counterbalance these somewhat, there are the Daily Globe (1851-1845) and the Washington Union (1846-1858) both Democratic papers published in Washington, D.C. In Kentucky, the leading Democratic papers were the Louisville Democrat (1843-1860) and the Kentucky Yeoman (Frankfort, 1840-1872).

Hiles' National Register (Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, 1811-1849) is good for excerpts of the various local journals in Kentucky. It reports fully upon political conventions, and contains letters and speeches of interest. In addition to this weekly, there was also a Whig monthly organ, the American Whig Review (New York, 1845-1852) which contains biographical sketches of leading Whigs, and articles and comments from a Whig point of view. The Whig Almanac and United States Register (New York, 1838-1855) was published annually and gives detailed election returns from many states, by counties, and has as well many articles showing contemporary Whig opinion.

III Government Documents

One of the indispensable sources for political opinion as verbally and publicly expressed is the Congressional Globe (Washington, 1834-1873) which contains debates and proceedings of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States. To be used in combination with this source are the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States (1830-1860) which show official statements, notes, rules, bills, and messages of the Presidents, and the Committee Reports. Useful also are the Senate and House Executive Documents of the period containing reports to both houses from the Executive departments.

IV Biographies and Memoirs

Carl Schurz, Life of Henry Clay (2 vols., Boston, 1887) is still the standard work for the life of Clay after the 1812 period, but

Glynden G. Van Deusen's The Life of Henry Clay (Boston, 1937) is somewhat later and of some value. However, Calvin Colton's Works of Henry Clay (10 vols., New York, 1904) is of more use for a close study of a short period in that it is a collection of Clay's letters and speeches. This work has been seriously impaired in its usefulness by a somewhat careful editing by Mr. Colton to remove any passages derogatory to Clay, but is still a tremendous source of information.

Another collection of letters and speeches is that of Mrs. Chapman Coleman, The Life of John J. Crittenden (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1871). Mrs. Coleman, a daughter of Crittenden, has also done a careful job of deleting many interesting letters from the voluminous Crittenden correspondence.

Two biographical works of recent years concerned with the life of President Taylor are Holman Hamilton's Zachary Taylor (Indianapolis, New York, 1941) which deals with that period of his life up to 1847, and Brainerd Dyer's Zachary Taylor (Baton Rouge, 1946) which devotes several chapters to a re-evaluation of Taylor as President and gives some interesting sidelights upon his association with his cabinet officials. Dyer blames the weakness of the Taylor regime partly upon Crittenden because he refused to take an active part in the cabinet. He assigns Crittenden the leading role in making Taylor President.

Cassius M. Clay's Cassius Marcellus Clay, Life and Memoirs, Writings and Speeches (Cincinnati, 1886) shows an intimate picture of

one of the most colorful figures in Kentucky politics during this period. Abolitionist, editor of a liberal newspaper in the heart of the Bluegrass, he was constantly the central figure in political turmoil. Another Kentucky figure which left its impress upon the Whig party in Kentucky was Judge George Robertson. His George Robertson's Scrapbook (Lexington, 1855) is a collection of anecdotes, speeches, and pamphlets of the times.

V Monographs, Essays, Special Background Material

Allan Nevins' Ordeal of the Union (2 vols., New York, 1947) is a good survey of the period from 1846 to 1857. The first volume, which includes the years 1847-1852, shows the political and cultural themes of these years as indications of a strengthening of the national bonds against the resistance of regional interests. A more specialized study, political practically to the exclusion of social and economic facets is that of Arthur O. Cole, The Whig Party in the South (Washington, 1913). This prize essay of the American Historical Association uses much of the manuscript material available for the subject and gives much attention to the Kentucky Whigs. There are valuable maps in the back of this book showing Whig voting in the South. For further maps showing soil areas, general geological regions and climatic conditions, in addition to political maps, a useful work is Charles O. Paullin, Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States (Washington and New York, 1932). Another general treatment of the period 1850-1860 is George F. Hilton's The Eve of Conflict (Boston, 1934). Ulrich B. Phillips' The Course of the South to Secession: an Interpretation (New York, 1939)

emphasizes the maintenance of white supremacy as a continuous political principle in the South and his essay, "The Southern Whigs 1834-1854," in Essays in American History Dedicated to Frederick Jackson Turner (New York, 1910), pp. 203-229, shows the many gradations within both the major political parties but maintains that the Whigs were the silk stocking class.

Several rather short articles which treat this period in Kentucky and the surrounding states are S. Merton Coulter's "The Downfall of the Whig Party in Kentucky," Kentucky State Historical Society Register, vol. 23 (1925), pp. 169-174, Anoda R. King, "The Last Years of the Whig Party in Illinois 1847-1856," Illinois State Historical Society Transactions (1925), pp. 103-154, and St. George L. Sioussat, "Tennessee and National Political Parties, 1850-1860," American Historical Association Reports (1914), I, 248-258.

A general social and cultural background for these years in Kentucky may be obtained from Francis G. Davenport, Ante-bellum Kentucky, a Social History, 1800-1860 (Oxford, Ohio, 1943). In this book the life of both rural and urban communities is portrayed and there are sections devoted to education, law, architecture, and literature. The crudities of Kentucky life at this time are somewhat glossed over. A somewhat more specialized study of agrarian conditions, is that of John W. Coleman, Slavery Times in Kentucky (Chapel Hill, 1940), in which he places the emphasis upon the farm rather than the plantation type of agriculture in Kentucky. The ~~drastic~~ slavery incidents are overplayed.

Another treatment of the slavery problem is that of Asa E. Martin, The Anti-Slavery Movement in Kentucky Prior to 1850 (Louisville, 1918) in which the protest to slavery in Kentucky is shown prior to the constitutional convention of 1849.

Connected with the social and cultural history of the times, there are two general books of interest for the entire South which also show the integral connection of slavery with all phases of thought and enterprise: Clement Eaton's Freedom of Thought in the Old South (Durham, North Carolina, 1940) and Ulrich B. Phillips' Life and Labor in the Old South (Boston, 1929).

For the revision of the constitution of Kentucky there are several special sources. Benjamin P. Poore, The Federal and State Constitutions (Washington, 1878) gives the complete constitutions for 1799 and 1850. The Journal and Proceedings of the Convention of the State of Kentucky (Frankfort, 1849) and the Report of the Debates and Proceedings of the Convention for the Revision of the Constitution (Frankfort, 1849) give the speeches and votes throughout this convention and together they are a splendid index to Kentucky politics.

Several miscellaneous background sources are George R. Ponge, Henry Clay and the Whig Party (Chapel Hill, 1936) which is especially centered on the campaign of 1844, Justin H. Smith, Annexation of Texas (New York, 1919), Lee L. Robinson, Kentucky in Washington (Louisville, 1928) William H. Townsend, Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town (Indianapolis, 1929) Alexander Lipscomb, Commercial History of the Southern States (Louisville, 1903), and Victor S. Clark, History of Manufactures in the United States 1607-1860 (Washington, D.C., 1916).

VI Kentucky Histories

The Kentucky History which is still the bible for the chronology of early events and for biographical sketches is Richard H. Collins' History of Kentucky (2 vols., Covington, Ky., 1874). There is no attempt at interpretation by this compiler of facts as there is in the later account of Zach F. Smith, History of Kentucky (Louisville, 1882). Smith was an early state superintendent of public education. Thomas D. Clark's A History of Kentucky (New York, 1937) is both a social and political history but the material for this period is not particularly helpful. By far the best interpretative work is that edited by Charles Kerr, History of Kentucky (5 vols., Chicago and New York, 1922), by William E. Connelly and E. Merton Coulter.

VII General Histories

Of the many general histories, John B. McMaster's A History of the People of the United States (8 vols., New York, 1914) and J.A.C. Chandler's The South in the Building of the Nation (12 vols., Richmond, 1909) are careful studies. In the American Nation; a History series edited by Albert B. Hart, there are two pertinent volumes. One by George P. Garrison, Westward Extension 1841-1850 (New York and London, 1906) is good for the Texas boundary question, the Wilmot Proviso, and the split of parties, and another by Theodore C. Smith, Parties and Slavery 1850-1859 (New York and London, 1906) deals with Union sentiment in the South and treats party readjustment. For a broad economic interpretation of this period, William E. Dodd's Expansion and Conflict (Boston, 1915) volume three of the Riverside History of the United States series, of which he is the editor, points the upheavals of this time toward the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the coming Civil War.