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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Army! The Heroes of Palo Alto, Rosaca de la Palma, Monterey, Vera Cruz, Buena Vista, Sacramento and Cerro Gordo—'tis but a feeble tribute to their gallant deeds to say, in every fight they conquered and crowned their country with immortal glory.1

Virginia's banner was heaped with glory as her sons marched forth to the dusty, disease ridden battlefields in Mexico in the year 1846. Such heroes as Taylor, Scott, Garland, Payne, Lee and others won fame and recognition for their gallantry and military ability. Their deeds have been the theme of numerous histories. There is another story of the Mexican War — and one not so well known — of the Virginians who stayed at home to praise or curse the war and of those who answered the country's call to glory, only to spend their energy, and in some cases their lives, in the dull routine of patrol duty.

How did Virginia respond to the War? What were her attitudes and what were her contributions? This is our story!

1. Toast drunk at a Fourth of July Celebration in Richmond. Richmond Enquirer, July 8, 1847.
I. VIRGINIA IN THE 1840's

Mexico was far removed from the minds of most Virginians in the spring of 1846. Those who were interested in foreign matters were concerned over the Oregon dispute with Great Britain. War seemed imminent, and Oregon was the number one news item all spring.

Virginians had zero personal and real problems to contemplate. The 800,000 whites with their 450,000 slaves were witnessing a continued decline in national status and economic well-being. Lands were valued at over $200,000,000 in 1850 but tobacco production had fallen 24.66% and cotton 54.8% in the decade of the 'Forties. The 1.2% increase in hay production and the 8.9% increase in hopes hardly offset this decline. During the war years, 1846-1848, exports varied from $3 million dollars to 5½ million dollars. Imports ranged from $200,000 to $380,000.

2. By the 1840 census there were 740,958 whites, 49,852 free Negroes, and 443,987 slaves. In 1850 the figures were 895,304 whites, 53,829 free Negroes, and 472,528 slaves, making a population increase of only 14.6% for the decade. Statistical Gazetteer of the State of Virginia (Richmond, 1855), p. 61.


5. Ibid., p. 95.
As a result of the decadence of the plantation system and the general economic decline, strict class lines were not drawn in Virginia politics. While in most Southern states, the Whig party was composed of the prosperous, conservative planters, in Virginia it contained the additional rallying points of local transportation needs and states'-rights.

This transitional decade witnessed growing passion and concern over that "peculiar institution." In measure with Northern abolitionist attacks, the South rallied in the defense of its property. The sectional blight spread to all phases of life, reaching a portentous height in the schism within the Baptist and Methodist Churches in 1844-45. These Southern Churches turned to justification and support of slavery, while the Presbyterians and Episcopalians accepted the "arist-o-slay society." The clergy were henceforth in "full sympathy with the dominant economic interests of their time."

As the summer season approached, it was announced that white silk parasols decorated with large delicate geraniums would be the height of fashion for the ladies.

---

9. Richmond Enquirer, June 3, 1846.
the gentry prepared to visit the "watering places" and activities moved on at a "southerly" pace, a clash occurred in the region of the disputed Texas boundary between General Taylor's troops and Arista's Mexican forces near Matamoros. The war which Mexico threatened in retaliation for the annexation of Texas had begun.

II. VIRGINIA AND THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS

The annexation of Texas had been a lively issue in Virginia. When Van Buren came out opposed to immediate annexation, the Democracy of Virginia deserted him for a "Texas man." The dean of Virginia Democracy, Thomas Ritchie, used his paper the Richmond Enquirer as a campaign organ for Polk and the annexation of Texas.

Most of the Whigs opposed annexation. One line of their reasoning was that the annexation of Texas would bring added competition which would accelerate the decline of land prices and population in the old states. Ritchie's reply was that this was going to happen anyway and Texas would be much less trouble as part of the United States than as a

---

12. Ibid., p. 243, and Dodd, op. cit., p. 129.
British colony.

The most vehement opposition came from one of Virginia's sincere nationalists, John Minor Botts. With the vision and voice of a prophet Botts declared:

If accomplished [the annexation of Texas] that it will lead to the disturbance of our harmony, the distraction of our people, and sooner or later to the dismemberment of this government, I have no shadow of doubt. 14

The Democrats and Folk swept the State. James Lyons led the "Texas Whigs" of eastern Virginia into the Democratic ranks to increase the margin of victory. John Pendleton was dubbed the "Lone Star" because he was the only Whig returned to the House of Representatives. The Democrats also acquired a majority in the State Legislature.

Congress took action before these new delegates could be seated. The Virginians in the Twenty-eighth Congress lacked unity in the debates over the annexation resolution. The Democrats wanted Texas but they disagreed as to the method for acquisition. Thomas H. Bayly said that Congress could admit Texas under the war power because this would eliminate the possibility of another border with a colony of Great Britain which might prevent a war with that nation. Furthermore since

Congress could admit States, it could take all "initiatory steps as may be necessary, preparatory to the admission of a new State..." His colleague, George C. Dromgoole stood opposed to the "territorial annexation of Texas to the United States by act of Congress." He favored the immediate admission of Texas as a State. One of the eight Whig votes which helped pass the resolution belonged to the "Texas Whig," Willoughby Newton of Virginia.

In the Senate, the Virginia opinion was less divided and less favorable to the immediate annexation of Texas. William S. Archer, Whig, opposed the proposed method of annexation by joint resolution. He said that someday Virginia would be proud that she had two Senators who "lifted a determined though unavailing voice against this blow of parricide, struck at the Constitution." William G. Rives, who had become a Whig in order to win the Senatorial election in 1841, also opposed annexation as unconstitutional. In addition he adhered to the theory that annexation would deal a dis-

astrous blow to the slaveholding interests of Virginia.

Such opposition was not enough to stop the eager pulse of the nation as she began to experience the first sensations of manifest destiny. The Texas resolution squeezed through the Senate by a margin of two votes. President Tyler and his Secretary of State, John C. Calhoun, impatiently put the final wheels into motion for the consummation of annexation. Late in March, 1845, Calhoun wrote to his loyal Virginia protégé, Robert M. T. Hunter, that the Texas affair was settled. "Our friends, by taking the ground firmly can control Virginia, and that will the administration."

The Calhoun faction of the Democratic Party was unable to gain immediate control in Virginia and just how far Virginia controlled the Administration is purely a matter of speculation. Folk turned out to have a mind of his own, and not one that was too easily controlled by others. The Administration Democrats did however receive the smile of the Folk regime. Mr. Ritchie was imposed upon to take over the official government organ in Washington. The Globe, which formerly served this purpose, had remained too loyal to Van Buren and too cool to Texas, and therefore it was replaced by the Union

and Ritchie. While to all ostensible purposes this was a promotion for the editor and a reward for the Democrat, in the long run it spelled the ruin of Ritchie's prestige and the end of his domination of Virginia affairs. Another Virginian who received the official nod was John Y. Mason, who became Polk's Secretary of the Navy.

The focus of the national spotlight centered on the nation's three greatest figures: John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, and Henry Clay. With these stars in the leading roles, the remainder of the cast had little chance to steal the show. Two Virginians, James M. Mason and Robert M. T. Hunter, formed a valuable part of Calhoun's coterie and as such performed well in their supporting roles. They demanded the respect of their generation and with others in the supporting cast, invite the historical inquiry of today.

This study covers the attitudes of Virginians in Congress, in the General Assembly, in the press, and in the election of 1847; and the contributions of Virginians in the Virginia Volunteer Regiment, the Regular Army, and the Ton Regiments.


CHAPTER II

VIRGINIA OPINIONS IN CONGRESS

As the composition of Virginia's Congressional membership changed so did her vocal support of the war. The Democratically controlled Twenty-ninth Congress acquiesced in most of the recommendations of the chief-executive. Any deviation from Administration policy was greeted with a storm of florid invective. The opposition roared and groaned but was out-voted on most major issues. The spectacle presented by the Thirtieth Congress was slightly different. The highly contested elections of 1847 returned Whig control to the House. Virginia's delegation included six Whigs and nine Democrats. The major result of this change was to increase the amount of vituperous oratory. Debate on any subject even remotely connected with the war was considered sufficient justification for a lengthy exposition of its causes and background.

After the summer of 1846, Congressional orators had a more fascinating topic than the mere justification or condemnation of "Mr. Polk's war." The shadow of a time bomb passed over Congress! Mr. Wilmot made known its portentous content
by the introduction of a proviso prohibiting slavery in any territory gained as a result of the war. Congressional and national reaction were immediate. Minutes, hours, and days ticked away as Congress debated. Should territory be acquired from Mexico? If so, should it be open or closed to slavery? Thus while the bomb was still in Mexican hands it caused explosions which rent the national bonds and strengthened the sectional tensions. The war ended, the territory was acquired, and the question of its disposition was left to the holocaust of 1861.

This chapter traces the varying Virginia attitudes in Congress on the vital questions of the war and the acquisition of territory.

I. THE TWENTY-NINETH CONGRESS

First Session

Virginia members. In the Twenty-ninth Congress, the Democrats filled fourteen seats to the one "Lone Star" Whig. Included in this delegation were some of the most prominent Virginians of the day. One such member was Robert M. T. Hunter of Lloyds, former Speaker of the House and soon to be elected to the Senate. Another and perhaps more colorful

veteran was George C. Dromgoole. Elected to the House in 1835, Dromgoole had been one of the committee which proposed the "Gag rule." Though his love of strong drink occasioned his frequent absence from official duties, he was constantly reelected by the voters. Another colorful figure was Thomas N. Bayly of Accomac. He had been elected to the House upon the resignation of his cousin Henry A. Wise in 1844. A former judge and general in the Virginia militia, Bayly was imbued with the impatience common to his generation. An exchange in the House with Garrett Davis of Kentucky would have resulted in a duel if friends and the police had not taken over.

The delegation also included former Virginia Governor James McDowell of Lexington. Elected to fill the vacancy left by the death of his brother-in-law William Taylor, McDowell, a "Texas man," strongly supported the Administration. By his side was Joseph Johnson, soon to be the first popularly

elected Governor of Virginia. This self-educated western Virginian made no speeches of any note during his one term in Congress.

The two terms of the lone Whig, John S. Pendleton, were just an interlude in his longer career in the diplomatic field. George Hopkins of Abingdon was serving his last term before his departure as charge d'affaires to Portugal. Other members were: William G. Brown of Preston County, who later served as a Unionist in the Thirty-seventh Congress; Augustus A. Chapman, a brigadier general of the state militia in the Civil War; James A. Seddon of Goochland, a Calhoun Democrat, better known for his activities as Confederate Secretary of War; Archibald Atkinson of Smithfield; Henry Bedinger of Charlestown; Edmund W. Hubbard of Curdsville; Shelton F. Leake of Charlottesville; and William M. Tredway of Danville.

The Senatorial seats were filled by William S. Archer, Whig, who had been active in political affairs since 1812; and Isaac S. Pennybacker, Democrat, elected by the Virginia Assembly of 1845-46 as Rice's successor. Both these men were replaced early in 1847. Robert M. T. Hunter was elected as Archer's successor and James M. Mason of Winchester was selected to fill

31. Ibid., p. 1666. 32. Ibid., p. 1329.
33. Ibid., p. 902. 34. Ibid., p. 965.
35. Ibid., p. 1792.
the vacancy occasioned by Pennybacker's death.

Opinions and votes. A war over the annexation of Texas was not generally expected. Mexico was thought to be too decadent and feeble to provoke such an event. Senator Archer approved the military and naval precautions taken by the government. He agreed with the President "that the appearance of our land and naval forces on the borders of Mexico" would prevent her "from either declaring war or invading Texas."

Polk ordered Taylor to the Rio Grande in January, 1846; in March the Mexican government refused finally to receive our Minister, Mr. Slidell; and in April the first clash of arms occurred. The President's Message to Congress, May 11, 1846, stated the wrongs suffered by the United States at Mexican hands and then went on to say:

As war exists, and, notwithstanding all our efforts to avoid it, exists by the act of Mexico herself, we are called upon, by every consideration of duty and patriotism, to vindicate, with decision, the honor, the rights, and the interests of our country.

The prompt action of Congress was then requested for placing at the disposal of the Executive the means of proce-


outing the war.

The House immediately resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the message. There was no objection to voting the necessary men and supplies to defend our borders. There was hesitancy, however, to declare war.

The preamble of the proposed bill stated: "Whereas, by the act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States: ..." Judge Bayly said this was a declaration of war and he had not understood the President's message as calling for such action. It was not yet known that the invasion of the United States was made with the sanction of the Mexican government. Suppose it was an unauthorized border clash? Like others who held this view, Bayly voted for the bill rather than withhold necessary men and supplies from the army which was believed to be greatly out-numbered. When the vote was taken, there were only 14 nays to the 174 yeas, which included the affirmative votes of the fourteen Virginians present.

Certain Senators also wanted to strike out the preamble, urging delay in declaring war. Senator Archer maintained that the existence of hostilities did not place the

41. No vote was recorded for Shelton F. Leake.
United States in a state of war. A war de facto existed, yes, but it would take Congressional action to make it de jure. The Senate should delay action until such time as it could be ascertained whether or not war should be declared.

He was followed by Senator Pennybacker who maintained that war did exist and a declaration of its existence was desirable in order "that the people might all know their position, that neutral nations might conduct themselves suitably," and that there should be a just reason for voting the necessary supplies.

Three votes were taken on a motion to strike out the war provision of the preamble changing it to an authorization to enable the government "to repel the invasion." On all three votes Senator Archer voted in the affirmative and Pennybacker in the negative. With the failure of this motion the final vote was taken on the bill. It passed - 40 yeas to 2 nays - with both Archer and Pennybacker in the yea column. Of the three Senators who did not vote, one was John C. Calhoun, who had also pleaded for time to consider the measure.

The President was authorized to call into the service of the United States up to 50,000 volunteers to serve twelve months after arrival at the place of rendezvous. The volun-

43. Ibid.
44. Ibid., p. 803.
troops were to provide their own clothing; were to receive the same pay and allowances as the regular soldiers; were to be equipped by the Government; and were to be reimbursed for the cost of their subsistence to the place of rendezvous. To cover the expenses of the war, $10,000,000 was appropriated.

Whig denunciations of the war as unjust and of the President as its progenitor by virtue of his ordering troops into the disputed territory, were instantaneous. On May 19, Dromgoole came to Polk's defense with a rebuttal of their arguments. Texas had established her boundary by a successful revolution. Even if it could be proven that this territory still belonged to Mexico, the President would have performed an illegal and unconstitutional act but not an act of war. According to Dromgoole, denunciations of the President would only serve to bring his good conduct to the attention of the people. Far more serious, however, were the denunciations of the war as unjust and unholy. This removed from the army the moral support it needed at a moment of peril. Dromgoole urged a vigorous prosecution of the war to redress old American claims; to uphold the honor of the Nation; and to get indemnity for the cost of the war.

A supplemental war bill was passed by the House, June 16, and agreed to by the Senate the next day. This

---

45. Ibid., p. 604. 46. Ibid., pp. 841-842. 47. Fennybacker voted for the bill and Archer opposed it. The final vote was 32 yeas to 19 nays. Ibid., p. 985.
bill authorized the creation of one major general and four
brigadier generals in addition to the present military es-
tablishment, the total number to be reduced at the end of the
war to one major general and two brigadier generals. The
President was given the authority to limit the number of
privates in volunteer companies to between sixty-four and one
hundred men. In addition, the bill authorized a monthly
clothing allowance of $3.50 for each non-commissioned officer,
musician, and private and a subsistence allowance of 50c
daily for every twenty miles by the most direct route from
their homes to the points of rendezvous, and from the place
of discharge back to their homes.

The President's next request to Congress asked for
two-million dollars to be used in negotiating with Mexico.
Polk's intrigue to allow the return of Santa Anna, the exiled
Mexican President, to Mexico was based on an agreement that
Santa Anna would immediately sue for peace and thus put a
speedy end to the fighting. In order to make this coup d'état
successful, Santa Anna would have to be enabled to pay the
Mexican troops, therefore Polk requested that two-million
dollars be put under his control to be paid immediately on the
Mexican ratification of a suitable treaty. His message to
Congress stated that the settlement of a lasting boundary
would be essential to the establishment of peace. His justi-

48. Ibid., pp. 924-925.
fication of the request was premised on the probability that the Mexican Government might be unable to wait for the whole payment until such time as the Senate might ratify the treaty and the House make the necessary appropriations.

On motion of Dorman, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole. Then followed such a confusion of debate over points of order as to completely baffle the Speaker and the House. That such affairs should mark the beginning of one of the tragic days of the decade was perhaps an evil omen. In the evening session a bill was passed in conformity with the President's request. It was to this bill that Mr. Wilmot of Pennsylvania added his famous amendment.

Provided, That, as an express and fundamental condition to the acquisition of any territory from the Republic of Mexico by the United States, by virtue of any treaty which may be negotiated between them, and to the use by the Executive of the moneys herein appropriated, neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of said territory, except for crime, whereof the party shall first be duly convicted.

The amendment was acceded to by 83 ayes to 64 noes and the bill as amended was accepted by 85 yeas to 79 nays. Virginia's representatives, including Pendleton, voted against

49. Message from the President, August 8, 1846, Ibid., p. 1211; Smith, op. cit., I, 201-203; and Polk, op. cit., II, 55-58. Prior to submitting the request, the President consulted Archer and Cass to ascertain whether or not the bill could get through Congress without making a party question of it.


51. Ibid.
the bill. Had the four Virginians who were apparently absent recorded their votes, the majority by which the bill was passed would have been cut to two. Party lines were discarded for sectional lines and the disaster of the future was foreshadowed. The session ended without Senate passage of the bill and the country was given a temporary respite in preparation for the battles to come.

Second Session

The tone of party strife was set by the President's message. He reviewed the causes of the war and its progress because of the allegations which had been made to the effect that the war was "unjust and unnecessary," and one of aggression on the part of the United States.

Such erroneous views, though entertained by but a few, have been widely and extensively circulated, not only at home, but have been spread throughout Mexico and the whole world. A more effectual means could not have been devised to encourage the enemy and protract the war than to advocate and adhere to their cause, and thus give them aid and comfort. 

The accusation of aiding and comforting the enemy was picked up by Democrats in Congress, in the press, and elsewhere to be used as a club to cow opposition. Bayly now came forward with a defence of the President on the four major accusations made against him. To the charge that Mexico had

52. No vote was recorded for Brown, Seddon, Chapman or Tredway. Ibid., p. 1218.
53. Richmond Enquirer, December 11, 1846.
agreed to treat with the United States only on the boundary dispute and not on all points of dispute as were the instructions to Slidell; Jayly maintained that the Mexican offer to treat "the present dispute" included all questions in dispute. Secondly, he denied that marching the troops to the Rio Grande started the war. Mexico decided on war before the troops were dispatched, and furthermore Mexico herself had never held such a contention. In reply to the accusation that the President was guilty of treason for allowing the return of Santa Anna to Mexico, Jayly said the President could not have stopped his return if he had so desired. Besides all nations involved in war do their utmost to bestir internal dissensions in the ranks of their foe and on this ground the President's action was justifiable. On the fourth point, that the formation of temporary governments in occupied areas was a usurpation of power, Jayly quoted at length from Wheaton and other works on international law to prove that the United States possessed not only the right but also the duty to provide government for conquered areas.

On the last point, Soddon had previously taken pains to prove that as commander-in-chief, the President had the right and duty to maintain law and order and render justice. Archer's satisfaction with the President's course in this

---

55. Ibid., pp. 23-26.
matter was not determined until the President's views were fully known. He then paid a friendly call on the chief-executive to express approbation of his conduct.

The new year brought no reprieve from party strife and in addition the sectional tension was heated to a new boiling point. In the Senate discussions over making regular army enlistments more attractive, Crittenden urged a vigorous prosecution of the war. Archer said he would not go so far as to urge vigorous prosecution at this time for fear that upon reflection he might have cause to regret his action. His thinking no doubt was following that of other Southern Whigs and Calhoun Democrats, who feared the addition of Mexican territory would result in a catastrophe and were therefore in favor of holding a defensive line sufficient to protect our borders.

Meanwhile in the House, Bedinger launched a bitter attack on the anti-war party. He poured a torrent of abuse on all who called the war unjust and then advocated its vigorous prosecution. Bedinger said that the time was not appropriate for the discussion of slavery but he predicted

56. Diary entry December 23, 1846, Polk, op. cit., II, 228.
57. Benton recommended making regular army enlistments for the war or for five years and paying a bounty on enlistment. The authorized strength of the army was over 16,000 but actual strength was about 5,000 less than that number. Congressional Globe, 29th. Cong., 2d Sess., pp., 130-132. For details of the bill see below p. 77.
58. Ibid., and Polk, op. cit., II, 115.
that the time was coming and he feared that the issue would
"shake this Union to its firm foundations."

Whether it was the appropriate time to discuss slavery
or not, it came more pointedly into the limelight as debate
on the Three Million Dollar bill and the Wilmot Proviso pro-
ceeded. Mr. Seddon argued that since the North was preach-
ing equality of the races they should not want to keep Negroes
out of the territories. In addition, if the territory should
be used for those who fought the battles then surely there
must be a large portion reserved for the slave-holders. Would
not this agitation to prohibit slaves in the territory have a
disastrous effect on those brave Southern men who were now
defending the Nation's honor? Such agitation, according to
Mr. Seddon, encouraged the enemy, depressed friends, consti-
tuted moral treason, and gave aid and comfort to Mexico.

We of the South - I say it plainly and firmly - never can
and never will submit to such a principle.... The common
acquisitions of the blood and treasure of the Union must
be open and free to the slaveholder, with his property
and domestic institutions, as to the northern man, with
his property and his familiar household privileges.61

Judge Bayly's arguments on the constitutionality of
the Wilmot Proviso were largely the same as those adopted by

59. Congressional Globe Appendix, 29th. Cong., 2d
60. The Three Million Dollar bill was a revised
version of the Two Million Dollar bill which had been re-
quested the preceding August.
61. Congressional Globe Appendix, op. cit., pp. 77-
78. Speech in the House, January 7, 1847.
the pro-slavery element at that time. First, the Constitution gave Congress no power to legislate for the territories. When it was intended that Congress should legislate it was specifically stated in the Constitution, i.e. powers over the seat of the government. Second, Congressional veto of territorial constitutions was not the same thing as active legislation. Why prohibit slavery when it was universally recognized that it could be established as soon as the territory became a state? Third, the Ordinance of 1787 which prohibited slavery in the Northwest Territory was "an illegal usurpation of power by the Congress" as the Articles of Confederation did not give them the power to pass it. Fourth, the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was an attempt at fundamental territorial legislation by Congress. But, said Bayly, "the strict constructionists never admitted the right of Congress to do so." That Compromise had been acquiesced in only because of the circumstances of its origin and to prevent further agitation of the subject. Its obligation was moral rather than legal. That the South remained willing to acquiesce in it was evidenced by its extension to Texas only two years previously. Prohibition of slavery in all the territories would not only break faith with the Missouri Compromise, but would also break faith with the Constitution. The Constitution contemplated the admission of slave states by its provision for three-fifths representation of the unfree population. Since slavery would not go where it was unprofitable, it was unwise to agitate the
subject. The Union rests, continued Bayly, on the "basis of the most perfect equality among all its members; and whenever the Government of it is administered for the exclusive advantage of any portion of it, its days will be numbered." The issue was being pushed, he maintained, by the politicians who hoped "to pande to the prejudices" of the people for personal gain; by those who wanted to carve out more free than slave states in order to gain control of the whole Union; and by the abolition fanatics who were trying to encourage the slaves to run away.

Though Southerners might unite in opposition to the Wilmot Proviso, they were far from united on the war. Virginia's "Lone Star," Mr. Pendleton, gave his version of the national situation in February. He laid the blame for the whole war at the feet of the President and his party. The President needed a war to gain glory; he was stupid in the movement of troops; and he did not come to Congress for advice on declaring war but with a statement that "war exists." In reply to the complaint that the Whigs voted supplies and then condemned the war, Pendleton declared, the Democrats would be delighted if the Whigs failed to vote supplies. The war was more a war on the Whigs than on Mexico. This was evidenced in the fact that essential measures were made so odious that they

62. Ibid., p. 347.  63. Ibid., pp. 345-349.
must be voted against. The President asked for three million dollars. Then a prominent Democrat tackled on the Wilmet Proviso, making it impossible to fulfill the President’s request. As if this wasn’t bad enough, the hired press of the Democracy then condemned the Whigs for giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Yet with all this, the President could not get a bill through Congress without Whig votes, even though there was a Democratic majority. Pendleton could see nothing but "unmixed evil" to come out of the war. The only possible good would be that it could no longer be charged that the Whigs in the North were closer to the abolitionists than the Democrats.

The Three Million Dollar bill again passed the House with the Proviso attached. The Senate killed the Proviso and the House finally gave it’s assent to the bill in March. The President’s request for a lieutenant general as commander of all forces was killed by Congress after bitter denunciations of Polk for trying to take the military glory away from the Whig generals. The post was intended for the powerful Thomas H. Benton of Missouri, to conciliate the Van Buren wing of the party. It was also intended to take some of the thunder out of Scott’s political sails by placing him in a subordinate position. Neither of these ends satisfied the Whigs nor the Calhoun Democrats and the President’s wishes were therefore

64. Speech on Army Appropriation bill, February 22, 1847, Ibid., pp. 409-414.
It was during this session that the "Ritchie expulsion resolution" passed the Senate. Senate refusal to grant ten regiments requested by the President had occasioned a bitter article in the Union. Signed the "Vindicator," the article called the Senate another field of the Mexican conflict. Those Senators who voted against the ten regiments were dubbed cohorts of Santa Anna. The Senate bristled forth with righteous indignation. Ritchie, who was not responsible for the writing of the article, stood firmly behind his reporter. A resolution to exclude the editor from the Senate floor was introduced by Senator Yulee of Florida. Mason opposed the resolution as an infringement on the freedom of the press but the resolution passed by a vote of 27 to 21. In the affirmative were included Archer and of more significance to Virginia politics, John C. Calhoun.

At long last the session came to a halt and the political and sectional flames were allowed to cool until another Congress should again stir the coals.

II. THE THIRTIETH CONGRESS

First Session

Virginia members. There were nine new delegates from

65. Smith, op. cit., p. 75.
66. Richmond Enquirer, February 12, 13, 15, 16, 1847. For effect on the Virginia elections see below p. 51.
Virginia to the Thirtieth Congress. The hotly contested
elections of 1847 gave Mr. Pendleton five Whig associates.
The most prominent and undoubtedly the most controversial
addition was John Minor Botts. An opponent of the annexation
of Texas and of the acquisition of territory from Mexico, Botts
was made Chairman of the Committee of Military Affairs. The
other Whigs were: William B. Preston of Blacksburg, who was
to become Secretary of the Navy under Taylor; two future
unsuccessful gubernatorial candidates, Thomas S. Flournoy
of Halifax and William L. Coggin of Otterbridge; and
Andrew S. Fulton of Wytheville.

The new Democrats were: Richard E. Meade, replacing
the deceased George Bromgrew; Thomas S. Buck of Appomattox;
serving his first of six terms in Congress; Richard L. T.
Beale, later a brigadier general in the Civil War; and
Robert A. Thompson of Kanawha. The old faces which re-
appeared belonged to Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Brown, McDowell,
and Pendleton.

Opinions and votes. The curtain opened on the Thirti-
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Ninth Virginia Cavalry (Richmond: B. F. Johnson Co., 1899).
in the 23rd Congress with Scott in occupation of Mexico City and the United States Commissioner, Mr. Trist, in negotiations for peace. The plot for this session centered on the acquisition of territory.

The President's message informed Congress that the Commissioner had taken with him a projected treaty which would secure indemnity to the United States in the form of a cession of territory. Since Mexico possessed no other means of indemnification, refusal to accept territory would mean refusal of all indemnity. This would leave the country fighting a war "without purpose or definite object." Withdrawal from conquests to a defensive line, as had been suggested, would be degrading to the national honor. Instead, the war should be prosecuted "with increased energy and power" and additional forces should be recruited.

On the heels of this message, Mr. Botts offered a set of resolutions in the House. Among other things they stated: any war which has the acquisition of territory for its object is dangerous to the endurance of the Union; the war was brought on by the President and for that reason we have no just claim against Mexico; territorial indemnification would set a precedent for future wars; annexation of territory would bring on new sectional strife; and, it would be in the true interest

of the United States to withdraw its troops from the Mexican interior to the true boundary of Texas. Considering his position as Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, it is relieving to note that his last resolution called for the continuance of supplies to the army should Congress decide to further prosecute the war.

In January, a resolution of thanks to General Taylor was amended with the words: "In a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." The amendment was defeated in the Senate but the House passed it by a vote of 85 to 81 with Botta, Goggin, Preston and Fulton voting in the affirmative and Beale, Bedinger, Brown, Meade and McDowell in the negative.

Bedinger attempted a defense of the President later in the month, but he was taken to task by his colleague Mr. Goggin. Goggin was painfully concerned over the Santa Anna affair. Contrary to the President's plans, Santa Anna had not sued for peace but had prosecuted the war with the utmost vigor. Now that the carnage of Buena Vista, Cerro Gordo, etc., had occurred, Goggin said he imagined the President's musings to be:

Ah, he is, indeed, a cantie chiel,
And well in war can flaunt his banner;
Thousands brave will rue the hour
I gave our foe his Santa Anna.
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Goggin continued his abuse of the President for some minutes. He then declared he wouldn’t give a dollar for all of Mexico, her people, her customs, and her debts. All the United States needed was peace.

The acquisition of all of Mexico was in the air. R. M. T. Hunter made his first major speech as a Senator on the consequence of such an event. A close associate of the fiery John C. Calhoun, Hunter’s speech could well be an echo of the "master." He opposed the annexation and incorporation of all of Mexico on the grounds of her racial and intellectual inferiority and the disastrous effects it would have on the Union. Politically it would aggravate the tendency toward sectionalism and morally it would catapult the United States into a path of conquest which would bring the end of its free institutions. Hunter favored the annexation of the sparsely populated northern regions. Since Mexico had been unable to extinguish the Indian titles to this territory the United States should do so. The few Mexicans in the region would have little effect on the American people or government and since Americans were settling the region anyway, it would be better to take it now and avoid future conflicts.

Like the Senator from South Carolina, Hunter favored the "line plan" if the new Mexican government did not sue for immediate peace. The plan consisted of withdrawing our troops

82 Ibid., pp. 267-272.
to a certain defensive position in northern Mexico until such
time as Mexico should be willing to negotiate. The advantages
of this plan, according to Hunter, were: it would lessen the
costs and hazards of war; it would include more than ample
territory for indemnity; it would lessen our involvement with
the Mexican people and government and allow them to straighten
out their internal affairs, thus leading to a peaceable settle­
ment; and it would lessen the increasing patronage of the
President.

Less than a month after Hunter's speech, the President
sent to the Senate the treaty negotiated at Guadalupe Hidalgo.
The provisions of the treaty were: a cessation of hostilities
and the resumption of peace; the evacuation of Mexico as soon
as possible with prompt restoration of all captured Mexican
public property; a definition of the boundary line; a
grant of privileges to nationals of both countries in the use
of the Gulf of California, and the Colorado, Rio Grande and

83. Congressional Globe Appendix, 30th. Cong., 1st
Sess., pp. 272-278.
84. U. S. Congress, Senate, The Treaty between the
United States and Mexico, Senate Proceedings, etc., Exec. Doc.
85. "Article V. The boundary line shall commence in
the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the
mouth of the Rio Grande, ... from thence up the middle of that
river, following the deepest channel ... to the point where it
strikes the Southern boundary of New Mexico ... to its western
termination; thence northward, along the western line of New
Mexico, until it intersects with the first branch of the River
Gila ... thence across the Rio Colorado, following the division
line between upper and Lower California, to the Pacific ocean."
Gila Rivers; a guarantee of the religious and property rights of Mexicans who should elect to remain within the territory ceded to the United States; a confirmation of Mexican land grants; an agreement on the part of the United States to prevent as far as possible, Indian incursions into Mexico, to prohibit the purchase of Mexicans and Mexican goods stolen by the Indians, and to prohibit the sale of firearms to the Indians; the payment by the United States of fifteen million dollars for the boundary adjustment and the assumption of American claims against Mexico to the total of not more than three and one-quarter million dollars; a renewal of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation of April 5, 1831; and a provision calling for ratification within four months.

The Senate struck out articles pertaining to: land grants in Texas; the prohibition of the sale of firearms and ammunition to Indians; and a secret and additional article which extended the time of ratification to eight months. A few minor amendments were made, largely regarding phraseology and the method of payment of money by the United States.

An amendment proposed by Senator Baldwin that "there

86. Vote to strike out, 33 years to 19 nays, Hunter and Mason in the affirmative. Ibid., pp. 9-11.
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shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the territories hereby ceded, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall be duly convicted," was defeated by 38 nays to 15 years. Senator Crittenden offered a resolution to reconsider the Treaty and limit our acquisitions to Texas and the bay and harbor of San Francisco with a proportionate reduction of the amount to be paid by the United States. This resolution was defeated by 30 nays to 18 years, with Hunter and Mason voting in the negative. The final vote on the Treaty as amended was 36 years including Hunter and Mason, to 14 nays. This on March 9, 1848, the Senate emerged with the Treaty ratified.

In order to promote Mexican ratification, the Senate passed an authorization for an additional ten regiments of troops. Mexican will to resist had been broken and the Treaty was duly ratified, bringing an end to this unhappy embroilment.

The curtain fell on the last act of the war but the critics continued to harass the "producer." Botts published a statement he had prepared before the war ended for presentation to the Committee on Military Affairs. He denounced the war, the
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President, and the acquisition of territory. Going a step further than some critics, he even advocated making an example "of this war-like chief, and not permit him to retire from office without a vindication of the Constitution by articles of impeachment." 93

Though the war continued as a favorite topic with some Congressmen - partly with the fall presidential elections in view - the major issue and the one which was to dominate national affairs for the next decade was the regulation of the territories. We leave Congress and other historians with that problem and turn to another part of our story.

CHAPTER III

OPINIONS IN VIRGINIA ON THE WAR

The Democrats and "Texas Whigs" swept Virginia's Congressional representation almost solidly into the Democratic camp in 1844. The Virginia Legislature of 1846-47, however, reveals a fairly close balance between the Democrats and the Whigs. The next Virginia Legislature was evenly divided between Democrats and Whigs on a joint count of both Houses. With state-wide division of Whigs and Democrats so close, it was inevitable that the war was destined to play an important part in domestic politics. The sentiments expressed in Congress were echoed on the local level with the press vigorously participating in the bitter partisan controversies.

The newspaper record of local events is used extensively in this chapter for want of better sources. Two leading Virginia papers, the Richmond Whig and the Richmond Enquirer are taken as representative of the opposing views and reactions of the Whigs and Democrats respectively. A survey of legislative activity and attitudes precedes the general press comments and public expressions. This is followed by a limit-
ed study of the issues and results of the Congressional election of 1847.

I. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE WAR

Members. The state-wide distribution of Whigs and Democrats in the make-up of the Virginia House of Delegates of 1846-47 is shown on the map on page 37. In general the Whig strongholds were in the areas of contemplated or actual canal routes of the Potomac, James River, and Kanawha canals and the states-rights strongholds of the Accomac Peninsula, the Peninsula between the York and James Rivers and the region of the Dismal Swamp.

The Democrats had a majority of thirteen in the House of Delegates and eight in the Senate. This should have been a sufficient majority to assure Democratic control on all key issues. The split between the Administration Democrats and the Calhoun Democrats, however, gave the Whigs the opportunity to prevail by combination with one or the other faction.

The legislature of 1847-48, which was evenly divided between the two parties, was only slightly concerned with the war as an issue and therefore is allotted only minimum space.

94. These were called the constant areas of Whig strength in Simms, op. cit., p. 165, and Phillips, op. cit., p. 214.
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in this review.

William Smith, an ardent Democrat, was elected Governor of Virginia in 1846. An advocate of the annexation of Texas, Smith acted as vigorously as possible to meet the demands made on the State as a result of the war. Hampered by the existing restrictions on gubernatorial powers, his activities at best were slow and stilted.

Opinions of the state government. The reading of the Governor's message marked the opening of the legislature in December, 1846. The Governor favored national expansion by peaceable means rather than force of arms and therefore he deprecated the war. Nevertheless since Mexico had started the war, Smith advocated the acquisition of territory as just compensation. He informed the Assembly that pursuant to the President's call on Virginia for one regiment of volunteers to be sent into the field, he had issued a proclamation calling for volunteers and authorizing the election of company officers. It was essential that the field officers for this unit be appointed without delay, but fearing a lack of power to make the appointments, he called on the Assembly to take the necessary action to give him that grant. The Governor also requested that a sum of money be appropriated to supply any deficiencies in the equipment and comfort of the Virginia

---

Regiment; and that a law be passed exempting the volunteers from the provisions of the anti-dueling laws in order to facilitate recruitment.

In compliance with the Governor's request, a sum of $10,000 was voted to care for the volunteers until they could be mustered into the forces of the United States. At that time, the Government was accepting volunteers only once a battalion had been formed. This resulted in a hardship on the first companies which organized and left their support to Virginia until such time as the requisite number had been recruited. Mr. Syne, Petersburg Whig, charged that Secretary of War, Marcy was trying to cheat Virginia out of money by refusing to accept less than a battalion. The bill, however, passed the Senate unanimously and the House with only one dissenting vote.

The House debate over the method for selecting the Regimental field officers, got immensely entangled in various constitutional interpretations of the powers of the legislature. Mr. Watts, a leading Whig, threw his support in favor of the bill and it passed with one negative vote. The

---
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bill, agreed to by the Senate, authorized the Governor and the Council to constitute a Board for the purpose of electing the necessary officers.

The Governor's request for the suspension of the anti-dueling law was rejected on the grounds that it would set a precedent for future exceptions; and would result in more moral damage than military good. Other legislative action in connection with the volunteers consisted of voting a flag for the unit and swords for all the company officers.

The next hurdle before the legislature was only indirectly connected with the war. The expiration of Archer's term in the Senate necessitated the election of his successor. Failure of the factions of the Democratic Party to reach a caucus agreement on a candidate, led to the nomination of numerous candidates in the Assembly. After several ballots the Whigs in combination with the Chivalry (Calhoun Democrats) secured the election of Robert M. T. Hunter.

A few days later the same coalition affected the election of James M. Mason, another Calhoun Democrat, to fill the vacancy occasioned by Pendleton's death. The candidate of the Democracy on this occasion had been James McDowell, former Governor and Representative. His vote in favor of the
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creation of a lieutenant-generalcy for his brother-in-law, Thomas H. Benton, did not recommend him to the Whigs or the Chivalry; and his earlier opinions in favor of abolition also hurt his cause. While these elections marked a triumph for the Chivalry in Virginia, the Whigs seemed equally jubilant.

We repeat—...that "THE LIEUTENANT GENERAL" scheme killed off Mr. McDowell, as we hope it will every Virginia representative who voted for the measure....106

In February the Assembly considered the Resolutions from the State of Vermont. These Resolutions condemned the war as unjust, called for its speedy conclusion, and after stating that any territory acquired would be slave, asked for the concurrence of other state legislatures in the refusal to admit into the Union any state whose constitution permitted slavery. Mr. Bondurant of Buckingham agreed with the Vermont Legislature that the war was unjust and had been started by the President. A heated debate followed his remarks. The Senate finally agreed to the unanimous resolution of the House instructing the Governor to return the Resolutions.

As if to make their rejection of the Vermont Reso-
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olutions more emphatic, the Assembly passed a vote of thanks to General Taylor and his men. The unanimous resolution empowered the Governor to order swords for Taylor and the Virginia heroes of Palo Alto and Monterey, Garland and Payne.

As spring elections drew nigh, politicians tried to avail themselves of every vote getting opportunity. McPherson, Democrat from Fago County, introduced a set of Resolutions in the House approving the war and its conduct by the President. The First Resolution stated that the war was provoked by Mexico and should be vigorously prosecuted. The Second Resolution tendered thanks to the President "for the justice, firmness and eminent ability with which he" had "conducted the war with Mexico." Mr. Cooke, Whig from Powhatan County, offered a substitute amendment calling for the withdrawal of our armies to the eastern side of the Nueces River and for making a defense of our territory there. While Whigs and others did not approve the war, they were willing to go as far in withdrawing from it as Mr. Cooke. He cast the lone vote for his resolution which was defeated by 107 votes.

Both the McPherson Resolutions passed the House by a strict party vote. The results in the Senate were virtually
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112

the same, thus putting the Whigs on record as opposed to the war and the President.

Barily had this maneuver been completed when the House of Representatives again passed the Wilmot Proviso. The reaction of the Virginia Assembly was instantaneous! The Assembly unanimously agreed "that the Government of the United States has no control" over the institution of slavery; that the Virginia Assembly will not recognize as binding any legislation tending to prohibit slavery in any territories acquired by conquest or treaty; that it is the duty of all who love the Union to oppose any such restriction; and that the passage of the Proviso makes it mandatory for the slave-holding States "to take firm, united and concerted action..."

When the next session of the Virginia Legislature convened, the editor of the Enquirer was still praising the Virginia Resolutions, which had "been reechoed by our sister States, and will doubtless form the basis of the policy of the whole South." No doubt the action of the Virginia Legislature was one of the steps which led to the congealing of the South into one political unit for the protection of its "peculiar institution." As such, it was one of the disasters
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II. THE PRESS AND THE WAR

Early in 1846, the Enquirer saw no prospect of war with Mexico. Disposing of her threats with a shrug, the editor thought the United States should be generous with Mexico but then should not be unjust to herself. More than a month later it was reported that a large group of Mexicans had been concentrated to oppose General Taylor's march and the Washington correspondent reported that the President advised war.

Rumors of the rejection of Slidell by Mexico led the editor of the Enquirer to speculate that no honor could be gained by overwhelming "so miserable a republic." Reparation for these many insults must be taken if Mexico should persist in her course toward the United States. Although he didn't recommend the immediate "annexation" of all of Mexico, he believed that in due course she must become a part of the American nation. The remainder of April and early part of May the paper was filled with rumors of war.

On May 13, 1846, the Enquirer took its hat off to the
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President's war message and gave its support to the call for vigorous prosecution of the war.

This was just one of the "first fruits of annexation," declared the Whig. The troops should not have been sent into the disputed territory in the first place. The prompt and vigorous measures were applauded but, the Whig stood its ground firmly contending that had Taylor stayed at Corpus Christi, the clash would have been averted.

Thus within less than a week after the declaration of war, the Enquirer and the Whig had taken their stands. The former defended the war; the latter defended the war only in so far as national honor demanded and then severely and unceasingly criticized the Executive and the war. An early Whig editorial which formed an exception to her almost constant later view, was that if the war should be protracted, Mexico might be completely dismembered and by the action of her own people annexed to the United States.

The Enquirer was instantly to the fore with attacks on the Whig party attitude toward the war. The Charlestown (Va) Free Press joined the Whigs in condemning the war whereas the Wheeling Times, another Whig journal, called for united
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support to promote the country's victory.

June 2, the Enquirer advised everyone to save the Whig newspapers because they contained the evidence that the Whigs favored Mexico and opposed the United States. The Whig of the same date warned the people not to be misled into a defense of the Executive who had grossly usurped the "war power" of the Constitution.

General Scott's differences with the President and Secretary of War Marcy provided more fuel for the fire. The Whigs charged that the President was afraid of letting Scott run the show because he was a Whig and might supplant "Young Hickory" in the Presidential chair. To this the Democrats replied that Scott had subdued his military position to his overwhelming political ambitions.

The Whig began to advocate the speedy termination of the war due to the extension of the patronage of the President which would result from its protraction. Already the "Taylor for Presidency" bandwagon had gotten under way and was to furnish an editorial topic for the next two years.

---
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Although the Whig opposed the principle of the Two Million Dollar bill, it was willing to support it to end the war. The appearance of the Wilmot Proviso did not draw violent attacks in the Richmond papers. Both papers expressed a sense of relief that the Senate had killed the amendment, but it was not until the following February that the press considered it a major issue.

After the adjournment of Congress the press controversy subsided until Kearny's Santa Fe Proclamation reached the east. The Whig condemned Kearny's assumption of power and the Enquirer praised it as taking a guarantee that our just demands would be met by Mexico.

The President's "aiding and comforting the enemy" speech brought bitter counter charges from the Whig. They denounced folk's blunder in allowing Santa Anna's return and declared it was just as important to expose and denounce a dangerous enemy at home as to defeat the foreign enemy.

After the initial storm over the President's message the major issue in the press, was the question of the acquisition of Mexican territory. Whig claims in November, 1846, that the addition of territory would weaken the Union and stir
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the sectional question were denied by the Enquirer. When it was divined that the Wilmot Proviso would again be attached to the President's request for money, the Enquirer began to take alarm. Its first stand was that this was not the time to argue the question. When it became obvious that the question was going to be argued anyway, the Enquirer decided that the true course was to win the war, get the territory, and then if the North persisted in the matter to take a share of the territory and separate from the Union.

The Whig followed the general party line and advocated the policy of self-denial which would avoid bringing up the issue of slavery. Refusal of Mexican territory would keep without "the walls of our Troy this wooden-horse, which, if it once find[s] entrance, will endanger the existence of the Union it promises to aggrandize." The Democrats thought this policy would only encourage more aggressive measures by the abolitionists in the North.

Passage of the Proviso in the House of Representatives was harkened as "the fire bell in the night." It broke faith with the Constitution and the Missouri Compromise. A public meeting in Richmond denounced the Proviso and pledged its
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faith in the Missouri Compromise. Senate failure to pass the Proviso left the Whigs and Democrats free to assail each other again, with the Democrats reviving the charge of aiding the enemy.

As the fall of 1847 approached, the Democrats thought they saw the possibility of a break within the Whig Party over the acquisition of Mexican territory. Botts remained firmly against any territory; whereas the Richmond Times said it did not wholly assent to such a proposition. The Whig held firm in its opposition to territorial acquisition and the Democratic hope vanished.

The opening of the Thirtieth Congress covered the Enquirer with gloom. It was bad enough to have Mr. Botts as head of the Military Committee urge the withdrawal of the troops from Mexico and the abandonment of all territory, but an even worse event occurred. Mr. Winthrop, author of the proviso prohibiting slavery in the Oregon territory, was elected Speaker of the House with the concurrence of the Virginia Whigs. The Whigs were as pleased with the Calhoun Democrats as they were with their own party. Calhoun's resolutions in opposition to the acquisition of all of Mexico
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were welcomed by the Whig, and Hunter's speech in "opposition to the ruinous policy of the Administration," was applauded.

The prospects of peace were heralded by both parties. The Whigs feared a continuation of the war might lead to the incorporation of all of Mexico into the United States, while the Democrats were delighted that such a just and honorable war had terminated in so honorable and satisfactory peace. Thus after almost two years of bitter controversy, both papers managed to agree on one thing. They were both glad the war was over.

III. THE WAR AS A FACTOR IN THE SPRING ELECTIONS OF 1847

To Commissioners of Elections in every County:

Gentlemen: - You are most respectfully requested to cause the Polls, this year, to be opened very early — say as early as 70'oclock. And for several reasons:

1. Farmers are busy. ****

2. You can do nothing to prevent non-resident voting—voters think it a Constitutional privilege—and the polls being open early or late don't prevent their voting more than once. ****

3. There is no necessity for delay. **** Surely nobody is going to wait until the day of election to hear speaking, to enable him to make up his mind.

4. It will be more convenient to you to complete your labors of the day early. 145

A FARMER

In 1847, property owners, leaseholders, and house-
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keepers who paid taxes were entitled to vote. Men could still vote in each county in which they held property and as a rule the cities controlled the elections in the surrounding counties.

There was good reason to open the polls early this election day as it was to prove one of the most highly contested of the period. For weeks in advance the issues had been argued and debated, both at Court Houses and in the press.

In a study of any election it is hazardous to state, dogmatically that any one issue caused any one final result and in an election occurring over one hundred years ago the task is even more hazardous. A review of the campaign and an analysis of the net result make it possible to draw certain general conclusions. The fact is that the Democrats lost five Congressional Districts to the Whigs. Our problem is to determine to what extent - if at all - these results were affected by the war with Mexico.

The split within the Democratic Party centered over two issues: the expulsion of Ritchie from the Senate; and Calhoun's opposition to the vigorous prosecution of the war. The Senate resolution calling for the expulsion of Mr. Ritchie from the Senate chamber was hailed throughout the Democratic regions of Virginia as an abridgement of the freedom of the press (even though Ritchie was still free to sit in the visit-

ors gallery). In the latter part of February and early March the Enquirer was full of reports of public meetings and resolutions adopted in protest to the Senate action. That Mr. Calhoun favored the exclusion of the Union editor only served to widen the crevice already made in Democratic ranks over the war.

The Democratic Convention in Richmond, February 23, adopted resolutions approving the conduct of the President and the war, voting thanks to Ritchie for forty years support of the Democratic Party, and opposing those Senators who voted for the exclusion of Ritchie and who opposed the vigorous prosecution of the war. John Caskie, of Richmond, opposed these resolutions on the grounds that they would defeat the party. In order to crush the Calhoun men, he declared, the Democrats were willing to crush the party. Harvie of Amelia; Holladay of Spotsylvania; Ambler of Louisa; and Anderson of Prince Edward also opposed the resolutions.
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149. Richmond Enquirer, February 26, 1847.

150. Richmond Whig, February 27, 1847.

151. Ibid., February 25, 1847.
This clash between the Chivalry and the Administration Democrats was particularly evident in the Sixth Congressional District. The Democratic incumbent, Mr. Seddon, declared himself a candidate for reelection. He addressed a Democratic meeting, giving his whole-hearted approval to Calhoun's course. The meeting unanimously approved Seddon's congressional record but did not unanimously endorse him as the next candidate for Congress. When the Democratic Convention convened it gave the nomination to Seddon. It then proceeded to adopt a resolution which stated that his nomination in no way implied approval directly or indirectly of the course of John C. Calhoun, nor did the Convention by this action pledge itself to vote for him for the Presidency. Seddon immediately withdrew his candidacy and Walter D. Leake, an Administration Democrat, was nominated.

The disaffection of the Chivalry left the Democratic position weakened and the Whig, John Minor Botts, carried the District by 594 votes. The war was praised and condemned during the campaign by Leake and Botts, respectively, but the major emphasis was placed on the Wilmot Proviso and Botts' associations with John Quincy Adams, the abolitionist. One

152. Ibid., March 26, 1847, and Ambler, Thomas Ritchie, op. cit., p. 269. See letter from "Another Calhoun Democrat," Richmond Whig, April 20, 1847.
153. Richmond Whig, April 13, 15, 1847, and Richmond Enquirer, April 15, 20, 1847.
factor not to be overlooked in this District was its Whig history in the past. It was frequently referred to in the press as the "Gibraltar of Whiggery." Had the Democrats not split, they might have been able to turn the trick, but in their factious condition it was an easy Whig victory.

The Thirteenth District presented an even more spectacular Democratic schism. The total Democratic vote cast in that district was 3,308 to a Whig total of 2,084. The Democratic vote was divided between two candidates and the Whig, Mr. Fulton, walked off with the election.

Another Whig gain was made in the Fifth District. The Whig candidate, William R. Goggin, had represented the District in the Twenty-sixth, Twenty-seventh, and Twenty-eighth Congresses but was not a candidate for reelection to the Twenty-ninth Congress. His letter of acceptance of the nomination stated that the Whigs "will give evidences...to resist Executive encroachments, which are daily becoming more and more alarming. They will rebuke the wild spirit...which plunged the country into a foreign war..." Whether Walter Leake, who supported the war and the administration, was defeated on that issue or the personality of Goggin is anybody's guess. A safe assumption would probably be a combination

---

155. Richmond Whig, February 5, 1847.
156. Goggin carried the district by 110 votes.
of both.

In the Third District, the incumbent Mr. Tredway, bowed to the Whig, Mr. Flournoy, by a one vote margin. A pre-election Whig meeting censured Tredway for his adherence to the Sub-Treasury, the Tariff of '46, and most specifically for his vote in favor of the Lieutenant General Bill. According to the resolution, that vote was said to be "uncalled for by the interests of the army, and unjust and dishonouring to the brave, gallant and skilful Generals who have heretofore led our armies to victory and glory." 157

The fifth Whig victory was in the Twelfth District. Here, William B. Preston downed Augustus Chapman by 228 votes. During the canvas, Preston asked Chapman if he had voted for the pay increase for volunteers. To Chapman's answer that he had, Preston produced a copy of the Union which said he had voted against the bill. Preston also played up Chapman's censure of General Taylor to advantage, and this District which had given a 949 vote majority to Polk, elected a Whig. 158

From the foregoing it would appear that the war was more of an issue in the last three districts, i.e., 12th., 3rd., and 5th., than in the 6th., and 13th., where the Whig gain can be directly attributed to the Democrat split.

157: Richmond Whig, February 4, 1847.
158: Ibid., April 2, March 19, 1847.
The war was at issue in other districts; however, with precisely opposite results.

Willoughby Newton was nominated by the Whigs in the Eighth District and the Whig urged his support even though he had voted wrong on the Texas question. Newton attacked the war and the course of the President while Beale steadfastly upheld them and carried the District. In the Fourth District the Whig candidate, Mr. Irving, also assailed the war to no avail. Thomas Boocock won by a slim majority of 4 votes, but this could not be considered a Whig gain since Polk carried the District in '44 by only 2 votes.

Although the Staunton Spectator said the election in the Eleventh District would be fought on the war alone, it was admitted by the Whig that it was too much to hope for a victory in the Valley where "the Tenth Legion" always rushed to the polls at the last minute to save the Democratic day. McDowell defeated the Whig, Gray, by almost 1,000 votes.

In the other districts the incumbents were not too seriously challenged. In the Fourteenth District, the Whig candidate, Mr. McDomas, did not take the field until shortly after

159. Ibid., March 5, 1847.
161. Ibid., March 9, 19, April 20, 1847.
162. Richmond Enquirer, March 9, 1847.
163. Richmond Whig, March 30, 1847.
MAP II. WHIG GAINS IN THE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS OF 1847.

Whig - 29th. and 30th. Cong.

Whig gains in 30th. Cong.
before the election, and was easily defeated by Thompson.

The Democrats attributed their losses to the apathy of the Democrats in sure districts and to the Whig "humbugs" about the war which had "been sown broad cast over the State." Had the Democrats changed "apathy" to "division" they would have come closer to a true analysis.

The map on page 57 shows the state congressional districts in 1847 and the districts gained by the Whigs in the election of that year.

164. Ibid., April 2, 13, 16, 20, 1847.
165. Richmond Enquirer, May 6, 1847.
CHAPTER IV

VIRGINIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR

Considering the sharply divided Virginia attitudes on the war, Virginia's contribution in men compares favorably with that of other States equally distant from the field of battle. The first calls for troops went to the States in the West and Southwest due to their proximity to the scene of conflict. In order to make all the States feel an interest in the war, the Cabinet decided to call on each state to hold a certain number of troops in readiness. Virginia was requested to call out three regiments of volunteers. The response was statewide. It was not until November, however, that Virginia was asked to send a regiment

---

166. The exact number of troops sent varies with each record. Miles National Register, LXXIV, September 27, 1848, gives the Virginia total as 1,182 whereas it is listed as 1,320 in the Complete General Army Register of the United States ed. by Thomas H. S. Hamersly (New York: Hamersly, 1888). Virginia compares favorably with the States of Massachusetts, New York, Maryland and the District of Columbia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Arkansas, Miles National Register, op. cit. (this does not include the volunteers in the regular army).
167. Folk, op. cit., I, 399-400.
168. Ibid., I, 405-404.
to the field. The initial fervor had died down in the long lapse of time and with the added difficulties of bad roads and weather it was January before this regiment could be sent to Fortress Monroe.

With all the flourish normal on such occasions, these well-uniformed Virginians went forth in vain search of battlefield glory. Many gave their lives but, it was to the dysentery and diseases of camp life and not to Mexican bullets and sabres. The volunteers arrived in Monterey after the Battle of Buena Vista and spent the rest of the war in garrison and patrol duty.

There were Virginians, however, who did see action. The regular army recruiters were active in Virginia throughout the war period. Volunteers in groups of five and ten were sent forward to join seasoned companies at the front. In addition, approximately five Virginia companies were recruited for the ten regiments authorized in the spring of 1847. Many of these were with Scott in the final campaign of the war.

This chapter covers the initial response to the call for men; the organization and recruitment of the Virginia Regiment of Volunteers; the activities of these men during their stay in Mexico; the regular army recruitment in Virginia; and the recruitment and service of the ten regiments.
I. INITIAL RESPONSE TO THE WAR

Patriots! Your country calls—obey! Glory awaits you! Virginians! be ever ready to blast treachery as to trample on tyranny! Let us gain the prize banner of the Union for our ready devotion, and wear it proudly by matchless deeds. Let Virginia be like her matchless son—"first in war, first in peace," and first in the array of States! .... 169

An enthusiastic crowd assembled in Richmond City Hall the evening of May 14. The crowd was so large that the meeting had to be adjourned to the steps in order that all might hear the speeches. Resolutions were passed calling for the formation of one or more companies of Virginia volunteers and a committee of five was appointed to raise funds to uniform and equip the proposed units. The next morning a meeting was held at the Military Hall to organize a volunteer corps. Thus two days after the declaration of war, Captain Carrington's volunteer company was organized. "With the drum beating and the flag flying" the volunteers marched through the streets and by Saturday the company was completed.

The officers left immediately for Washington to tender their services to the President. Approbation over their prompt organization lessened in some measure their disappointment that they could not be accepted until such time as a

170. Richmond Enquirer, May 16, 18, 1846.
call for troops was made on Virginia. On the recommendation of General Scott, they returned to Richmond to uniform and drill until called.

Within a few days the Governor was called upon to have three regiments enrolled and ready for muster into the service of the United States when called. The Governor's Proclamation stated that he was ready to accept companies consisting of 64 men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, and full of physical strength and vigor. Those already uniformed could retain their existing uniforms, while all new companies were ordered to conform to the militia regulations.

The Adjutant General prescribed the form of enrollment and uniform. In addition he advised the volunteers not to abandon their normal occupation, except as may be convenient for purposes of training, until such time as called into the service.

The prescribed uniform was a dark blue single breast-coat with three rows of buttons on the breast and a stand-up collar no higher than to allow the free turning of the chin. The collar was to be edged with silver lace for officers and white worsted lace for non-commissioned officers and privates. The skirts of the jackets were to reach no lower

171. Ibid., May 20, 22, 1846.
173. General Order, May 23, 1846, Ibid.
than the middle of the thigh. Trousers for the winter would be dark blue and for the summer white linen or cotton. Field officers were to wear cocked hats decorated with plumes of white cock feathers. Company officers and enlisted men's caps were to be round, bell-crowned of black leather.

Meanwhile news of meetings throughout the state filled the newspapers. Thirty men were already recruited at Fredericksburg where "For Texas" greeted the eye on every street corner. The Richmond Grays under Captain Robert Scott, Jr. offered their services to the Governor. An initial meeting was held in Petersburg where patriotic addresses were delivered to an enthusiastic crowd. Greene County reported seventy volunteers had elected St. Clair T. Dean as their Captain, while Washington County reported three full companies.

Representative Joseph Johnson addressed a meeting in Harrison County and a volunteer from Buckingham called on that county to come forth with a company. In Berkeley, an enthusiastic citizen offered 150 acres of Texas land to

174. Ibid., May 23, 1846.
175. Extract from Fredericksburg Recorder in the Richmond Enquirer, May 21, 1846.
176. Ibid., May 25, 1846.
177. Ibid., May 20, 1846.
178. Captains of the Washington County companies were Floyd, Edmundson and Cummings. Ibid., June 29, 1846.
179. Ibid., June 2, 1846. Raised four companies
180. Richmond Whig, July 1, 1846.
each man who would volunteer. Among the "Berkley Volunteers" was Ephraim Alburtis, editor of the Virginia Republican. Fairfax County reported a company under organization and other meetings took place in Madison County, Charleston, Barbour County, Blacksburg, and Morgantown.

In spite of this seemingly overwhelming evidence of willingness to serve, the Whig, June 22, noted that the Virginians were not rushing forward as volunteers. The Mobile Herald said:

It seems, from all accounts, that Virginia is backward in coming forward with her volunteers for the Mexican war. So, at least, we infer from a Richmond paper. This is bad. The Old Dominion, we thought, would be first in the field. Perhaps, however, she is getting old and decrepit.

The Enquirer stated in vindication of the Old Dominion that twenty-one companies numbering 1,800 men had been formed and it was convinced that a call for immediate service would secure a prompt response. Enrollment had been slow because of the uncertainty of being called; the necessity that young men pay some attention to the pursuits of industry; the expense of the equipment; and the reluctance of employers

181. Ibid., June 3, 1846. 182. Ibid., June 10, 1846. 183. Ibid., June 9, 1846. 184. Ibid., June 10, 1846. 185. Ibid., June 16, 1846. 186. Ibid., June 10, 1846. 187. 207 volunteers. Ibid., July 14, 1846. 188. Extract in Richmond Enquirer, July 11, 1846.
to keep persons who were subject to call.

A General Order in July called for five Riflemen companies to be included in the three regiments. By the end of that month the following companies had tendered their services to the Governor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Captain</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
<td>E. G. Carrington</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. G. Scott</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>John B. Floyd</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Edmondson</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. C. Cummings</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>Fleming Gardner</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James F. Preston</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry S. Stanger</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell County</td>
<td>John F. McElhaney</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth County</td>
<td>W. P. Buchanan</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott County</td>
<td>George E. Starn</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wythe County</td>
<td>Joseph F. Kent</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell County</td>
<td>Robert Barns and</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William L. Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison County</td>
<td>Byron S. Bassell</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiram M. Winters</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrus Vance</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monongalia County</td>
<td>Leroy Kramer</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Fowler</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour County</td>
<td>William Johnson</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles S. Hall</td>
<td>Riflemen</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>William J. Willey</td>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location                               Captain         Type                     Number of
Shenandoah County          William Y. Lovell       Riflemen      77
Greene County              S. T. Deane            Infantry      69
Jefferson County           John W. Rowan           Artillery     77
Lynchburg                  William A. Talbot       Artillery     63
Petersburg                 H. A. Garland            Artillery     63
(For service in state - strength not given)

With two more companies listed as partially organized
this made the total of thirty companies which Virginia had
been called upon to have in readiness.

II. THE RECRUITMENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST VIRGINIA
REGIMENT OF VOLUNTEERS

The President...has made a requisition upon the Governor
of Virginia for one Infantry Regiment of Volunteers for
immediate service, and to be continued therein during
the war with Mexico unless sooner discharged. 192

The change in term of enlistment from twelve months
to "for the war" necessitated the reorganization of the
companies. The uniform of the state militia was again pre-
scribed by the Adjutant General, who said he hoped to be able
to supply the necessary uniforms at the place of rendezvous.
The original point of rendezvous was Guyandotte on the Ohio
River, however, due to the bad weather conditions, Secretary

Marcy allowed Governor Smith to change this to Richmond.

By November 24, companies from Lynchburg, Alexandria, Jefferson County, Berkeley County and two from the city of Richmond had offered their services. Since some areas were having difficulty recruiting full companies, the Adjutant General announced that individual tenders of service would be accepted in Richmond, where several companies were organizing. At the same time the Governor issued an order dispensing with the uniform previously prescribed and authorizing one better suited to the comfort of the troops and the nature of the service required. General Order, December 15, 1845, listed the following articles as being required and which would be furnished in Richmond:

1. Navy blue cloth cap
2. Navy blue jacket and pair of pantaloons
2. Pair boots
2. Pair woolen socks
2. Flannel shirts
1. Overcoat
1. Leather stock

Unfortunately Captain Carrington had already made arrangements for the procurement of uniforms according to the

---

194. Ibid., December 15, 1846.
195. Ibid., November 24, 1846, and Notice to Volunteers Ibid., December 4, 1846.
196. The uniform authorized called for short jackets with no cross-belt and one waist-belt and body-belt. For pictures see Plates 17, 18, 19, U. S. Quartermaster Corps, The Army of the United States, Illustrated by H. A. Ogden (New York: B. M. Whitlock, 1883).
197. Richmond Enquirer, December 18, 1846.
first General Order. General lack of communication between Carrington and Richardson (the Adjutant General) resulted in a duplication of orders for his company. The difficulties were finally resolved, but not until the entire matter was aired before the General Assembly.

The United States authorized a monthly clothing allowance of $3.50, six months allocation, $21.00, being payable upon muster into the service if sufficient clothing had been procured. In order to have the regiment uniformly dressed and to do so at the lowest cost, the Governor authorized two local merchants to go to northern cities and make the necessary purchases. Due to the demands from all sections of the country for the same supplies, it was only after exceeding difficulty that the requisite materials were obtained. The total cost of the uniforms exceeded the six months commutation allowance by $3.00 per volunteer. This excess was paid by the General Assembly on the request of the Governor.

---

198. For details see Journal of the House, op. cit., pp. 57, 160, 230-231. Camp stools and tables purchased by Scott and Carrington were not paid for by the Government. For correspondence between Carrington and Richardson, and Richardson and the Assembly, see Document No. 16, Ibid., pp. 1-9.

199. The merchants paid $2.07 per yard for Blue cloth; $1.50 each for blankets; 25¢ per pair for socks. In addition they exceeded their authorization and bought drawers which they were advised were essential. Ibid.

200. Ibid., pp. 204-205, 211.
The Governor and Council proceeded to select the field officers for the Regiment as soon as they received the authorization of the General Assembly to do so. John F. Hamtramck of Jefferson County was chosen Colonel; Thomas B. Randolph of Warren, Lt. Colonel; and Jubal A. Early of Franklin, Major. All three officers were graduates of West Point. Hamtramck and Early had fought in the Florida War under General Taylor and Randolph had served gallantly at Queenstown.

As the troops began filling the Union Hotel in Richmond, the Whig yielded to the temptation of berating the "Tenth Legion" for its failure to send forth a volunteer company. To the Enquirer's reply that certain strong Whig areas had not yet come forward, the Whig stated that the Whigs should feel no disgrace. After all it was the Democracy which had put the "usurper" in the executive seat and surely it was their duty to support him. A letter from a Lynchburg "Democrat" said the Whig was just anxious to get as many Democrats as possible out of the state before spring 202 elections.


The volunteers were showered with gifts of flags, swords, and patriotic orations. One Richmond merchant gave $120 worth of prime tobacco to Captain Scott's Company, and the author of History of Oregon and California, Robert Greenhow, bestowed copies of his book on the field officers.

At last a battalion assembled in Richmond, were mustered into the service of the United States and left for Fort Monroe January 4, 1847. The Rev. Dr. Plumer delivered an address to the volunteers at the Union Hotel, after which thousands of spectators lined the wharf to see the volunteers off. The companies of Carse, Scott, Bankhead, and Carrington were joined by F. H. Archer's Petersburg Company at City Point and proceeded together to the Fort. The companies of William B. Archer, Alburtis of Berkely and Harper of Staunton remained in Richmond awaiting the organization of the Second Battalion.

The map on page 71 below charts the volunteer companies as accurately as possible according to the scant records available. The green areas represent the initial response to the call for three regiments and the red areas represent the approximate counties from which the First Regiment of V olu-

203. Richmond Whig, January 12, 1847; Richmond Enquirer, December 8, 18, 1846, January 12, 1847; Journal of the House, op. cit., pp. 69, 147; and Journal of the Senate, op. cit., pp. 51, 113.

204. Richmond Enquirer, December 10, 15, 1846, January 5, 12, 1847.
MAP III. RESPONSE TO THE CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS.
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*William B. Archer's Co. was composed of volunteers from all over the state.
The Governor's request to furnish an extra battalion was refused by Secretary Marcy, but he did authorize the formation of two more companies, to be armed with rifles and bayonets and serve as flankers for the Regiment.

The twelve companies thus organized were: James F. Preston's Montgomery Volunteers; Kenton Harper's Staunton Volunteers; William M. Robinson's company from Petersburg; John W. Rowan's Jefferson County company; Robert C. Scott and Edward C. Carrington with Richmond companies; John P. Young's Portsmouth Volunteers; Caroline County Volunteers under Smith P. Bankhead; Montgomery D. Corse's Alexandria company; Ephraim G. Albrittis and the "Berkeley Volunteers;" Fletcher H. Archer's Petersburg Volunteers; and William B. Archer's men from all over the state.

---

205. Ibid., January 12, 1847.
206. Lists of the officers and men for 11 companies - 10 of the original companies and one called later in 1847— not including the companies of Scott and Preston are in Auditor's Office, Richmond, Muster Rolls of the Virginia Militia in the War of 1812 (Richmond, 1952). List of officers is in Mexican War Veterans, compiled by Hugh Robarts (Washington, 1887). Additional information is in "Volunteer Organizations of the Mexican War - Virginia Volunteers," Archives of the United States, Washington.
III. THE VIRGINIA REGIMENT ON ACTIVE DUTY

Lt. Col. Randolph and the companies of Scott, Archer, Harper and Bankhead left Fort Monroe for Mexico the end of January, 1847. Major Early drilled and trained the remainder of the Regiment until March 1, when the last volunteers departed the shores of Virginia.

Carrington and Corso reached Point Isabel on February 21, 1847, where they were ordered to depart for Matamoros by boat, marching thence the 300 miles to Monterey. The volunteers were disappointed at not being ordered to Vera Cruz, where more excitement was to be expected. Two days later Scott, Archer, Harper and Bankhead arrived, and by March 4, the whole First Battalion was assembled at Carmargo. A detachment accompanied the Ohio Regiment into Monterey and was then ordered back to Carmargo as escort for a wagon train.

The disappointment of such an assignment was made even worse by the climate of the area. The dust, according to Captain Harper, made it hardly worth while to change shirts,

207. Richmond Enquirer, January 26, 1847.
208. Jubal Anderson Early, Jubal Anderson Early
209. Letter from Carrington to his Mother, Point Isabel, February 21, 1847, Richmond Enquirer, March 12, 1847.
"confounded" all complexions and turned the blue uniforms into a pretty gray.

The remainder of the Regiment arrived at Carmargo, and after three days rest - but not comfort - they set out to accompany a large wagon train to Monterey. The Second Battalion under Randolph went as far as China, where they remained to make some fortifications, while the First Battalion under Hamtramck proceeded to Monterey with the wagon train. The route followed was a new one, and this, added to the excessive heat made the trip extremely tedious. The unexpected rain was welcomed after the "furnace" like winds, even though it flooded the tents and the resulting mud caused the 220 wagons to be stretched out over five miles. The climate was already taking its toll of the Virginians. One hundred had remained in the hospital at Carmargo and about thirty were hospitalized at China. The dry, sandy, barrenness of the region offered little to break the monotony and morale grew exceedingly poor.

The heat, sickness, and menial duties did nothing to improve dispositions and following a temper outburst, a fatal duel occurred between two officers in May. Lt. Munford was

211. Letter from Captain Harper, Carmargo, May 27, 1847.
212. Early, op. cit., p. xxii; Official Correspondent of the Picayune, Carmargo, March 29, 1847, Richmond Whig, April 20, 1847; and letter from Harper, China, April 16, 1847, Richmond Whig, June 1, 1847.
killed instantly and Lt. Mahan died a few days later.

Shortly after this unhappy occurrence, Harper wrote that of his company which was eighty strong on arrival in Mexico, only two officers, seven non-commissioned officers, and thirty-one privates were fit for duty. His company alone had twenty-nine men in the hospital.

The First Battalion was now encamped at Walnut Springs, near General Taylor's Camp. Due to the sickness of Hamtramck, Major Early was in command. It was this Battalion which moved into Monterey to replace the Ohio Regiment. As Governor of the city, Early maintained strict order. The Virginia Regiment was praised for its good appearance and orderliness. The correspondent of the Picayune attributed this to the fact that the Regiment had field officers who understood the profession of arms and the necessity for military discipline.

The Second Battalion under Randolph moved from China to Buena Vista early in June. Hamtramck, who was now recovered from his illness; Early; and the remainder of the Regiment were relieved of duty in Monterey by the Massa-

213. Richmond Enquirer, June 15, 18, August 31, 1847.
214. Letter from Harper dated June 15, in Miles National Register, LXXII, July 31, 1847.
Massachusetts Regiment and also repaired to Buena Vista. Captain Fairfax with a company of volunteers from Fairfax County arrived in Mexico about this time; and Capt. Carrington, Lt. Kinney and Lt. Ashby returned to Virginia to secure replacements for the vacancies in company ranks due to sickness.

At Buena Vista, the Virginia Regiment was encamped with the Second Mississippi and the North Carolina Regiments. Life settled into the routine of company drills in the mornings, battalion and regimental drills every afternoon, and brigade reviews every Sunday. The climate was a little cooler, and the afternoon showers kept the dust settled. Even with this improvement health conditions remained bad and the sick list long. In July, the Virginia Regiment had about 120 men on the sick list, most of them however not seriously ill.

The dull, monotonous routine of the camp caused officers and men alike to complain. The strict disciplinarian of the North Carolina Regiment, Colonel Paine, became so unpopular that a mutiny threatened in August. The disturbance

---

216. Letter from Z. Taylor, June 23, 1847, Ibid.
217. Letter from Monterey, June 3, 1847, Richmond Enquirer, July 13, 1847, and letter from the Picayune Correspondent, Monterey, June 20, Ibid.
218. Letter from the Picayune Correspondent, Camp Buena Vista, July 13, 1847, Ibid., August 17, and letter of July 24, Ibid., August 24, 1847. Captain Fairfax died in August, see letter from Scott, August 15, 1847, Ibid., September 14, 1847.
was quickly put down and the three regiments were thereupon separated. A Virginia private was injured in the fracas and was summarily given a dishonorable discharge.

In September more troops were withdrawn from Taylor for Scott, but the Virginia Regiment stayed on. Hamtramck was placed in charge of the brigade formed of the Virginia and Second Mississippi Regiments and the troops resigned themselves to the inactivity of camp life, while deaths and discharges decreased their numbers. A correspondent said that:

Enthusiasm of the Virginians, although we laugh at their Old Dominion pride and their odd notions, justice compels us to say that they are the soberest, most orderly and finest looking body of men, as a whole, in the service. There is one thing can be said of them of which the volunteers are generally neglectful, that is, they dress uniformly and cleanly, which adds much to their fine appearance.

Perhaps this praise helped somewhat to heal the disappointment experienced at being robbed of the opportunity to gain military glory. In Virginia, two more volunteer companies were raised in response to the call on the Governor. William Talbot of Lynchburg raised one company, which left Fort Monroe in December and William A. Scott recruited the

---

219. Letters from the Picaune Correspondent, August 15, 19, 1847, Richmond Enquirer, September 17, and Richmond Whig, September 21, 1847; Executive Document 60, op. cit., pp. 1203-1210; and Smith, op. cit., II, 418.
220. Letter from a Virginia Officer, Richmond Enquirer, October 12, 1847.
221. Correspondent of the New Orleans National, Richmond Whig, October 5, 1847.
other company. Between October 17, 1847, and the muster out of the Regiment 76 men were recruited in Virginia. Of this number only 7 went to Mexico. The whole number of replacements recruited for the Regiment— including the above — was 169.

At the close of the war, Major Early marched the Regiment to the Rio Grande where they embarked for Fortress Monroe. After a year and a half on foreign soil, the volunteers reached Virginia early in April and were mustered out of the service.

IV. REGULAR ARMY RECRUITMENT IN VIRGINIA

The fate of the First Virginia Regiment was not shared by all Virginia volunteers. Most of the Virginians who entered the ranks of the regular army had ample opportunity to win military laurels on the battlefield.

The authorized strength of the army in 1846 was 775 officers and 17,020 men or a total of 17,812. Recruitment was so slow that by December, 1846, the total present and absent numbered only 10,690 men or a deficiency of 6,922.

222. Ibid., August 3, October 8, December 14, and Richmond Enquirer, December 10, 1847. Exact information on Scott's company is not available.


During the year 1846, 95 Virginians were recruited for five years in the regular army.

The Secretary of War suggested making service in the Army more attractive by lessening the term of service and giving a bounty for enlistment. The law passed in compliance with this request authorized enlistment for "five years" or "for the war" at the option of the recruit. Recruits were to receive a bounty of $12 - $6 to be paid on enlistment and the remainder once the recruit joined the regiment. Later legislation authorized a bounty to all soldiers - volunteers and regulars - upon discharge. Those who had served for twelve months or more were to receive 160 acres of land or $100 treasury scrip bearing an interest of six percent. Soldiers who served less than a year were authorized to receive 40 acres of land or $25 in scrip.

Following this legislation, 122 Virginians enlisted in 1847 and 33 more in the first months of 1848. Eliminating those who enlisted for "five years" in January and February, 1846, Virginia's total regular army enlistments after May 13, 1846, was 225.

Forty-five of this number entered the Second Dragoons;

226. Ibid., p. 206.
ten of them in time for action at Buena Vista and the siege of Vera Cruz, and the remainder in time for the action at Churubusco. The seventeen Virginians who enlisted in the Sixth Infantry were also in action at Vera Cruz, Churubusco, and Molino del Rey.

The largest number of volunteers entered the Fourth Regiment of Artillery. Forty-six enlisted in this Regiment in time for the battles of Buena Vista and Cerro Gordo and thirty-eight more joined the unit in time for the battle of Molino del Rey. The next largest contingent, fifty-five, entered the Eighth Infantry Regiment. Of this number, thirty-two enlisted in time to participate in the siege of Vera Cruz, and the battles of Churubusco, Molino del Rey, and Chapultepec.

Late in 1847, thirteen volunteers entered the Mounted Riflemen and three entered the First Regiment of Dragoons. It is doubtful if any of this group reached the battlefield in time for action. The thirty-three enlisted in 1848, were listed for general service, and of course saw no military action in the war.

The chart on page 81 shows the place of recruitment

230. Ibid., I, 555; II, 53, 145, 343.
231. Ibid., II, 112-116, 197, 343, 384, 402.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruiting Station</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2d</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Roads</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Monroe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyandotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinsburg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Rocky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanardsville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherdstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>250*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes twenty-five men who enlisted in January and February, 1848, for a period of five years.
for the various units. It must be kept in mind that the recruiters generally advertised their location, and men from outlying areas went to those points to enlist.

V. VIRGINIANS IN THE TEN REGIMENTS

The President's request for ten regiments to serve during the war was tossed about like a hot potato in Congress, while the army patiently waited for reinforcements. After rejecting the bill once, the Senate finally gave its approval and on February 11, 1848, it became law. The ten regiments were to consist of one regiment of dragoons and nine regiments of infantry— one of which was to be organized and equipped as voltigeurs and foot riflemen. It wasn't until March, however, that the President was authorized to commission the officers necessary, thus making it late summer before the new troops could reach Mexico.

William M. Graham, a native of Prince William County, who had served with Taylor at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma was appointed Lt. Col. of the Eleventh Regiment.

William B. Taliaferro, Elisha V. McComas, and Arthur C.

---

Cummings were appointed Captains in this Regiment. Their recruiting in Virginia yielded at least 131 privates. Incomplete muster rolls make it impossible to state the exact number recruited.

John Tyler, Jr., son of the former President, was appointed a Captain in the Thirteenth Regiment. Although he resigned May 28, 1847, 77 Virginians were recruited for his company and served until the end of the war.

The Voltiguer Regiment was also assigned a Virginia Colonel. Benton had amused the Senate over the name of this Regiment. He informed them that the original voltiguerers were men in the Roman armies who followed the horses, seized their manes and jumped upon them while they were at full gallop. Theoretically the voltiguerers consisted of an equal number of infantry and mounted men, the former to be ridden on the horses of the latter when great mobility was desired. They were

---

235. Other Virginia officers in this Regiment were: D. S. Lee, Joseph Samuel, Alonzo Loring, George B. Fitzgerald, William H. Scott, Spear Nicholas, and John Seddon. See General Order, No. 19, April 28, 1847, Official Army Register, 1847, pp. 1-15.


equipped with some small guns that could be taken apart and transported on mules, but in actuality they were foot riflemen in the Mexican war.

Joseph E. Johnston was appointed Lt. Col. of the Voltigners. Captain Oscar E. Edwards, who had raised a company of volunteers too late to be accepted for the First Regiment of Virginia Volunteers, was given command of one company. James H. Calwell, son of the proprietor of White Sulphur Springs, was also appointed a Captain. The newspapers estimated his Virginia recruits at between 70 and 80.

The Virginians in the Thirteenth Infantry Regiment were destined to join their fellow citizens in Taylor's inactive force near Monterey. The Eleventh Infantry Regiment and the Voltigners fared better. They were both sent to reinforce Scott and participated in the battles of Churubusco, Molino del Rey, and Chapultepec.

The Virginians who gave their lives in these battles.

240. muster rolls, etc., for the Voltigners were not available at the Archives. Richmond Enquirer, January 12, 1847, Richmond Whig, February 24, 1847. Other officers in this Regiment were Birkett D. Fry, John M. Blayke, John W. Leigh, George W. Carr, Van Renselaer Otey, Isaac W. Smith, James R. May, Washington Terrett, and James E. Slaughter. Official Army Register, op. cit., pp. 1-15.
241. Richmond Whig, June 18, 1847, Richmond Enquirer, June 18, 1847.
243. Ibid., II, 77-78, 385, 402-03, 410.
may have received more momentary applause than their brothers who succumbed to disease at Buena Vista, but the latter were just as surely defending their country. The military activities of the army have been amply covered by historians, making it unnecessary to delve into the campaigns in this paper.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Virginia's initial response to the news of the war was the patriotic reply of all citizens when the national flag is attacked. Within a few days, however, the party strife over the origin of the war and the fight for the political pie to be gained at its conclusion began. The almost equal division between Whigs and Democrats in the state at this time, and the resulting political maneuvering thwarted a more active support of the war.

The split between the Administration Democrats and the Chivalry over the expulsion of Ritchie from the Senate and the Calhoun opposition to an aggressive war policy; and the complete Whig opposition to the war led to the Whig gains in the state and congressional election in 1847.

The war itself was overshadowed by the reaction produced by the Wilmot Proviso. The Democrats were ready to secede, whereas the Whigs would have preferred refusal of all territory. The parties stood together in defense of "Southern rights" and thus the future breakdown of the national political parties was forewarned.
Both the Whigs and the Democrats claimed the volunteers as their party members, while the volunteers themselves, bemoaned their fate of garrison duty. The recruits in the regular army and ten regiments were more generously blessed by the fortunes of war and were allowed to "flesh their swords" in Taylor's and Scott's campaigns. The deaths due to disease were just as surely in the "line of duty" as were those on the battlefields, and the volunteers could be proud that theirs was one of the few volunteer regiments to be commended for orderliness.

244. Richmond Enquirer, January 12, November 19, 1847.
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APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1846-47

Senate

Amelia, Pocahontas, Chesterfield, Petersburg: James H. Cox (D).


Spotsylvania, Caroline, Essex: Norborne E. Sutton (W).

Albemarle, Nelson, Amherst: John Thompson, Jr. (W).

Fauquier, Prince William: John R. Wallace (D).

Augusta, Rockbridge: Samuel McDowell Moore (W).

Shenandoah, Hardy, Page, Warren: Williams (D).

Monongalia, Preston, Randolph, Barbour, Marion, Taylor: 
William J. Willey (D).

Isle of Wight, Prince George, Southampton, Surry, Sussex: 
William A. Spark (D).

Mecklenburg and Halifax: Richard H. Baptist (D).

Buckingham, Cumberland, Campbell, Appomattox: Thomas M. 
Bondurant (W).

Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Warwick, 
Williamsburg: Richard R. Garrett (D).

Gulpeper, Madison, Orange, Rappahannock, Greene: John 
Woolfolk (D).

Frederick, Jefferson, Clarke: John S. Gallaher (W).

Tazewell, Wythe, Grayson, Smyth, Carroll, Pulaski: John 
W. Johnston (D).

Greenbrier, Monroe, Giles, Montgomery, Floyd, Mercer, 

Charlotte, Lunenburg, Nottoway, Prince Edward, Appomattox: 
William H. Dennis (D).

Patrick, Henry, Pittsylvania: Vincent Witcher (W).

Charles City, James City, New Kent, Henrico, City of Rich-
mond: Robert C. Stanard (W).

Stafford, King George, Westmoreland, Richmond, Lancaster, 
Northumberland: James M. Smith (D).

Rockingham, Pendleton: George E. Deniele (D).

Berkeley, Morgan, Hampshire: Thomas Sloan (D).

Harrison, Lewis, Wood, Braxton, Ritchie, Taylor, Doddridge, 
Gilmer: John G. Stringer (D).


Norfolk, Nansemond, Princess Anne, City of Norfolk: John 
G. Grump (W).

Brunswick, Dinwiddle, Greensville: Edward P. Scott (D).

King and Queen, King William, Gloucester, Matthews, Middle-
sox: Carter M. Braxton (D).

Fluvanna, Goochland, Louisa, Hanover: Ambler (D).
Loudoun, Fairfax: Asa Rogers (W).
Alleghany, Bath, Pocahontas, Botetourt, Roanoke: John McCauley (D).
Brooks, Ohio, Tyler, Marshall, Doddridge: John Parriott (W).
Kanawha, Mason, Cabell, Fayette, Logan, Wayne, Nicholas, Jackson: James H. Fry (D).

House of Delegates

Aacomac: James W. Curtis (W); William B. Finney (W).
Albemarle: Bazaleel Brown (W); W. D. Hart (W).
Appomattox: Samuel D. M'Dearman (D).
Alleghany: Douglas S. Layne (D).
Amelia: Lewis Harvie (D).
Amherst: Paulus Powell (D).
Augusta: Hugh W. Sheffey (W); Chapman Johnson, Jr. (W).
Bath: Andrew H. Byrd (D).
Bedford: Reeves S. Scruggs (W); William M. Burwell (W).
Berkeley: William L. Boak (W); Adam Small (W).
Botetourt: John W. Thompson (D).
Braxton; Louisa; Gilmer: James Bennett (D).
Brookes: Thomas Bamberrick (D).
Brunswick: John F. Maclin (D); George W. Harrison (D).
Buckingham: Willis F. Beecock (D).
Cabell and Wayne: John Morris (D).
Campbell: Charles L. Mosby (W); Thomas Fox (W).
Caroline: James M. G. Dickinson (D).
Charles City and New Kent: Richmond T. Lacy (W).
Charlotte: Wyatt Cardwell (W).
Chesterfield: John W. Jones (D).
Culpeper: Daniel F. Slaughter (W).
Cumberland: Henry P. Irving (W).
Danville: William F. Thompson (D).
Elizabeth City and Warwick: Thomas P. Chisman (D).
Essex: Lawrence Roane (W).
Fairfax: Thomas R. Love (W).
Fauquier: Robert E. Scott (W); William R. Smith (D).
Fayette and Nicholas: Hiram Hill (D).
Floyd: S. J. A. Evans (D).
Fluvanna: George Stillman (W).
Franklin: William A. Street (D).
Frederick: John F. Wall (W); James H. Carson (D).
Giles and Mercer: Cornelius White (D).
Gloucester: Richard P. Jones (D).
Grayson and Carroll: John Carroll (D).
Goochland: Walter Leake (D).
Greenbrier: John B. Calwell (D).
Greensville: William H. Walker (D).
Hanover: Richard Darracott (W).

Hartford: Samuel B. Major (D); John Stovall (D).

Hampshire: Asa Hiet (D); Daniel Thompson (D).

Hardy: Charles Carter Lee (W).

Harrison and Dodderidge: John S. Duncan (W).

Henrico: John A. Lancaster (W).

Henry: Overton R. Dillard (D).

Isle of Wight: Shimek Godwin (D).

James City, York and Williamsburg: William Howard (W).

Jefferson: Andrew Hunter (W); William B. Thornton (W).

Kanawha: Spencer Patrick (W).

King George: Robert Wallace (W).

King and Queen: John Caines (D).

Kings and Queen: Thomas Robinson (D).

Lancaster and Richmond: Charles Grosham (W).

Lee: William Richmond (D).

Logan: St. Clair Ballard (D).

Louisa: Burr Harrison (W); C. C. McIntyre (W); Jonas F. Schooley (W).

Louisa: John Pindeuter, Jr. (D).

Lunenburg: Upton Edmondson (D).

Madison: Robert A. Banks (D).

Marion: Thomas S. Raymond (W).


Matthews and Middlesex: Christopher T. Browne (D).

Mason and Jackson: Charles S. Waggoner (W).

Mecklenburg: William C. Goode (D); Edwin A. Williams (D).

Monongalia: Andrew Brown (W).

Monroe: Christopher J. Beirne (D).

Montgomery and Pulaski: James F. Edmundson (D).

Montgomery: John H. Breathed (W).

Nansemond: Hugh H. Kelly (D).

Nelson: Charles Perrow (W).

Norfolk Borough: C. W. Newton (W).

Norfolk County: Samuel Watts (W); George D. Happer (W).

Northampton: George T. Yerby (W).

Northumberland: Edwin Nelms (D).

Nottoway: Asa Oliver (W).

Ohio: Daniel M. Edginton (W).

Orange and Greene: Thomas Davis (D).

Page: John McPherson (D).

Patrick: John Tatum (D).

Pendleton: Anderson Newman (D).

Petersburg: John W. Syme (W).

Pittsylvania: James Lanier (W); Whitmell P. Tunsall (W).

Pocahontas: William Cockley (D).

Powhatan: Chastain Cooke (W).

Preston: Buckner Fairfax (D).

Prince Anne: John W. Stone (W).
Prince Edward: Samuel C. Anderson (D).
Prince George: Thomas H. Daniel (D).
Prince William: John W. Tyler (D).
Randolph and Barbours: Henry Sturm (D).
Rappahannock: James F. Strother (W).
Richmond City: Joseph Mayo (W).
Roanoke: William M. Cook (D).
Rockbridge: James F. Harper (W); Charles P. Norman (W).
Rockingham: Naason Bare (D); John G. Brown (D).
Russell: John F. M'Elhenney (W).
Scott: William H. Morison (D).
Shenandoah: John Hill (D); Daniel Stickley (D).
Smyth: Thomas M. Tatc (D).
Southampton: William S. Goodwin (D).
Spottsylvania: Alexander Holladay (D).
Stafford: Edmund C. Fitzhugh (D).
Surry: David Margrave (D).
Sussex: John B. Freeman (D).
Taylor: John S. Burdett (W).
Tazewell: Thomas H. Gillespie (D).
Tyler, Dodridge, and Whetzel: John W. Horner (W).
Warren and Clarke: James Castelmaan (D).
Washington: Samuel E. Goodson (D).
Westmoreland: Hannibal Chandler (W).
Wythe and Pulaski: Benjamin R. Floyd (D).

Party designations - (W) Whig and (D) Democrat - as given in the Richmond Whig, May 11, 1846.
APPENDIX B

VIRGINIA RESOLUTIONS, FEBRUARY 17, 1847

And this General Assembly deeming this proviso to be destructive of the compromises of the Constitution of the United States, and an attack on the dearest rights of the South, as well as a dangerous and alarming usurpation by the Federal Government—Therefore,

Be it resolved, unanimously, by the General Assembly of Virginia, That the Government of the United States had no control, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, over the institution of slavery; and that, in taking any such control, it transcends the limits of its legitimate functions by destroying the internal organization of the sovereignties that created it.

2. Resolved unanimously, That under no circumstances will this body recognize as binding, any enactment of the Federal Government which has for its object the prohibition of slavery in any territory, to be acquired either by conquest or treaty; holding it to be the natural and indefeasible right of each and every citizen of each and every State of this Confederacy, to reside with his property, of whatever description, in any territory which may be acquired by the arms of the United States, or yielded by treaty with any foreign power.

3. Resolved unanimously, That this General Assembly holds it to be the duty of every man, in every section of this confederacy, if the Union is dear to him, to oppose the passage of any law, for whatever purpose, by which territory to be acquired may be subject to such a restriction.

4. Resolved unanimously, That the passage of the above mentioned proviso makes it the duty of every slaveholding State, and of all the citizens thereof, as they value their dearest privileges, their sovereignty, their independence, their rights of property; to take firm united and concerted action in the emergency.

5. Resolved unanimously, That the Governor of this Commonwealth be, and he is hereby requested to transmit copies of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to the Executive Departments of the States of this Union.
VITA

Judith Elaine Fauquier was born September 20, 1930, in Covington, Louisiana. After her third year in high school she moved to Seligman, Missouri, where she graduated from high school in May, 1947. In September of that year she entered the University of Missouri as a Home Economics major.

The next year she enlisted in the Women's Army Corps for a two year period. The outbreak of the Korean War caused this term to be extended an additional year. During this time she served as an instructor and recruiter.

In January, 1952, she entered the University of Kentucky where she majored in Political Science. Her student activities included membership in the Political Science Club, Phi Alpha Theta, Mortar Board, and Phi Beta Kappa. She attended the Geography Workshop at the Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico, during the summer of 1953. In January, 1954, she completed the requirements for a Bachelor of Arts Degree.

February 14, 1954, she became Mrs. Carl Sheets Happs. After a brief tenure as a housewife, she enrolled in the Graduate School of the University of Richmond, Virginia.