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THE ATTITUDE OF CLEVELAND, OHIO, TOWARD THE SLAVERY QUESTION AS EXPRESSED THRU HER LEADING NEWSPAPERS DURING THE CIVIL WAR

Chapter I

Introduction

It is a well known fact that sections of Ohio, especially southern Ohio, contained significant groups of pro-slavery sympathizers and "peace without victory" advocates. The "peace without victory" group was indifferent to the slavery question. Yet it is generally agreed that the success of the sentiments of either group would have had the same results. The Union would have been divided into smaller slave and free sovereign States or it would have been preserved as one all-slave Union. It is necessary to know the sentiments of a group toward slavery in order to understand the attitude of that group toward the Civil War. The primary purpose of this thesis is to determine the attitude of one of Ohio's largest northern cities toward the slavery question.

What was the attitude of Cleveland, Ohio, toward the slavery question? It is understood that before the present investigation no examination has been made of Cleveland's leading newspapers for the sole purpose of answering this enquiry. This medium has been used as the basis for this
investigation not because it is the only means of determining public opinion, but because it is one of the best and most reliable.

One would hesitate in this day of independent thinking and split tickets to make the above statement concerning modern newspapers. One feels justified however in thus cataloging most of the newspapers for the Civil War period. The relation which existed between the political parties, the newspapers, and the people is well known. In the first place the newspapers were effective guides to public opinion. This was true because the people of this period were more actively interested in governmental affairs than people often appear to be now. There was less splitting of tickets and more loyal adherence to party policies as set forth in the local newspapers. In the second place the newspapers were generally party organs. This last fact makes it necessary for an investigation of this kind to be approached from the party standpoint.

Information in this thesis, portraying Cleveland's attitude toward the slavery question has been derived from the Republican Cleveland Morning Leader, and the Cleveland Daily Herald and from the Democratic Cleveland Plain Dealer. The various phases of the enquiry may be grouped around the following general questions; first, What was the general attitude of the people of Cleveland, Ohio, toward the negro race?
Second, Did the Republicans of Cleveland, Ohio, belong to the radical or conservative wing of their party? To what extent did they deviate from that wing? Third, To what extent did the Cleveland Democracy support the war after a solution of the slavery question came to be accepted as a pre-requisite to victory? Fourth, With what grace did the Cleveland Democracy accept the various solutions to the slavery question which were suggested or adopted during this period?

In order to answer the above questions a search has been made thru the above mentioned newspapers. For obvious reasons special emphasis has been placed upon the editorial policy of the papers. Note has been taken of the type of information concerning the negro which each paper published. Note was also taken of the type of information which was ignored or published only as news without comment. Attention was given to the occasional overshadowing of the negro question by events of more emotional interest to the people. Military news especially overshadowed the slavery question.

The conclusions which have been made as a result of this search are both positive and negative. A newspaper which ignored events or opinions might be interpreted to oppose those events or opinions if they were in conflict with proclaimed party policy; or to ignore them because of inability to harmon-
ize them with proclaimed policy. Another fact to be considered here is that the paper may have considered the event or opinion of insufficient importance to be mentioned because of more urgent news. The paper may also have been ignorant of the news at the time when publication would have been in order. Positive published matter of course has justified legitimate conclusions.
CHAPTER II

Cleveland's Attitude Toward the Social Status of the Negro

The leading Cleveland papers were unwilling actually to place the negro upon an equal basis with the white man. This conclusion is made upon the failure to find in any of the three papers examined statements to the effect that the negro should be received upon a social level with the whites. Each of the papers expressed approval of schemes for segregating the negro race from the white race. The Cleveland Morning Leader voices the expressed sentiments of the other two papers when in August of 1862 it agrees with Lincoln that it would be better for both races to be separated.¹

Neither party was willing that negro laborers should come north and compete with white labor. This attitude is positively expressed by The Cleveland Plain Dealer when it speaks of the "Negro invasion" from the South.² The Republican papers' disapproval is more negative than positive in that they do not as often register positive disapproval, yet immediately deny the Democratic paper's expressed fears. The Leader's answer to the Plain Dealer's fears of Oct. 1863, as "ridiculous bosh"³

1. The Cleveland Morning Leader, Aug. 18, 1862.
2. The Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 1860.
is typical. In November of 1862, the Plain Dealer called the Emancipation Proclamation an enemy to laboring men. To this statement, the Leader answered "It is slavery that is driving thousands to the North. Give them freedom at the South, and, so far from negroes coming to the North they would go in large numbers from the North to the South." 1 The Cleveland Daily Herald made known its positive disapproval however when in 1862 it declared "it is plain that the rebellion is now flooding the North with fugitive negroes, ----- How long shall slavery be permitted to make of the North a city of refuge for the blacks?" If the South wins "the exodus of blacks from the slave States will be as a flood. Self defense, therefore against black immigration demands that this rebellion be crushed. ----- The alternative is presented; either strike slavery or destroy our Union, and blight Northern peace by the presence of millions of blacks." 2

When the Negro Soldiers Bill was before Congress in 1863 the three papers agreed with the Herald that "There should be positive provision forbidding any colored officer attempting to exercise authority over a white soldier ----- Independent of the feeling - or prejudice if you please to call it that

1. Leader. Nov. 11, 1862.
2. The Cleveland Daily Herald, July 29, 1862.
precludes the possibility of service of white soldiers under any colored officer. We believe the colored soldiers would themselves prefer white officers. ——Moreover military power could not be intrusted to them, for from the very fact that the race is an oppressed one, would spring up an official arrogance that could not be endured."

The Plain Dealer is the most conspicuous of the three papers in its stand against the equality of the two races. Information which would arouse sympathy for, or be of credit to the race which was published in the Leader or Herald, was ignored by this paper. No mention was made of the unusual punishments which were often inflicted upon the negroes. No space was devoted to the peaceful meetings of free negroes which were held in Cleveland and in other parts of the North from time to time. The bravery of the negro soldiers, so often elaborated upon by the two Republican papers, was ignored by the Democratic paper. Further evidence of the Plain Dealer's unyielding disapproval of racial equality is its silence editorially upon the subject of the recognition of the negro republic of Hayti by foreign powers. In this connection it also ignored the subject of negroes falsely accused of crime

and vindicated.

The Plain Dealer's editorials definitely expressed the paper's attitude toward racial equality. The following lines quoted are typical of the paper's editorial attitude. On Sept. 28, 1860, the paper wrote of "our Black Republican friends who claim that the sentence 'all men are born equal' of necessity included the negro because he is a man. The same logic excluded a woman because she ain't (isn't) a man. They want the negro to vote if he has a 'visible admixture' of white blood, but exclude their wives and sisters and daughters, because they were not born equal to the negro".

On Jan. 11, 1861, the paper declared the "for the first time in our history, the executive and legislative department of our government under the protection of armed men ------- All for the "poor negro". What a blessing to this great country, having in it a party of political preachers, screechers and professional agitators, all devoted to the elevation of the African race at the expense and destruction of the white race."

On Jan. 12, 1861 the paper says, "The Northern Mind has become educated to believe that the African race in this country is a down-trodden people. The reverse is true. They are already morally, socially, and religiously far above what they would have been in their native wilds." When speaking of the purpose of the war, Jan. 31, 1863 it claimed that "the war is
now being prosecuted ------ for the benefit of the negroes and swindling contractors". The Lincoln faction of the Republican party was described on Sept. 9, 1864, as "The Abolition Shoddy Party". It proposes to abolish the Union, and it also proposes to vote an unending lease of shoddy". During the same month, Sept. 27, 1864, the Plain Dealer condemned Lincoln for welcoming Fred Douglas to the White House "as an equal, to the exclusion of many white men waiting in the ante-room -------- free white men of America pause and consider the depths of degredation and infamy."

The Leader and the Herald were consistent in recognizing theoretically the "brotherhood" of the negro race. This distinction between actual and theoretical is made because no instance was found where the Republican papers sanctioned an equality that involved actual equal social acceptance of the blacks.

Mention has already been made of the negative position of the papers. It will be noticed in the following quotations that friendly words for the negro are remote from actual acceptance upon an equal social basis. The implication rather is equality under moral and secular law. The Herald condemns the Plain Dealer for its general attitude toward "our African brother". The Leader often speaks of the "colored men", a

phrase implying a status far above the status implied by the Plain Dealer’s general use of the word "Blacks". In 1860 the Republican papers called for the recognition of the Republic of Hayti. Their attitude was that the "rising republic (will) grow and flourish and speedily take its place among the nations of the earth". 1 In its issue of Jan. 5, 1861, the Leader said that the South was awaking to the realization that slaves have intelligence, and "fearful power which he is likely to use against those who have sought all their lives to make themselves his enemies." In 1862 there were riots against the negro laborers in St. Louis, Cincinnati and Toledo. The Republican papers’ reaction was that "Nature knows no color in the field of labor. And the black man, if he is able and willing has the same right to earn his living by honest and well paid toil as the white man." 2 In answer to the charge of the Columbus statesman that "The Abolitionists seem to regard the army as the proper place to begin to carry out their ideas of negro equality and negro superiority", the Leader says, "We admit the awful charge. The army is the proper place to make the negro equal to the white man in digg-

1. Leader, Nov. 22, 1860.
2. Ibid., Aug. 8, 1862.
ing a ditch, building a fort, or carrying ammunition, and if equal in these respects then he is equal in stopping a rebel bullet, and if in stopping one, then in firing one at that rebel's heart." 1 Negro indolence was excused by the Leader because the fruits of labor were not their own. 2 This paper also demanded that equal educational opportunities be given to the negro if proved capable of receiving that education. 3 The Herald pleaded to give the "negro a chance for manhood" 4.

The Plain Dealer, Leader and Herald agreed that slavery was wrong. The parting of the ways occurred at the question of the nature of the wrong. The Plain Dealer refused to accept the "Higher Law" 5 point of view. 6 In the words of the

1. Leader, Mar. 12, 1863.
2. Ibid, May 26, 1863.
5. On March 11, 1850 Seward made a speech in Congress in opposition to the Compromise of 1850. In speaking of the territorial question he declared that there "is a higher law than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain". This speech was aphorized. "The Higher Law" became propaganda material for the abolitionists and was also accepted by many in the more moderate anti-slavery group.
Plain Dealer "we hate slavery ---- we utterly abhor it, both for the wrongs to which it subjects the blacks and still more for its degrading and demoralizing effects on the white race. We did not make it, nor have we an opportunity to unmake it without trampling in the dust the Constitution we are fighting to defend, and in this we agree in toto with the Republican Administration." ¹ The Republican papers were adherents to the "Higher Law" point of view. This was clearly expressed in the following words of the Herald, "We are of those who believe a hand above man's hand, has so directed this war as to bring down the white man's pride and bring freedom to the black." ² Both Republican papers often wrote of the "barbarism of slavery"³ and the Leader sarcastically talked about the "kind and humanizing effects of the institution of slavery".⁴ The Herald believed that one of the greatest evils of slavery was its degradation of the non slave holding whites.⁵ In the issue of

1. Plain Dealer, Aug. 23, 1861.
4. Leader, Jan. 5, 1860.
Jan. 4, 1861, it asks, "what do the South want? ---- that we should love slavery - that this sympathy should be rubbed out in some way so that we should be willing to stop and arrest a negro suspected of having run away, just as we would stop a stray horse and give notice of the fact ---- Is it possible to bring the North to this? Never!"

The Plain Dealer's utterance on Aug. 23, 1861, "We did not make it (slavery), nor have we an opportunity to unmake it without trampling in the dust the Constitution" is the keynote to its attitude toward the legality of the institution. Nor did it render evidence of readjusting its States Rights Theory to the extent necessary to sanction a change in the Constitution. It clearly expressed its attitude toward constitutional readjustment, "If we do not wish slavery in Ohio it is our business. If the people of Georgia wish slavery it is none of our business, for it is a matter over which we have no control, and are in no way responsible."¹ This paper also believed that any attempt to "prohibit or abolish the relation of master and slave in a territory would be a departure from the original doctrine of the American Institutions" and adhered "immoveably to the principle of non-intervention by Congress".² When the bill prohib-

1. Plain Dealer, Sept. 3, 1864.
iting polygamy in the territories was before Congress the Plain Dealer opposed it on the grounds that if Congress could "prohibit polygamy in a territory, it has the same power over slavery".¹

That this paper came to change its attitude toward the power of Congress over slavery is suggested in an editorial published in July, 1862. It said at this time that the exclusion of slavery from the territories "is the extent of the power of Congress if governed by the Constitution in its action.---------- why is there any necessity for further agitation of the subject in the free States." With the opening of hostilities the paper is silent upon the fugitive slave question except for an item in the issue of Nov. 29, 1861, in which it commended Gen. Halleck's order that the army under his command was not to engage in the business of stealing and secreting negroes.

The Republican papers were of the opinion that slavery was not an institution unalterably guaranteed, or guaranteed to any extent to the States which choose to retain it. This conclusion is evident by the attitude of these papers toward the emancipation and abolition measures which will be discussed later. In their attitude toward slavery in the territories the papers stood firmly with the Republican party in its stand for non-extension. This is concluded from their unqualified approval of the Republican

¹ Plain Dealer, Apr. 12, 1860.
platform in 1860, their call for the passage of the Wilmot proviso,\(^1\) and their rejoicing when the Proviso became a law in 1862. The **Herald** believed that as long as the institution existed the Slave States were "entitled to an efficient law for the recapture of runaway slaves."\(^2\) The **Leader** declared the "people of Ohio and the Western Reserve are law abiding. ----- They hate and detest the fugitive slave law with all the power of their honest souls; and yet when it is clearly set before them they must submit, for the time being to that law. We believe they will do it."\(^3\) This utterance was called forth by the capture of the fugitive Lucy in Cleveland. When it was decided that she must be returned to her master each of the papers

1. **When a bill was pending in Congress in 1846 providing for the purchase of territory in the Southwest, David Wilmot, Representative from Pennsylvania proposed an amendment providing that no money should be appropriated unless slavery should be prohibited in the purchased territory. This proposed amendment came to be known as the Wilmot proviso. Repeated attempts to make the Proviso a law failed until the principle was incorporated in the law which abolished slavery in the territories in 1862.**


3. **Leader**, Jan. 21, 1861.
expressed approval. In 1864 the Republican papers expressed the expected approval when "The Rebellion forced another onward step in the march of American Freedom!" The "infamous law" was then wiped from the statute books, and in repealing it "Congress has performed an act, in comparison with which as far as moral effect and naked justice is concerned, almost all of its other deeds sink into insignificance".

The free negro inhabitants of Cleveland occupied a position in respect to the white population which was in accordance with the general attitude of the city toward the race. This group which is estimated to be about one thousand in number was apparently unobtrusive and law abiding. The Plain Dealer's comments upon this group were of a political character. It expressed apprehension of the future political power of the negro. This anxiety is understood in the light of the fact that the Democrats generally looked upon the Republican party as the Abolition Party. When a law was passed in Arkansas in 1860

1. There was much interest shown in the newspapers over this fugitive slave case. Lucy had run away from her Virginia master and he demanded that Cleveland give her up to him.
3. Leader, June 27, 1864.
requiring the free negroes to leave the State the Plain Dealer, ironically remarked, "Let them come to Ohio, where they can vote the Republican ticket, mix in our common schools and eventually marry our daughters if they like".¹ Six months later this paper wrote, "The African who carries 1, 1 or 2 Saxon blood in his veins is a prince among blacks, but a pitiful creature among white men. They will soon come to the Northern States ------ In many states they will form an active and powerful political party".² A month before this, on May 10, 1861 the paper had written in the same tone, "give them their freedom and they become free voters in the free states."

Little is said during the following year concerning the free negroes. This is understandable when it is remembered that during the greater part of the years of 1862 and 1863 the country's thoughts were filled with fearful concern for the outcome of events upon the battle field. During the latter part of 1863, however, the Plain Dealer, in an editorial calling for adjustment of difficulties between the North and the South, accused the Republicans of preventing a lasting and fair adjustment in their effort to lay foundations for the

1. Plain Dealer, Jan. 11, 1860.

2. Ibid, June 28, 1861.
negro vote.¹

The language used by the Republican papers in speaking of the free colored population causes one to remember that the papers were party organs. The frequency with which these papers use the phrase "our colored citizens" brings to one's mind the word, suave. Yet, in spite of political motives which must be attributed to the Republican as well as the Democratic papers, acknowledgment must be made of the Republican paper's consistent evidence of willingness to be just to the negro. When the fugitive Lucy was stationed in the county jail in Cleveland, the Leader published under the title "Position of our Colored Citizens" the following resolution submitted by the negro population, "Whereas, It was freely circulated in Saturday evening's papers that the colored citizens of Cleveland are disloyal; therefore, Resolved, That we, as citizens of Cleveland, deny such allegation relative to the fugitive now incarcerated in the County Jail. We claim to be law abiding citizens, and deny that any attempt at rescue was in contemplation by the colored people who gathered around the Court House on Saturday, or that any rescue will be attempted. W. E. Ambush, Chairman of Committee."² In January of 1863,

1. Plain Dealer, Aug. 24, 1863.
2. Leader, Jan. 21, 1861.
both Republican papers expressed approval over the great "Emancipation Jubilee" held by "our colored citizens." According to the Leader, in its issue of July 4, 1860, a "Colored Clevelander" was in San Domingo in the interests of forming a colored colony. During August of 1860, the Leader and Herald wrote of the general celebration of West India Emancipation by the "colored people" in the North. On May 13, 1862 the "colored folks" in Washington D. C. were celebrating emancipation. When the people of Northern Ohio, aided the needy freedmen in 1864, the Leader wrote that "Their philanthropy is not of race, nor of skin, and needs only to know that a brother man is in want." When petitions were presented to the Ohio Legislature in 1862 asking that negroes be expelled from the State the people of Ohio were advanced "too far in civilization to close its doors against that unfortunate class who, escaping from bondage from the rebellion states, seek an asylum in our midst." The next year the same paper condemned the Democrats of Ohio for attempting to exclude "colored citizens"

2. Leader, Feb. 1, 1864.
3. Ibid, Apr. 18, 1862.
from the state by legislation.\(^1\)

When the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect the question of caring for the freedmen occupied a considerable amount of Republican newspaper space, while the Democratic paper ignored the needs of this group. During the latter part of 1863, the people were asked to "give money and clothing and to give liberally"\(^2\) to the freedmen because they were "made poor by no crime of their own and whose present wants can be supplied by no possible effort which they can make".\(^3\) The only statistics suggesting the amount that was given by the people of Cleveland is a notice in the *Leader* on Feb. 1, 1864, to the effect that total receipts from the people of Northern Ohio to Jan. 27, was $7,958.50 in cash, and 573 boxes. The future of the negroes was only suggested by the papers. The *Herald* favored the impracticable plan of having lands which were purchased by the government at tax sales in the Department of the South, surveyed and divided into lots of twenty acres alternately and reserved for occupancy by the negroes. Thus "two invaluable movements are inaugurated -

that of cutting into small tracts and of converting the heir of the lash into the owner of the land." The *Leader* would let the future solve the negro problem, "Though the problem of their disenthrallment and ultimate civilization be a vast one, we should not be deterred from an act of justice to the negro race. If the problem cannot be solved in our lifetime, we can be content to leave it to the next generation. Our duty is to act in harmony with history, reason and our own moral institutions. This is all we can do."

CHAPTER III

The Correlation of Slavery with the Civil War.

There was but little doubt in the minds of Clevelanders that the underlying cause of the Civil War was slavery. The Cleveland people were convinced that slavery was wrong and hoped to see its expansion curbed. Both papers were non-extensionists in this sense. As has been pointed out before, the Republican papers, in agreement with their party, would curb the extension of the institution by legislation. They were so thoroughly committed to this principle that there could be "no backing down, no compromise with wrongs, no partnership with slavery". Rather they would "go on bravely and calmly to the issue".1 The Herald's reason for the necessity for a Republican victory in 1860, was the reason expressed by the other Republican paper, - the necessity to protect the slave holders against their slaves. This thought was expressed by the papers in reply to frequent insurrection alarms at the South. The papers insisted that "Instead of a Republican victory inaugurating the abolition of slavery in the States, though such a triumph has become an absolute necessity, it would protect the slave holders against their slaves."----The

1. Leader, Dec. 4, 1860.
race of Toussaint and Turner is not extinct and an avenger will as surely spring up as that God is just, unless the people of this land, by the election of a Republican President, say to the advance of this infernal spirit of slavery extension, thus far and no farther, and here shall thy proud wave be stayed".\(^1\) In 1862 the Leader wrote under a heading "Let the Negro Alone", that "It can't be done, and will not be done until the doom of slavery is sealed with that of the rebellion. Slavery is the cause of this War, and while the war lasts the cause will come up".\(^2\) When Abolition came to be widely advocated in 1864 by the Republican papers, the Herald declared that "it is the natural result of the slave holders rebellion, and South as well as North, the feeling is becoming universal that both the political and physical power of slavery is over in the United States."\(^3\)

The Plain Dealer foreshadowed the future struggle between the slavery and the non-slavery group when it wrote that the allegations that the Dred Scott Decision settled the question of slavery in the territories was a cool assumption. It further declared that there was not a "single

1. Herald, Aug. 6, 1860.
2. Leader, Feb. 14, 1862.
being in the United States who believed that the question of slavery in the territories was finally settled" by that decision.\(^1\) Being a Douglas Popular Sovereignty disciple it called often for the adoption of this theory as the only practicable way to keep slavery out of the territories and to stop the war.\(^2\) Its recognition of slavery as the underlying cause of the struggle is suggested by a cartoon in its issue of Apr. 21, 1860, showing the North and the South each trying to pull the negro to its side of the line. Above were the words "Impending Crisis"; below were the words "Irrepressible Conflict". Lincoln was considered to be the Abolitionist candidate by the Democratic paper. If he were elected, the paper predicted, "senators and representatives from the cotton states will not take their seats at all any more, or if they do it will be merely to prevent hostile legislation and gain time to consolidate the South in armed opposition to the Government."\(^3\)

According to all three papers the immediate cause of the Civil War was the split in the Democratic Party over the slavery question. "So long as the party was a unit and content to do the bidding of slavery, the crisis was postponed, but when

2. Ibid, Jan. 29, 1862.
the rupture happened at the Charleston convention, the political check against secession was removed."

1 When the results of the election were known, the Plain Dealer said, "Lincoln is elected and the South are left no alternative but to stop swearing or go on seceding. Now the question arises for the Democrats to settle, have the South a right to secede for such a cause? If they have not, then it will be the duty of Lincoln, as the chief executive officer and commander-in-chief of the army and navy to prevent a dissolution of the Union if need be by force, and it will be the duty of the Democrats to sustain him in the discharge of such duty."  

2 The Leader placed the responsibility for the war upon the Democrats. It was a "Democratic Rebellion" brought about by the stubborn determination of that group to keep territorial doors open to slavery. The paper's declaration that the election of Lincoln was not the "cause of the present secession movement at the South, but only the pretext for carrying out a predisposed design" was a virtual recogni—

1. Plain Dealer, Jan. 28, 1860.
2. Ibid, Nov. 7, 1860.
3. Leader, Nov. 25, 1863.
tion of the immediate cause.

Each of the papers agreed that the purpose of the war was the preservation of the Union, "first, last, and always".\textsuperscript{1} The papers did not agree however upon the nature of the Union which was to be preserved. The Democratic paper, to the end of the war declared "that the aim and object of the Democratic Party are to preserve the Federal Union and the rights of the States unimpaired".\textsuperscript{2} In 1861 the \textit{Plain Dealer} was beginning to accuse the Republicans of making the war an abolition war. It protested against using the Union army to fight for anything but Union and demanded that "our volunteers be discharged and invited to enlist anew with this understanding. Such is not the war we are supporting. We are for the constitution and not against it."\textsuperscript{3} This paper called continually for "the Constitution as it is and the Union as it was".\textsuperscript{4} The Republican papers never wavered in their avowed purpose of saving the Union. Early in the war however one finds sentiment for a Union which would be all free. "We fight that rebellion may be crushed - that the Union may be preserved, and that the hopes of liberty -

loving the wide world over, may be realized," said the Leader on July 19, 1861.

The following month this paper became even more outspoken in its antislavery sentiments, "the time has passed when we should attempt to conceal the fact the struggle in which we are now engaged is for or against slavery. ------ Abolition is the only possible way to secure a permanent Union."¹ The Herald was just a little behind the Leader in its expression of conviction that abolition must come. This attitude is suggested when in 1862 this paper said, "The sole object of the war is, to clear the track of rebel obstructions and so let the constitution have the same scope as before the rascals blocked up the track. ------ nothing, short of unconditional surrender to the constitution and the laws as they are, will be satisfactory to the people of Ohio."² The above interpretation is given to the quoted passage when it is remembered that constitutional scope to the Republicans meant the right of the National Government to legislate upon the slavery question. When Lincoln announced his intention to issue the Emancipation Proclamation the Leader expressed the sentiments of both papers when it said, "Our victorious armies now feel that they are fighting the great battle of freedom against slavery ------ that

¹ Leader, Aug. 1, 1861.
² Herald, Feb. 26, 1862.
their hands are no longer to be tied and otherwise hampered by the protection of an institution accursed both by God and man". 1

The question naturally presents itself as to how Cleveland reacted to the call to support the war in so far as that support involved the negro question. Did the Democratic States Rights press support a war which came to be definitely linked with abolition? As has already been pointed out, the Republican papers early in the war recognized the inseparability of abolition with victory. The Republican papers were with the exception of the Fremont Proclamation loyal to the Administration. They took Fremont’s part in the Proclamation affair, 2 however, believing that the Proclamation was "misunderstood — as well by those who would avoid mixing up the emancipation question with the war, as by those who seek to make it a war

1. Leader, Sept. 25, 1862.
2. In August of 1861, Fremont, as commander of the Department of the West issued a proclamation freeing the slaves of all of those in Missouri who should be proven to have taken any active part in the rebellion. Lincoln modified this to conform to the law regulating the confiscating of property which was used for insurrectionary purposes.
of emancipation. So far as declaring freedom to the slaves of Missouri rebels are concerned, we see no objection either from principle or from policy. Missourians are a worthless portion who have no property or character to lose. The declaration would not increase the Missouri slave exodus, and would hasten the day of deliverance of that state from the curse of involuntary servitude." The next day this paper declared that the public favor of the late proclamation was almost universal in the loyal states.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Leader} believed with the \textit{Herald} that the Proclamation "struck a vital blow at rebellion in Missouri".\textsuperscript{2} Both papers objected to the removal of Fremont from command. The President's "modification of Fremont's proclamation first opened the door for complaints of that General to be made known",\textsuperscript{3} said the \textit{Leader} in defending Fremont.

The \textit{Plain Dealer} accused the Republicans of making the war an abolition war. It devoted much editorial space to the attempt to convince the people that the war was not a "mere abolition war". It recognized the "abolition element" in it

2. \textit{Leader}, Sept. 21, 1861.
yet contended that the "main contending powers" were not of that order. Yet this paper was willing to support a war that was for the preservation of the Union. When Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers in April of 1861, it said, "if the Constitution is to be the guide and President Lincoln wants citizen soldiers to put down rebellion against the Federal Laws, reunite the Confederacy and make the flag of our Union respected everywhere then we, as a Union man are ready to enlist, forgetting all past differences of political opinion, and fighting alone for our country, its liberty and laws." After 1863, the paper emphatically condemned the government for "perverting" the purpose of the war. In an editorial giving some reasons why the administration of the government should go into different hands, it declared that "the war has been perverted from its originally declared purpose (namely, the simple suppression of certain armed organizations in the South, with a view to the restoration of friendly and constitutional relations) to a gigantic scheme for the subversion of the industrial system of the Southern States." In the issue of Sept. 6, 1864, it accused Lincoln of being "chained to the sectional

1. Plain Dealer, Jan. 29, 1862.
2. Ibid, Apr. 15, 1861.
3. Ibid, Jan. 29, 1864.
union of an abolition party. He has protracted this war and filled unnumbered thousands of graves to build up such a union upon the ghastly wreck of that sublime fabric which the patriotic statesmen of 1787 created".

In spite of utterances such as these the Plain Dealer actually supported the war except when political motives influenced otherwise. The slavery question was so inseparable from the question of the preservation of the Union, that the Plain Dealer found it impossible to refuse to support the war because of it. It placed the preservation of the Union above everything; it fought or ignored the slavery question. It supported the war with but one aim in view - to preserve the Union. This is evidenced by its refusal to have anything to do with Copperheadism. It believed that group of peace advocates to be "far more dangerous than the open armed rebels of the South". It also refused to have anything to do with peace movements except upon the basis of the union of all of the States. When the Democrats gained victories in the local elections in the Northwest in 1863, it declared that these victories should not be interpreted to mean favor of peace on any terms with Jeff Davis. Its creed was, first, No peace upon the basis of dissolution of this Union, second, 1. Plain Dealer, Sept. 10, 1861.
Peace promptly — upon the basis of a restored Union, third, Constitutional government and not bayonet rule for the North and South. During the same autumn it declared in an editorial under the title "Is Peace Possible" that "the Federal Government is not fighting for glory but for national existence. To undertake such a work and stop short because war is an evil, and peace desirable would be ignominy forever." Generally the Plain Dealer supported the Union candidates for city and state elections although it admitted that it did this only to show a united front to the enemy. The Leader complained in 1862, that the Democrats supported the Union tickets, but that the support was bounded by the old party lines. However, the support was given, and elections during the war in Cleveland went strongly Union. When Lincoln's various calls for volunteers came, no word of complaint is justified for the way in which the Plain Dealer pleaded with Clevelanders that "the rebellion must be overcome. It can be — it must be — it shall be — it will be, 'To arms! To arms! ye brave!'" Again in 1863 it challe-

1. Plain Dealer, Mar. 14, 1863.
3. Ibid, July 31, 1861.
4. Leader, July 24, 1862.
5. Plain Dealer, July 3, 1862.
engaged, "Every patriot will burnish up his gun and rally to the call". 1 A few months later came further pleas to the Ohio boys to volunteer. "Volunteer, and we shall have no draft" it answered in reply to echoes of disapproval of the draft. This paper favored volunteering rather than drafting, 2 yet believing that the "law must be obeyed" it condemned in vehement terms the draft riots in New York. 3

All three of the papers approved of treating the captured slaves as contraband of war. At the beginning of the war the Plain Dealer spoke of the advantages of a double status, "If the fugitive colored people down South claimed by the rebels are chattels, they may be confiscated; if they are men they are deserters from the enemy and can't be returned." 4 This paper expressed neither approval nor disapproval of the treatment of slaves as contraband after this. It only published contraband news as uncommented fact. Therefore it would seem that its attitude was that of the Leader and Herald. These papers favored Secretary of War Cameron's view that because considered property by the South the slaves should be considered

1. Plain Dealer, Oct. 16, 1863.
3. Ibid, July 15, 1863.
4. Ibid. June, 16, 1861.
so by the North. This would justify the North in treating them as contraband of war when captured. ¹

The Cleveland papers were not so well agreed that negroes should be allowed to become soldiers of the Federal Army. The Plain Dealer opposed the plan from the first. Especially did it oppose the putting of captured slaves in the army. In 1864 this paper was still declaring that the taking of slaves forcibly from their masters, and "putting them into the army will certainly open the eyes of the American people to the utter lawlessness of Mr. Lincoln's character."² Of course this paper had nothing complimentary to say of the conduct of the negro soldiers. it ignored them. The Republican papers were warmly in favor of arming the negroes. During the first part of 1862 they were calling for negro troops.³ One finds nothing but praise in both Republican papers for the way in which the negroes conducted themselves in the army.

2. Plain Dealer, July 24, 1864.
3. Herald, Apr. 11, 1862, Leader, May 6, 1862.
CHAPTER IV

Solutions for the Negro Problem

Various possibilities for the solution of the negro problem presented themselves during the Civil War. The first in order of time was the possibility of more compromise. The Democratic paper's real attitude upon the question was at times overshadowed by political expediency. Nevertheless, the impression received after reading the paper's comments upon the question for this period, is that the paper would have been willing to come to an agreement upon terms which would have guaranteed slavery in the South and Union. However the Plain Dealer at times deviates from this stand. When, just before the Charleston convention, the Richmond Enquirer wrote, "What then should sound policy and fair play suggest to the delegates from the anti-Democratic States? If the Northern Democracy are as we believe they are, true and faithful to the constitutional rights of the South, let their delegates to Charleston, adopt, without question, or dispute the platform of principles which the Southern States may present, and thus quiet the charges and insinuations of unsoundness leveled at them by the Southern opposition."

The Plain Dealer answered, "The fling about anti-Democratic States comes with wretched bad grace from a section of the Union for whom the Democracy of the North have been making
personal and political sacrifices until they have lost their ascendency in almost every free state. We have stood by the Southern interpretations of the Constitution until we have lost all but an organization as a party and are now being taunted as being anti-Democratic States."¹ When a National Peace Conference was being proposed by some during the latter part of 1860, the Plain Dealer thought differently. It believed that the South would not "recede from their politics one jot or tittle in a convention or out. If the North have any more conventions to make, let them go into conventions. We have had enough of conventions."² Yet this paper's reaction

1. Plain Dealer, Mar. 12, 1860.
2. Ibid, Nov. 19, 1860.
to Lincoln's speech at Indianapolis\(^1\) would lead one to think that the paper had changed its mind upon the question of a peace conference. It declared that the "whole programme of the Peace Conference are (is) knocked into a cocked hat by this war speech, and long before Mr. Lincoln reaches Washing-

ton he will be required to modify his views, or he will be stopped from crossing the Mason Dixon Line. Mr. Lincoln's policy, had it been timely adopted, might have been both right and expedient; but events have so far progressed that it now is for the government to decide whether the revolution has not

\(^1\) In a stump speech at Indianapolis Lincoln said, "Would marching an army into South Carolina with hostile intent be invasion? I think it would, and it would be coercion also, if the South Carolinans were forced to submit. ---- But if the United States should merely hold and retake its forts and collect the duties, or withhold the mails were they habitually violated, would any of these things be invasion or coercion? Do professional Union-lovers resolved to resist coercion, understand that such things as these, on the part of the United States, would be invasion or coercion? If they do their idea of preservation is exceedingly thin and airy".
been too successful to be called any longer a rebellion.\textsuperscript{1} When commissioners from the Southern States came to Washington to secure recognition as a foreign power the \textit{Plain Dealer} accused the "not an inch no parley with traitor government" with seeking a moment to parley.\textsuperscript{2} This paper had little sympathy for the South's demand for additional guarantees as a basis of settlement with the North, and as a condition precedent to the preservation of the Union. South Carolina was considered to be like "Oberlin, so conceited and fanatical that public opinion had no effect at all upon her".\textsuperscript{3} In its issue of Aug. 21, 1861, under the title "Concession and Compromise" it declared that "These terms are becoming quite obsolete in our vocabulary of terms. When speaking of the South and the rebellion who now say concession and compromise? Such an one would be looked upon with suspicion and watched as a traitor."\textsuperscript{4} As the war progressed however the \textit{Plain Dealer} talked more and more of the desirability of making some concessions to the South. However it must be remembered that suggestions to this effect were always accompanied by a reminiscence of the fact that compromise suggestions implied Union. In 1863 the \textit{Plain Dealer} declared that "Whenever the

1. \textit{Plain Dealer}. Feb. 12, 1861.
South extends her hand to be helped back into the Union morally, as she has never ceased to be politically - we will take the hand, and favor every honorable and legal measure, to obliterate the "Slings and arrows" of this terrible strife. It shall not be said that we have taunted the States now in arms against the Government, with their inability to cope with us".\(^1\) This paper harped often upon the Democratic willingness to accept the Crittenden propositions. The "voters of Ohio" were admonished to remember that the compromise bill which "would have saved the Union" without the "loss of a single man" was defeated by the Republicans.\(^2\) During the last year of the war this paper was still willing to compromise with the South upon terms which would keep all of the States in the Union but would guarantee the institution of slavery to the South.\(^3\)

After the latter part of 1862 the Republican papers ignored the compromise question. Before that time their manifestations of disapproval were those expressed in connection with the agitation for the acceptance of the Crittenden Compromise. These papers unreservedly denounced this suggested solution to the question. To adopt it, they believed would be "to overthrow

1. **Plain Dealer**, Mar. 4, 1863.
the Chicago platform upon which the Republican Party won its victory.¹ They believed that the "vital principle" of the Republican platform was that "slavery could have no legal existence in the territories".² They were in favor of standing by that principle "not simply because it is in the platform, but because it is just and right".³ In August of 1862, the Leader granted that Crittenden's proposition⁴ "may have been all well enough two years ago. As an evidence of a spirit of modification the Republicans in Congress adopted (?) it one year ago, but it is out of date and behind the present times".⁵

1. Leader, Jan. 18, 1861.
2. The Republican platform of 1860 declared that "the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom; ______ we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individual, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States."
3. Leader, Mar. 2, 1861.
4. At the beginning of the war Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky submitted a plan of compromise whereby squatter sovereignty would prevail in the territories, and slavery would continue to exist in the District of Columbia, Interstate slave trade would be prohibited and the personal liberty laws would be withdrawn.
5. Leader, Aug. 28, 1862.
Another possible solution to the negro problem was to colonize them. This of course involved only free negroes of the North and South or freed negroes of the South. The Republican papers from the first favored Lincoln's plan for compensated emancipation and colonization in Liberia, South America or Hayti. The Leader approved of a ludicrous scheme suggested in the Continental Monthly whereby the negroes would be given the State of South Carolina for settlement.\textsuperscript{1} The Plain Dealer approved of colonization for the free negroes, but disapproved at first of compensated emancipation. It asked, "why should the government buy up one kind of property that has deteriorated in value on account of the war and not another? How many property interests in the North have suffered from this rebellion, and will the government compensate for these losses?"\textsuperscript{2} By another year, however, the paper had come to the conclusion that the negroes would do well if they would accept the President's plan.\textsuperscript{3}

The Republican papers and the Democratic paper disagreed most intensely upon the subject of the Emancipation Proclamation. The Republican papers subordinated the emancipation question to that of the preservation of the Union; yet they called for emancipation as the most efficacious way in which to crush the rebellion. When

1. Leader, Dec. 28, 1861.
2. Plain Dealer, Mar. 3, 1861.
3. Ibid, Aug. 20, 1862.
Lincoln wrote in his open letter to Horace Greeley that if he could save the Union without freeing any of the slaves he would do it; if by freeing all of the slaves he would do it; or if by freeing some he would do that, the Republican papers approved. They believed that this was right and all that the anti-slavery community asked of him. However, the Leader asked, "How far does slavery stand in the way of Union?" Answering its own question, it said that it was much in the way and should be removed.\(^1\) Until the passage of the thirteenth amendment these papers expressed approval of all projects, materialized or otherwise which made the negro more free. When the free negroes celebrated the 26th anniversary of West India Emancipation in August, 1860 these papers commended the demonstrations. They noted especially that the exercises were conducted with good order in spite of the fact that they were numerouslly attended. On Jan. 22, 1863 the Herald called attention to the fact that emancipation in the Dutch West Indies had been "peaceably accomplished" and that there was "no demand for re-enslavement."

Emancipation in districts under Union Military control was approved in the main, by the Republican papers. Mention has already been made of the joyous reception given to Fremont's

\(^1\) Leader, Aug. 25, 1862, Herald, Aug. 26, 1862.
proclamation. When Gen. Hunter, commanding the Department of the South, issued his order which was to free forever slaves in Georgia, Florida and South Carolina, the papers approved of the annulling of the order by Lincoln. They did this, not because they were opposed to emancipation in the military district, but because they had come to the conclusion that emancipation should come directly from the government. They were glad that Hunter made his order because it gave Lincoln a chance to "foreshadow his policy", and to utter a "warning voice."\(^1\)

When Lincoln sent his special message to Congress on March 6, 1862, in which he advocated gradual emancipation, the Leader agreed that "The course suggested by the President's message should be eventually pursued."\(^2\) After Congress had passed the bill emancipating the slaves in the District of Columbia the Herald asked its readers to remember that for some time it had "advocated the passage of such a law".\(^3\) There was general rejoicing when the slaves were emancipated in the territories or in any of the States. Missouri caused more editorial interest than any of the other States when it freed its slaves. This was probably due to the part which

2. Leader, Mar. 13, 1862.
3. Herald, Apr. 9, 1862.
this State had played in the Kansas - Nebraska troubles. The Republican papers followed the long struggle over slavery in this State with sympathetic interest. When a Missouri State Convention adopted an ordinance of gradual emancipation in July of 1865, these papers were disappointed. They were glad that this attempt to emancipate the slaves had failed because it was not considered adequate to the demand of the hour. When the radicals gained control of that State in 1864, they chose a new state convention. This convention which was to adopt an ordinance of immediate emancipation in January of 1865, was hailed with acclamations. "Thank God for Missouri! Missouri is free!" cried the Leader. After the passage of the immediate emancipation bill the Herald expressed satisfaction that former attempts to emancipate slaves in the State were unsuccessful. For the failure resulted in giving rapid growth to the immediate emancipation sentiment.¹

Immediately after the breaking out of hostilities, the Leader called the attention of its readers to a speech delivered by John Quincy Adams, in which he said that the Government possessed the full power for the emancipation of the servile population of any or all of the States.² This paper suggestive-

¹. Herald, June 3, 1865.
². This speech was delivered by John Quincy Adams in the House of Representatives on August 14 and 15, 1842.
ly remarked that "the Doctrine will at this time command more attention than it did when first promulgated."\(^1\) It has already been noted that the **Herald** early spoke of the necessity of depriving rebels of their property. It being "plain that slavery is the fountain whence the rebellion draws its life", the paper asked "how long will slavery be permitted to strike its blows at the heart of the Union".\(^2\) When Lincoln issued his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation in September, 1862, the Republican papers' joy was great. According to the **Leader** "the day will live in history and through all coming time as the greatest of the country."\(^3\) The **Herald**, a little less grandiloquent, reassured the Democratic Press that it "was solely a war measure". It continued in the same editorial however, that "every act necessary for the suppression of Rebellion is right, -- He who at this day asks to have slavery spared is willing that the thousands of white men who have left our fields and farms, shall die in battle or in camp, and their families and friends be made hopeless mourners, that the white men-laborers at the South may enjoy the labor of their slaves while they themselves plot treason in National council, hang loyal men by the wayside and slaughter in battle our northern troops."\(^4\) On the Proclamation's first anniversary, the **Herald**

1. **Leader**, May 22, 1861.
summed up the effects of this measure as follows, "It broke the back of this 'peculiar institution' and slavery is everywhere dying out more rapidly than the most sanguine could have anticipated. Providence and the Proclamation will in due time complete the great work."\(^1\)

The Democratic paper refusing to acknowledge that slavery had an inseparable relationship with the war considered Lincoln's Proclamation as extraneous and wanton. It had no sympathy with compulsory emancipation projects coming from the central government or any of the military officials. Besides the papers' reaction to the Proclamation, this attitude was evidenced in its condemnation of the orders issued by Fremont and Hunter and emancipation in the District of Columbia and the territories. The greatest oral war was waged when the Republican papers were calling for emancipation by proclamation in the rebellion states during the latter part of 1861 and 1862. The paper assured its readers that "not the intervention of England herself in favor of the rebel cause would give the conspirators such delight as would such a proclamation from President Lincoln. It would be worth a million men to them."\(^2\) It was sickening to "see the manner in

2. **Plain Dealer**, Apr. 28, 1862.
which this negro question is thrust forward."¹ Its readers were continually being told that the war had been "prolonged at a great loss of life and expenditure of money by these abolition schemes, that the disaffected people of the South had become aggravated and embittered into a closer union by them, that thousands of helpless negroes had been thrown upon the charity of the North, that much political division of sentiment had been created in the North, and that thus far not one practically beneficial result had followed the adoption of the abolition dogmas. ----- Let us with becoming zeal and energy 'put our foot down firmly' on this hydra of abolition and crush its vile life completely out before it smothers to death what is left worth preserving of our institutions and of public liberty".²

The Plain Dealer did however favor any schemes for emancipation which would come directly from the people. During the discussion which preceded the Emancipation Proclamation it called often for gradual emancipation and squatter sovereignty. As the Border States made their slaves free this paper was glad. During the agitation for emancipation in Missouri it declared that if the bill could be sustained it would be a Godsend to

1. Plain Dealer, Dec. 10, 1862.
2. Ibid, Dec. 29, 1863.
Missouri. "That State has hardly an apology for preserving slavery."¹ This same approval was expressed when other States made their slaves free.

The Republican papers of Cleveland were abolition papers, but they were Union abolitionists. In January of 1861 the Leader denied that the Republican party was an abolitionist party. Under the title "Are the Republicans Abolitionists?", the Leader answered, "In vain have the Republican Press denied the charge; in vain have the Republican speakers repudiated the charge." In the same editorial it quoted Wendell Phillips words; "Thirty years ago Southern Leaders, sixteen years ago Northern abolitionists announced their purpose to seek the dissolution of the American Union. Who dreamed that success would come so soon?" The Leader challenged that, "No Democrat, Northern or Southern dares after reading that, proclaim it as the doctrine of the Republican Party".² Yet the Leader only emphasized her stand as an abolitionist sympathizer when it published, two days later, a letter signed "An abolitionist". The letter was inspired by the discussion of Wendell Phillips' abolitionism. It declared that "the great body of Abolitionists never were disunionists. They never claimed any right to interfere, except by arguments and in a moral way.

1. Plain Dealer, July 2, 1863.
2. Leader, Jan. 24, 1861.
with slavery in the States. Messrs. Garrison and Phillips represent only a small fragment of Abolitionists".\(^1\) The Leader's real attitude toward the question was portrayed when she closed the discussion by saying that "All abolitionists should not be held responsible for the disunion sentiment of Wendell Phillips any more than all slave holders for those of Yancy."\(^2\) A discussion of the attitude of the Herald and the Leader toward Horace Greeley's abolitionism would be but a repetition of that of Wendell Phillips. John Brown was hailed as a martyr. When the legislature of Virginia appropriated $150,000 in January of 1860 to use toward paying expenses of the John Brown war, the Leader commented, "a like appropriation to establish public schools in which young Virginia could be taught to read and write, would exert a still more happy influence on the destiny of the Old Dominion".\(^3\) Calls were made by both papers in July of 1860, to give money to the John Brown fund.

By the beginning of 1861 the Republican papers were recognizing the fact that the war would involve a solution of the slavery question. A solution to the question would come only with abolition insisted both papers in February of that year.

1. Leader, Jan. 26, 1861.
2. Ibid, Jan. 28, 1861.
The "final doom of slavery is to come thru the agency of its friends". A slave Republic could not be maintained because it must be necessarily expensive, said the **Leader** in speaking of the probability of a slave confederacy.¹ When Charles Sumner made a speech at Cooper's Union declaring that slavery was the cause of the war and in its extinction must be found the cure the **Leader** believed that this was "one of the cheering signs of the times, and shows that the public are no longer satisfied to be assured that there is war and rebellion in our land, but that they enquire into the cause, and demand that the cause shall be indicted for its offense against National safety and honor".² By another year the papers had come to acknowledge the fact that it was "anticipating manifest destiny ........ to assert that the annihilation of slavery cannot long be postponed by any human agency."³ Satisfaction expressed for the **Emancipation Proclamation** was accompanied by calls for abolition. Legislatures were told that they could not attend to this matter too quickly. They were advised to "turn their attention to this subject before suggesting presidential candidates. Slavery was the cause of the war. The war has developed the fact that Slavery and Republican institutions cannot exist together in harmony".⁴ Their duty was to "put slavery where not even a

1. **Leader**, Feb. 15, 1861.
2. **Ibid.**, Nov. 30, 1861.
smell can offend the nostrils of humanity".\(^1\) If slavery "comes out of this war with its capacity for reorganizing itself again undestroyed, the people of the South will be more sensitive than ever in regard to it. \(\text{----} \) It must be placed by an amendment to the Constitution in such a position that it can no longer become the source of war."\(^2\) This agitation was continued until "the last and crowning act in this wonderful progress of the anti-slavery sentiment was rendered by the passage of the thirteenth amendment."\(^3\)

The Democratic party in Cleveland fought abolition, but finally accepted it as the inevitable. From a position of strenuous opposition, it came to accept the territorial abolition law, but it would grant Congress no further power over the institution. A discussion of its right against abolition would simply be a repetition of what has already been said in connection with this paper's attitude toward other phases of the slavery question. As soon as the Confederacy was crushed, the Plain Dealer would bring the rebellion States back to their old status, and if possible make stronger "the guarantee of personal liberty in the United States." Personal liberty in this editorial meant the right of each state to have slavery if it

1. Herald, Apr. 4, 1864.
2. Leader, Aug. 22, 1864.
3. Ibid., Feb. 2, 1865.
wanted it. On Dec. 8, 1862, it counseled Congress that if it would induce an immediate proclamation to the communities living in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Tennessee, "that their persons and rights of property will be respected, if they will return to their allegiance ----- we feel confident that the happiest result would follow". In defining the campaign issues of 1864 it informed "the dominant party that it must not expect the Democratic Party to accept the idea that a party who will have no Union save upon their abolition plan, is animated by any elevated or patriotic idea". The thirteenth amendment put a quietus upon further agitation against abolition. On January 27, 1865, the Plain Dealer wrote that "The Democrats in Congress seem to think that it is a fiat of fate that slavery is about to disappear and is no longer a subject to quarrel about. --- One thing we all have to agree to is that slavery is fast passing away and if the war continues another year it will not have a foothold on this continent."

1. Plain Dealer, May 27, 1863.
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

Conclusions based upon this investigation may be generally summed up under phases of the negro question upon which the Cleveland people agreed, and those upon which they disagreed. In so far as its opinion was expressed thru its leading newspapers Cleveland agreed that the negro race socially could not be placed upon a par with the white race. The Democratic press positively asserted it and the Republican press implied it. The Leader and the Herald during the war called only for political equality in so far as it involved freedom from bondage and opportunity for self development. Clevelanders agreed that slavery was the underlying cause of the Civil War and that for the best interests of the country slavery should be abolished.

The papers disagreed upon the way in which abolition should come. The Democratic paper was in agreement with Democratic party policy in that it did not cease to advocate the adoption of squatter sovereignty. It fought the passage of the bill to abolish slavery in the territories to the time when it became a law in 1862. It then bent its energies toward blocking if possible by public opinion the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment. The battle was
waged upon the grounds that these measures were inexpedient and in direct opposition to rights which were incapable of being alienated from the States. This contention was continued until the passage of the thirteenth amendment in 1865, made further agitation useless.

The Republican papers were in agreement with Republican party policy. They granted the constitutionality of the institution in the states where it already existed and would protect it there, but would let it go no further. When the people of their own accord abolished slavery in their local communities these papers were glad, but this was not sufficient. Congress had jurisdiction over the territories, and congressional legislation alone could free the territories entirely from the institution of slavery. After the passage of the territorial abolition bill came the call to Lincoln to issue as a necessary war measure the Emancipation Proclamation. This implied, however, that the party would still protect the institution in the Border States. The proclamation of 1863 only brought the party a step higher in its abolition aspirations. From this time on, the call was for an amendment as the only legal way to eliminate slavery from American soil.

There was much contention over the relation of the war to the solution of the slavery question. The Democratic papers' support of the war is especially commendable because of the involving of this question which it believed should be extrane-
ous to the controversy. Along with reproaches to the dominant party for forcing the slavery question into the war as an issue, came calls to support the war. However, this paper recognized the fact that there probably would have been no Civil War if the United States had been all free. It believed that the slavery question was one which belonged to the States separately. It had a right in the territories until the acquirement of statehood gave the right to exclude. Having been allowed to enter congressional halls, compromise was the only way out. The Republican party preferred war. The Southern States preferred secession and possible war. "Treasonable" secession was the direct cause of the war and the Democratic paper asked for nothing but to bring the seceded states back into the Union.

Until 1862, the Republicans agreed with the Democrats that the war was solely for the preservation of the Union. During this year came the conviction however that the divinely appointed purpose of the war was the abolition of slavery from American soil. There could be no victory with slavery. From this time until the passage of the thirteenth amendment these papers were warring for an all free United States of America.
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