

pardon." Upon the common ground of honoring the brave, the Union and Confederate veterans unite to offer tribute to departed valor.

There is another feature of this memorial work that makes the rite a broad one. It is not alone those who died for the cause that are thus honored by the Grand Army, but every Union soldier who has since passed away, so far as the graves can be identified. It does not matter that a veteran has devoted a quarter of a century to civil pursuits since his military service ended, or that changes of opinion on the issues of the war have been openly declared by him: all is forgotten except the fact that he once answered the call of duty. Mere partisan feelings are tabooed, and the veteran, though he died but yesterday, is remembered at his burial with military honors. To his comrades he has become a "dead soldier," whose "march" is just "over," and whose spirit has joined the "long column"

above. There is in this catholicity of soldier sentiment, winning, as it does, the admiration and sympathy of former foes, an earnest of civil security in the future.

In that strong fraternal impulse also, which is expressed in the most touching manner in the joint memorial services along the old border, and in some of the chief interior cities of the South, there is a trace of further development of that true national sentiment which has had such remarkable growth in the South since the war. Lincoln said of the people of the North and the South, in 1865: "Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God." To-day the veterans' memories of the conflict that called them to arms are on both sides turning to a single noble ideal—martial heroism. Surely the worshipers of that ideal will know no North and no South while twining chaplets to immortalize the brave.

OPEN LETTERS.

Fraternization—The Blue and the Gray.

IN the number of this magazine for July, 1888, I gave a list of the important reunions of organized bodies of Union and ex-Confederate veterans. The list was as full as the available records would permit.¹ Other instances of fraternal meetings were the receptions given to the Gate City Guard, of Atlanta, Georgia, in 1879, at Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Hartford, Boston, and elsewhere, by local military organizations, composed in part of Union veterans, and a reunion at Elizabeth, New Jersey, October 19, 1875, participated in by ex-Confederates living in the North and numbers of Union veterans who responded to the call.

Since the publication of my article on reunions, Mr. William G. James, Assistant Adjutant-General Department of Louisiana and Mississippi, G. A. R., has sent me the following item from the New Orleans "Picayune," in an account of the Confederate Memorial Services of April 6, 1878:

During the day a deputation from the Grand Army of the Republic visited the Confederate monument with an offering of two baskets of flowers and a number of bouquets, with this inscription attached:

IN MEMORIAM. A TRIBUTE TO THE FALLEN BRAVE FROM
JOSEPH A. MOWER POST NO. 1, DEPARTMENT OF
LOUISIANA, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. James adds:

On the 30th of May following this occurrence, just as the steamboat with the comrades of Mower Post and their friends was landing at Chalmette National Cemetery, there came alongside a tugboat with a barge, evidently fitted up for the occasion, filled with ladies and gentlemen, who proved to be the members and guests of two Confederate veteran organizations, with floral offerings for our dead. This party was followed by another composed of the Continental Guards (ex-Confederates), also bringing offerings. On each Memorial Day since, these Confederate organizations have presented offerings and participated with us in our memorial services at Chalmette National Cemetery, and it is a question whether there are not more ex-Confederates than Union veterans present on these occasions.

¹ In the account of the Antietam reunion of September, 1887, the "50th N. Y. Volunteers" should read "20th N. Y. Volunteers."

Mower Post was organized April 3, 1872, and now has nearly 150 members in good standing.

George L. Kilmer,

Abraham Lincoln Post No. 13, Dep't New York, G. A. R.

General McClellan's Baggage-Destroying Order.

L. BY JAMES F. RUSLING, LATE BREVET BRIGADIER-GENERAL, U. S. V.

IN Messrs. Nicolay and Hay's "Lincoln," referring to General McClellan's conduct after the battle of Gaines's Mill, June 28, 1862 (see THE CENTURY MAGAZINE, November, 1888, p. 142), in a foot-note they say:

Lieutenant-Colonel B. S. Alexander, of the Corps of Engineers, gave the following sworn evidence before the Committee on the Conduct of the War (p. 592). He said he saw, on the evening of the 28th, at General McClellan's headquarters at Savage's Station, an order directing the destruction of the baggage of the officers and men, and he thought also the camp equipage; appealing to the officers and men to submit to this privation because it would be only for a few days, he thought the order stated. He went to the general at once, and remonstrated with him against allowing any such order to be issued, telling him he thought it would have a bad effect upon the army—would demoralize the officers and men; that it would tell them more plainly than in any other way that they were a defeated army, running for their lives. This led to some discussion among the officers at headquarters, and Colonel Alexander heard afterward that the order was never promulgated, but suppressed.

Now is it not very singular that nobody has ever produced a copy of that "order"? General McClellan in his official report of the Peninsula campaign, and also in his "Own Story" (1887), makes no mention of it. And yet it is the truth of history that just such an "order" was "issued" and "promulgated" by him on that occasion, for I myself saw and read it. I was then a captain and assistant quartermaster of Carr's (Patterson's) brigade, Hooker's division of the Third Army Corps (Heintzelman's). The order was received at brigade headquarters from the division headquarters about 8 P. M., June 28, and handed to me and others there for our official guidance. The brigade

itself was out on picket, in front of Fair Oaks, with headquarters pitched near Fair Oaks, just south of the railroad. After showing the order to me and others, the adjutant-general (C. K. Hall, now deceased) mounted his horse and rode to the front to promulgate it to the regiments of the brigade (the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th New Jersey and the 2d New York). What became of this order afterward I do not know, but suppose it was destroyed, with most of the official desks and papers of the brigade, near Bristow Station, Virginia, in the August following, when Stonewall Jackson got possession of the railroad there, in the rear of Pope, and burned several hundred cars, including the baggage of our brigade. But the substance of the order I entered in my "Army Journal" a few days subsequent to the issue of it, and it is recorded there as follows:

On the night of Saturday above mentioned (June 28, 1862), about dark, we received orders from army headquarters to load the trains with ammunition and subsistence, to destroy all trunks and surplus baggage, to abandon all camp equipage but not to burn it, and to decamp across White Oak Swamp, in the direction of James River, with as much expedition as possible. . . . Ordered headquarters train to gear up, then galloped to the regiments and directed regimental quartermasters to report with their trains to me near Savage's Station as soon as possible. Then returned to camp, and proceeded to arrange for the skedaddle. Resolved to save all private baggage and official papers at headquarters at any rate, and packed my train accordingly. . . . This done, I packed three tents, and abandoned the rest (only three), first cutting them to pieces, and with this exception loaded up everything. About 11 P. M. bade the staff "good-bye," and soon after 12 M. reached the plain by Savage's Station.

My recollection is that the "order" came by telegraph, and read about as follows:

The general commanding directs that the trains be loaded with ammunition and subsistence, and dispatched as promptly as possible by Savage's Station, across White Oak Swamp, in the direction of James River. All trunks and private baggage, and all camp equipage, will be abandoned and destroyed, but not burned. The general commanding trusts his brave troops will bear these privations with their wonted fortitude, as it will be but for a few days.

In obedience to this order, all of the regiments of our brigade abandoned and destroyed their camp equipage, and most of their private baggage, such as officers' trunks, valises, etc., as well as a large amount of new army clothing just received. The First and Second Brigades of the division received the same order, and of course obeyed it in the same way. Trunks and valises were knocked and hacked to pieces; clothing was cut and torn to rags; tents were ripped and slit to ribbons. Our wall, Sibley, and hospital tents — many almost new — were cut and ripped, and the poles chopped to pieces, but nothing was set on fire that night, lest the enemy should learn of our movement prematurely. Next morning, when the troops fell back to Savage's Station, fire was set to many things, including the commissary depot at Fair Oaks.

That extraordinary order certainly was "issued" and "promulgated" to Hooker's division of the Third Army Corps, and hence, I presume, to the rest of the corps. The truth, I think, is that it was promulgated to the Third Corps, and perhaps to another, but not to the rest of the army, because of the vigorous protests of Colonel Alexander and others, who saw its demoralizing tendency at a glance.

TRENTON, N. J.

II. BY GEORGE E. CORSON.

ON the twenty-eighth day of June, 1862, I was commissary sergeant, and acting quartermaster sergeant, of the first battalion, 17th regiment, United States Infantry, and as such on that date was with the wagon train of Sykes's division of Porter's corps, which was parked near and a little to the south-east of Savage's Station. About 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon of the 28th the quartermasters in charge of the train received orders to empty the wagons under their charge of the baggage of the officers and men, and of all camp equipage, and to destroy the same at once by burning. The order was immediately executed. All the personal effects of the officers, consisting of their clothing, bedding, mess-chests, etc., the knapsacks of the men, — left by them in our camp at Gaines's Mill on the morning of the 26th, when the troops were ordered off in light marching order in the direction of Mechanicsville, and which had been brought along in our wagons, — and the tents and other camp equipage, were removed from the wagons, made into large piles, and set on fire.

Strict orders were given the teamsters, guards, and others on duty with the train not to rifle, interfere with, or attempt to save from the flames any of the effects of the officers or men, though it was known that many of the officers' valises and knapsacks contained money, watches, revolvers, and other valuables. One or more of the teamsters or train-guard were, of my personal knowledge, wounded by the discharge of loaded revolvers from the burning piles. I narrowly escaped the same fate myself, while superintending the destruction of the property in my charge. After completing this destruction the now empty train was taken to Savage's Station and there loaded with hard-bread, pork, coffee, sugar, and other commissary stores. The remaining commissary stores, among which there was said to be three hundred barrels of whisky, and the vast amount of quartermaster's stores which had been accumulated at the station for the use of the army, were set on fire, and by the light of the great conflagration our train wended its way towards the James River.

It will be seen from these facts that the order of General McClellan, referred to by Colonel Alexander, was promulgated in the afternoon of June 28, to the officers in charge of the wagon-trains in the immediate vicinity of Savage's Station, to the great loss and hardship at least of the officers and men of Sykes's division; but whether said order was intended for the whole army, or made known to them, I never knew, and have no means of determining. Having assisted in executing the order, and the recollection of the scenes connected therewith being among the most vivid of my memories of the war, I was surprised, when I read Colonel Alexander's statement, to find that any officer connected with McClellan's headquarters should be ignorant of the fact that the order was promulgated and duly executed.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Abuse of Applause.

ONE of the canons of art insisted upon by Richard Wagner as an essential reform was that all applause during the acting of a drama or an opera was to be censured as interfering with the purpose of the represen-

Difficulties soon met them again, and at a new turn, for the borrowed money was insufficient in amount to complete the works. Experience was teaching them that the duties of their business had many complexities. They had just struggled with a very unfamiliar combination of duties — the making of estimates of the cost of work and the paying for it. This was very unlike their daily toil, which had been directed by men possessing great financial skill and business ability. Their estimates were far too low to complete even the blast-furnace, which on the score of economy was nevertheless pushed toward completion.

It was at this stage of affairs that they became thoroughly awakened to the saddest of business straits — inability to borrow, and their unfinished works mortgaged at a ruinous interest. Overwhelming ruin was impending. It was evident that only financial skill could secure the needed aid. To solicit such help now, after their earlier boastings, must have caused them much chagrin. A friend was sought in whose business ability and integrity they reposed much confidence. They proposed to him the transfer of the controlling interest and the management of their scheme at a great sacrifice, if he would but help them to success. He gave them encouragement, for, as mentioned earlier, the scheme appeared to casual inspection as possessed of substantial merits. The financial part he investigated without discovering any troublesome perplexities. But when the basis of the scheme was carefully examined by an expert sent by the capitalist to look over the property, the fact was discovered, or, to speak accurately, was verified (for the coöperators had been advised of it early in the history of their enterprise), that there was no suitable fuel economically accessible. What they had deemed a bituminous coal was in reality a lignite, which would in no way serve for iron-smelting; and unless proper fuel could be obtained in the vicinity there was no reason for the existence of their scheme.

The adverse report was the death-knell to the bright hopes of all interested. With some of their number the shock made reason totter as their fair dream vanished.

It would have been a happy event, and not less notable as an example, had the coöperators succeeded. Their signal failure is an instructive lesson. These unfortunate investors have come to know by costly experience that a coöperative scheme is subject to all the laws which circumscribe any business venture. No special commercial deity presides over coöperation. In fact, such enterprises have inherent weaknesses which render them even less exempt than others from danger of wreck. Skill in labor is not the sole essential to success in business, nor does capital allied with it make it sure. If that were so, then but a brief interval would elapse before the united workmen of the world would control its capital. To achieve commercial success the combination of financial skill and business ability is far more essential than the combination of labor and capital. The former qualities may be likened to the abilities of a victorious general, the latter qualities to the attributes of an army. The army may be ever so courageous, ever so strong in numbers and equipment, but without a skilful captain no real battles can be won.

N.

Suggestions on the Labor Question.

I SHOULD be glad to see a careful consideration of the following points by some capable writer on the labor question:

First. The misdirection of associated strength. The mere possession of power and opportunities does not give the party controlling them infallible wisdom in their use.

Second. The policy of confining the associations to a few well-defined objects of beneficial character. Squandering strength by meddling with questions that can be settled by other means brings a stormy and expensive life and an early death to an association.

Third. The growing tendency all over the world to localize administration, and to keep communities free from entanglement with the errors and mistakes of their neighbors. The labor movement seems to reverse this plan, and to endeavor to make every personal difficulty wide-spread and national.

Fourth. The irresponsible action by secret societies to effect objects that should be controlled by open and regular laws, affecting all citizens alike. If the laws are not right, let them be properly amended.

Fifth. The wisdom of compelling all associations of employers or employees to take out State charters making them responsible corporations that can sue and be sued; that is, making them responsible for the use of their great power for either good or evil. To make this provision complete, the officers controlling strikes or lockouts should be required to give substantial security that they will conduct their duties lawfully and with discretion. A provision of this kind would send reckless and impracticable agitators to the rear, and bring the more prudent elements of society to the control of the various associations.

A Reader.

General McClellan's Baggage-Destroying Order.

IN THE CENTURY for May, 1889, pages 157, 158, there are letters from General J. F. Rusling and George E. Corson, referring to a foot-note (page 142 of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE for November, 1888) of Messrs. Hay and Nicolay's "Life of Lincoln." The foot-note quotes from testimony of Lieutenant-colonel Alexander before the Committee on the Conduct of the War, to the effect that he saw on the evening of June 28, at General McClellan's headquarters at Savage's Station, an order directing the destruction of the baggage of the officers and men, and he thought also the camp equipage, and that he "remonstrated with the general against allowing any such order to be issued," and that he heard afterward that "the order was never promulgated, but suppressed." General Rusling states conclusively that the order was issued and executed (as does George E. Corson), but he thinks it singular that nobody has ever produced a copy of the baggage-destroying order, and that General McClellan does not mention it either in his official report or in the writings included in "McClellan's Own Story." General Rusling relied apparently upon Messrs. Hay and Nicolay's omission to correct Colonel Alexander's statement as to its suppression as evidence that it was in fact suppressed, so far as accessible publications could demonstrate.

This order, however, was published in full, together with the other circular orders of the same date (June

28, 1862), in Part III. of Vol. XI. of the War Records, p. 272, and has been accessible to any one since that volume was issued in 1884, five years before the date of General Rusling's letter, and four years before the publication by Messrs. Hay and Nicolay of Colonel Alexander's statement. In the next column and same page of THE CENTURY MAGAZINE these authors quote from the same volume of War Records, and from the third page preceding the circular, which is its own refutation of Colonel Alexander's statement as to its scope, as well as its non-promulgation and suppression. The circular order applied only to "tents and all articles not indispensable to the safety or maintenance of the troops, and to officers' unnecessary baggage," and distinctly provided for the carrying by every division and army corps of its entire supply of intrenching-tools, showing that it was an order preparatory for battle, and not for contemplated disaster. Since many of the severely wounded were necessarily left behind in the field-hospitals, with surgeons and medical supplies, it must be believed that there were not wagons enough to transport this unnecessary baggage, and as these wagons, used for ammunition and necessary forage and subsistence, were all brought in safely to Harrison's Bar, the presumption is that McClellan knew his business, for a furious and successful battle was fought on every day of the journey.

This baggage-destroying order was, in fact, an ordinary incident of army life, very shocking, doubtless, to Colonel Alexander,—who was then new in experience of actual war,—and to civilians; but common enough in all campaigns. In fact, the same thing occurred when Sherman began his march to the sea; and when Grant began the Wilderness Campaign the superfluous impedimenta of the army were destroyed. "War Records," Vol. XXXVI., Part II., page 382, contains Burnside's order of May 4, 1864, to "abandon and destroy" the "large amount of forage and subsistence stores" accumulated for issue to his own troops, and which were at Brandy Station, *between* Grant's army and Washington, with no enemy within many miles, and directly on the railroad then in operation to Washington; and this merely in order to make a more rapid junction with Grant's army, then about to cross the Rapidan. Every soldier of the war is familiar with many such instances, which occurred in every department and in every campaign.

I. W. Heysinger, M. D.,
Late Captain U. S. A.

The Sea-Serpent at Nahant.

THAT the traditions at Nahant about the "sea-serpent" were not evanescent may be shown by the following remarks, arising from the article in the JUNE CENTURY. When serving as a midshipman in H. M. S. *Warspite* in 1842 or 1843 I was allowed to accompany Lieutenant Dickson and Mr. Jacob, purser of that ship, to Nahant. During our visit, one of us said to the consul's wife that we had been surprised to see fishing-boats out on Sunday in the bay.

"Oh," she said, "are they out? Then I suppose there are shoals of fish" (I think she named the fish) "in the bay; they say they almost always precede the appearance of the sea-serpent." Of course I cannot say that those were exactly the words used, but I remember that there was some little talk on the subject,

more in joke than in earnest, and we went away to an hotel to get our dinner before going back to Boston.

After dinner a man ran up and rather excitedly asked for a telescope, as the sea-serpent was in sight. Somebody furnished one, and we all hurried up to the group. There, sure enough, was "something" very much like what appears in the very minute sketch in the article referred to. It was certainly moving; not, we thought, with the tide, and was not a shoal of fish. How far off it was I cannot say, but probably not more than a couple of hundred yards, traveling along at a rate of something between five and ten knots, with a slight, undulatory motion, and leaving a wake behind it. I cannot particularize any shape as to the head, which was not raised clear of the water, though showing like other lumps of dark-colored body above the surface. I suppose we saw it for four or five minutes, and I know that we three Englishmen thought we had seen something very unusual. I wrote home about what I had seen, and I think my account gave rise to a friendly altercation between my father (then Lord Francis Egerton) and Professor Owen, and, if I mistake not, to an article in one of the quarterlies. The subject was little talked of on board the ship, probably because we were afraid of being chaffed about our credulity; but I am sure that, except what I have said of the lady's remark, we had had no reason to expect to see anything strange at Nahant, nor had we ever heard of a sea-serpent as a frequenter of the bay.

Francis Egerton, Admiral.

ST. GEORGE'S HILL, WEYBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

"The Century's" American Artists Series.

WILLIAM MERRITT CHASE. (SEE PAGE 29.)

WHATEVER place posterity may award Mr. Chase as an artist, whatever the merits of his works may be in the estimation of the older or younger generation of artists, no one conversant with the art progress of this country can doubt that he is one of the strongest personalities in our modern art life, and a most important factor in its development. By nature an optimist, possessed of a fervent enthusiasm, artistic in everything, an honest believer in himself, and in the future of American art, he has impressed his thoughts and theories, fancies and ideas, upon hundreds of students and younger artists, and has raised their enthusiasm to the diapaason of his own.

The Art Students' League of New York has always been fortunate in the choice of its professors, and in the third and fourth years of its babyhood perhaps especially so. In 1878 Mr. Walter Shirlaw took charge of the weakling; the year following Mr. Carroll Beckwith and Mr. Chase were added to its staff. Shirlaw and Chase had just returned from Munich, Beckwith from Paris. With the knowledge of European methods possessed by these three, the artistic faithfulness and calm gentleness of Shirlaw, the vigor and tact of Beckwith, and the enthusiasm of Chase, the weak baby became a sturdy child, and at the end of its fourth year the school had an attendance of one hundred and forty, and a surplus of eighteen hundred dollars. Mr. Chase has been identified with the League from that time to the present, and is now one of the ten professors who instruct its students, nearly one thousand in number.