

is no record of any violence or breach of the peace on the part of the citizens of the state. This was no doubt partly the result of intimidation, but also showed the admirable power of self-restraint and the law-abiding character of the people. Although, as stated above, the general result throughout the state was not materially affected by this use of armed force, yet the great question is as to who was originally responsible for the move, and to what extent it was justified. After a careful weighing of the evidence, our opinion is that President Lincoln and General Schenck used the military merely to keep disloyal citizens from voting, a proceeding which may partly be justified as a legitimate political move to strengthen the hands of the government in time of war. The policy of the administration in regard to the other border states tends to confirm this view.<sup>87</sup>

The *Baltimore American* repeated the strong argument that had been urged by President Lincoln in support of this measure, by saying in an editorial on November 23, 1863: "The very fact that the laws of the state provided no remedy for its protection against the arts of treason as lately displayed at the polls, constituted an imperative and all-sufficient reason why the general government should provide some remedy for so unexpected and grave a disability."

The great mistake, and the one for which General Schenck deserves severe censure, if not positive condemnation, is found in the fact that he not only openly espoused the cause of the Unconditional Union party, but actually made political speeches at various meetings in different parts of the state, and urged the people to vote for Goldsborough and the other candidates on that ticket. He also allowed his officers to do the same.<sup>88</sup> It would be hard to

---

<sup>87</sup> Nicolay and Hay, "Life of Lincoln," viii, 420, 427-8, 432-3, 441, etc.

<sup>88</sup> See "Sun," Aug. 17, Oct. 29; "American," Oct. 9, 15, 16, 19, 23, 29.