

the washington legend 1865-1900

the heroic image in flux

howard n. rabinowitz

Most historiographical surveys of the image of George Washington have neglected the years from 1865 to 1900, preferring instead to concentrate on pre-Civil War and post-1920 developments.¹ This emphasis is unfortunate because the late nineteenth century was a critical era in the evolution of the Washington legend.

The Civil War greatly tried the nation's resolve. The war's successful termination was viewed by many as vindicating the hopes of the Revolutionary generation. In the effort to begin anew after the long struggle, post-war Americans, both Northerners and Southerners, were comforted by the faith of the Founding Fathers in the country's future.²

Americans found additional reasons to touch base with the founders. The late nineteenth century was distinguished by tremendous economic expansion and the proponents of the new industrial civilization emphasized the nation's considerable progress since 1776.³ Others, however, were less concerned with material gains than with the seeming decline in public morals. These critics looked nostalgically to the era when wise, public spirited men governed free from the contamination of industrialization, immigration, and urbanization. They asked Americans to rededicate themselves to the ideals of their illustrious ancestors and to forsake their false gods. Speaking before both houses of Congress on the anniversary of Washington's inauguration, Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, emphasized the need to teach the life of Washington to the nation. "Whatever doubts or fears assail us in the turmoil of our impetuous national life, that story [of Washington] comes to console and to strengthen, like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land."⁴

Other factors such as the questioning of traditional religious beliefs

and the growing involvement of the United States in world affairs further encouraged resorting to the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. In addition, the coincidence of chronology added its own considerable weight. National days of observance rekindled interest in the early years of the Republic, beginning with the hundredth anniversary of the Stamp Act, ending with the centennial of Washington's death, and including the special dates of 1876, 1887 and especially 1889. Local observances commemorated battles such as Saratoga and Trenton and the wintering of the troops at Valley Forge. It was the heyday of professional orators and a speech about Washington was always in order. The centennial fever finally brought about the completion of the Washington Monument in the nation's capital and led to the construction of smaller monuments in other cities.

In the face of a changing world, the admirers of Washington were not likely to picture him in any manner harmful to his reputation or to their own point of view. Holiday orators, authors of children's books, and other uncritical admirers approached him with an entirely didactic intent.

But a new generation of writers attempted to picture Washington as he really was. Some were disciples of the German "scientific" school and were professionally trained scholars; others simply felt that the old fables undermined Washington's reputation. All shared a genuine admiration for the man, but, unlike earlier authors, they believed that Washington need not be perfect to be considered a true hero. They also had little in common with the subsequent debunking efforts of William Woodward. Nor was Mark Twain's celebrated remark that he was a greater man than Washington because Washington could not tell a lie, whereas he could and would not, in keeping with this new attitude. More typical was the belief that "the world will love General Washington better when it knows Washington the man."⁵

For the first time biographies, magazine articles, and general histories condemned the myths of Parson Weems and the blatant falsifications in Jared Sparks' edition of Washington's writings. These authors, along with other antebellum writers, were attacked for their distorted image of Washington which laid him open to the ridicule of later generations. John Fiske, himself an uncritical admirer, dismissed Weems' work as "a forrage of absurdities." James Parton, one of the country's leading biographers and the author of an 1879 article entitled "The Traditional and Real Washington," objected to hiding Washington behind "a haze of eulogy and tradition," charging that the hero had been "edited into obscurity like a great play." John Habberton, a successful writer of fiction, undertook his lone work of non-fiction "to divest George Washington of the mummy-cloths in which four generations of politicians have enshrouded him and to blow away nearly a century's accumulation of firecracker smoke." More scholarly, but with a similar intent, was the influential two volume biography by Henry Cabot Lodge, then a young congressman from Massachusetts and Harvard's first Ph.D. in political

science. In 1896 Paul Leicester Ford, a noted bibliographer and best selling novelist, produced the period's most significant work, *The True George Washington*, aimed at "humanizing Washington and making him a man rather than a historical figure." Ford's brother, Worthington, provided a fitting climax to the series of reappraisals with the publication in 1900 of a dispassionate two volume study. Having already published numerous articles attacking the traditional view of Washington, Ford further stimulated the new dialogue with an edition of Washington's writings, supplanting the earlier corrupted work by Sparks.⁶

Despite their announced aims, these more objective scholars often produced an account similar in many respects to that of the traditionalists. The weight of the past and of the man himself proved too great and an entirely new image of Washington never really emerged. Nevertheless, significant advances, even if more in intent than in results, were made in establishing a critical analysis of the nation's first president.

Everyone agreed that Washington possessed great physical strength. More attention, however, was given to his "strength of character," particularly his extraordinary self-control. Unlike pre-Civil War writers, later observers gave ample space to his violent emotions. Henry Cabot Lodge wrote of a "strong, vigorous man, in whose veins ran warm red blood, in whose heart were stormy passions, [who] had a dangerous temper held under control" (I, 14, 107). John Fiske referred to Washington's "prodigious nature [which] was habitually curbed by a will of iron."⁷ The moral for young men was clear to a prominent New England Unitarian clergyman and Harvard professor: had Washington lacked this control, "he probably would have been nothing more than a hot-headed, reckless Virginia cavalier and slave driver."⁸ His self-discipline or strength of purpose was likened to that of a stock figure of late nineteenth-century American life and thought: the self-made man.⁹

And like the self-made men of the day, Washington had no ready place for "abstract reasoning" in his mind. When a problem was faced and solved, "it was a success from a practical rather than a theoretical point of view."¹⁰ Expressing the views of many, John Fiske wrote that although Washington had "little book learning, . . . he possessed in the very highest degree the rare faculty of always discerning the essential facts in every case and interpreting them correctly."¹¹ No longer did admirers accept Jared Sparks' image of Washington as a perfect speller and grammarian or as the model student that Weems and the other early biographers depicted. The author of one children's book retained the old view of Washington as an accomplished speller, but attributed this more to his diligence and industry than to any "uncommon aptitude at learning."¹² Paul Leicester Ford's biography contained none of this ambivalence. Although Washington may have studied hard, he was "a poor speller and worse grammarian though he improved over early training" (66). The public, however, was always reminded that Wash-

ington regretted his lack of formal education, and that he contributed generously to several colleges.¹³

Washington's educational experience brought him closer to the average American who had little schooling and enhanced his position as a democratic hero. So too did his activities during the years which otherwise might have been spent in school. His father had died when George was twelve and it was necessary for him to find work to help support his family. He was first employed as a surveyor and then as a soldier in the service of the Crown. In both capacities he was frequently on the frontier. His wilderness exploits were of great interest to Americans who were witnessing the last of the Indian Wars and the passing of the west. Four years before Frederick Jackson Turner's famous paper, Lodge entitled a chapter in his biography "On the Frontier." In it, Washington seemed a refugee from Cooper's *Leatherstocking Tales*, "an adventurous pioneer, reckless frontier fighter and a soldier of great promise" (I, 91). Authors delighted in recounting the scene in the House of Burgesses when the modest young man received that august assembly's plaudits for his able defense of the colony. Washington allegedly rose to acknowledge the thanks, but was so overcome that he could not utter a word.

The frontier was not merely a place to live dangerously and become a modest hero. Morrison Heady pointed out that it was during this part of his life that, like later pioneers, Washington learned the necessity of self reliance (78). More importantly, according to William Trent, professor at University of the South, the early frontier experience "gave him his true sympathy with democracy."¹⁴ General Braddock's unsuccessful campaign allowed authors to contrast the practical, democratic behavior of Washington and his company of Virginia irregulars with that of the aristocratic, rigid and status-conscious British troops.

But it was not forgotten that Washington was also an aristocrat. A heightened interest in genealogy resulted in the publication of numerous articles and at least two books dealing with Washington's ancestry. Several authorities were content to locate Washington's forebearers in the time of William the Conqueror, but one intrepid genealogist produced a four hundred page tome tracing Washington's progenitors back to Odin, the legendary Scandinavian god.¹⁵ Most serious biographers, however, focused on Washington's immediate aristocratic contacts. Washington was seen to have had the best of all possible worlds. Not only did he profit from the frontier experience, but through contact with his wealthy half-brother Lawrence and the Fairfax family, he encountered the sophisticated life of eighteenth-century England.¹⁶ Writers gave generous coverage to Washington's "aristocratic interest" in horses, fox hunting and courtly balls, but the hero, while benefiting from the dignity bestowed on him by such treatment, was not allowed to wander too far from American ideals. As Woodrow Wilson wrote, "Washington was an aristocrat by taste, not by principle."¹⁷

Washington the gentleman received more attention than Washington

the backwoods democrat. His uncompensated public service was deemed especially praiseworthy. The fact that he served as an unpaid volunteer under Braddock was given almost as much attention as his bravery under fire. Even more emphasis was placed on Washington's refusal of salary during his terms as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army and as President.¹⁸ Furthermore, his career was free of corrupt behavior. The prominent Civil Service reformer Carl Schurz felt that Washington's conduct as President (especially his dedication to political morality) should serve as a model for future Chief Executives. The Reverend Andrew Peabody despaired that were Washington alive he could gain election in only a few congressional districts and stood no chance of being nominated for the presidency for "he had none of the gifts by which in our day men gravel into power, obtain position by not deserving it and mount to higher places by intrigue and corruption."¹⁹

Washington was not only personally honorable; he demanded the same of others. His hatred of wartime speculators, forestallers, extortionists, and suppliers who were making excessive profits was invariably commented on by speechmakers and biographers. Few people who remembered the shabby profiteering of the Civil War could fail to be impressed by Washington's behavior.

Washington's reputation also owed a great deal to his image as a reluctant office seeker. Robert C. Winthrop, former Speaker of the House of Representatives and the most popular orator on George Washington, declared that "from first to last, he never solicited, or sought an office, military or civil."²⁰ Morrison Heady's view of Washington's election to the House of Burgesses in 1758 was typical: he had been chosen while on the last campaign of the French and Indian war "without, however, any particular desire or effort on his part" (257).

A far different and now commonly accepted view began to appear during the last decades of the century. Paul Leicester Ford noted that Washington had run for the House of Burgesses in 1757 despite the fact that "he was not popular." He lost, 270-40. During the next election he secured the aid of the county boss and, in violation of the law against entertaining voters, spent a great deal of money on liquor for his neighbors. This time he triumphed over the same opponent, 310-40. Even with continued large scale expenditures during subsequent campaigns, he narrowly won in 1768 by a count of 185-142, far from the unanimous re-elections claimed by most authorities (295-97). Four years later Ford's brother underlined this discovery by noting that Washington had lost more than one race for Burgess.²¹ Even the Fords, however, were justifiably satisfied that Washington would have preferred to remain at his beloved Mount Vernon rather than become general and president.

Washington's alleged attitude toward change in society was a further source of comfort to defenders of the status quo who had been frightened by the Haymarket Riot, the Homestead Strike, and protests couched in the language of Marxism and Populism. George R. Peck, one of the

nation's foremost railroad attorneys, contrasted Washington with "the professional revolutionist, the agitator who has no real conception of what he is agitating."²² To another prominent admirer, Washington "tolerated no extremity unless to curb the excesses of his enemy."²³

Washington was also praised by defenders of traditional religion who had been forced to contend with Darwinism, higher criticism, and the study of comparative religion. To George Bancroft, whose *History of the United States* enjoyed a large audience, "belief in God and trust in His overruling power framed the essence of his [Washington's] character" (VII, 398). Not surprisingly, clergymen, including Andrew Peabody and B. F. DeCosta, wrote of Washington's faithful attendance at Sunday services. The Episcopal minister and amateur historian, Philip Slaughter, in his celebrated pamphlet, *Christianity the Key to the Character and Career of George Washington*, maintained that Washington spent two hours per day reading the Bible and praying.²⁴ But Washington was not merely an example to be emulated; he was proof of God's continued intercession in man's affairs. He was to one writer "a chosen instrument in the hands of God." To another it was clear that "Providence denied Washington children of his own that he might be Father of his country."²⁵

As the century waned, less emphasis was placed on Washington's religious faith and more on his toleration. Lodge did not broach the subject of religion until the next to last page of the second volume and then mainly to note that Washington, even though a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was not at all sectarian. Still, Lodge declared that Washington had deep religious beliefs and "knelt and prayed in the day of darkness or in the hour of triumph with a childlike confidence" (II, 387).

Among the first to question the intensity of Washington's religious devotion was Frank Carpenter, a well known travel writer. In an article entitled "The Real George Washington," the author asserted that "it is a question whether he was a deeply religious man." Carpenter doubted that Washington left his comfortable house to pray in the snow at Valley Forge. As vestryman in Alexandria, he argued, Washington was more concerned with attending to the business of the church than to its religious observances (548). This was significant criticism, but it was Paul Leicester Ford who launched the full scale attack on the myth of the pious Washington. Ford argued that Washington was not a regular churchgoer except when as President his sense of duty led him to attend more often. Contrary claims were "made more with an aim to influence others than to present an accurate picture." As for the observance of a sacred Sabbath, Washington usually wrote letters, prepared invoices, conducted business, or even entertained and went fox hunting on Sundays. When he did pray, which was not every morning, it was standing up and not kneeling. More important to Ford was the fact that Washington was very tolerant of all faiths and even atheism. Drawing an important distinction between the private and public Washington, Ford concluded

that regardless of Washington's personal beliefs he had, however, thrown his influence in favor of religion (78-79). Indicative of the new approach to Washington was the absence of any consideration of religion in the biographies published by Woodrow Wilson and Worthington Chauncey Ford in 1896 and 1900 respectively.

For many people Washington the dutiful son, loyal husband, and tender stepfather provided an example worthy of emulation in a society threatened by the disintegration of family ties. Farm children were leaving home to make their fortunes in the burgeoning cities, lower-class women were finding employment in sweatshops and factories and the new middle-class women were rejecting their traditional roles as wives and mothers to challenge the men in the colleges, professions, and settlement houses of America.

Since the time of Weems, Washington had been pictured as a truthful lad who obeyed his elders. His parents were regarded as excellent people who instilled in him religious principles, a respect for the truth and a sense of responsibility. When his father died, George received guidance from his half-brother Lawrence, who treated him like a son. After Lawrence's death, George assumed the responsibility of caring for his sister-in-law and her young daughter. Bound together by a series of mutual obligations, the Washingtons provided a worthy example for the youth and adults of nineteenth-century America.

Washington's mother, Mary, rang the most responsive cord in the hearts of Washington followers. A separate chapter on her even appeared in a book devoted to the lives of George Washington and the other signers of the Declaration of Independence.²⁶ Despite limited evidence, extravagant claims were made about her influence on her son's life. Caroline Carothers reported that "to his mother, Washington ascribed all that was good in him" (2). This "discreet and affectionate mother" was pictured to have had a warm and personal relationship with her son throughout her life. Lodge observed that "even at the head of armies Washington would turn aside to visit [his mother] with the same respect and devotion as when he was a mere boy" (II, 365).²⁷

A heartwarming picture, but one that did not go unchallenged by the diligent Ford brothers. Paul charged that "the sentimentality that has been lavished about the relations between the two and [his mother's] influence upon him [Washington] partakes of fiction rather than truth." Washington was lucky to have passed most of his time with his educated and cultured brother since "his mother lived in comparatively straightened circumstances, was illiterate and untidy." After the hero inherited Mount Vernon, the two saw little of one another although she lived nearby. Mary Washington did not even come to see her son during one of the illnesses that brought him close to death. Where others depicted an independent old age, Ford saw her as a nagging woman constantly asking her son for more money. He quoted Washington's cold letter informing her that it would be unwise to move to Mount Vernon and disclosed the

hero's annoyance at her efforts to secure a state pension. Washington likewise objected to her frequent borrowing and her acceptance of gifts solicited from neighbors (17-20). Worthington Chauncey Ford, though kinder than his brother, conveyed a similar impression.²⁸ Accounts such as these eventually helped to remove Mary from her pedestal and cleared the way for her replacement as America's first mother by Nancy Hanks Lincoln and, more recently, by Rose Kennedy. During the period under consideration, however, the efforts of the revisionists did little to change her traditional image with the public.

If every man must have a great mother, so too must he have the perfect wife. According to the common view, Washington had met the widow Curtis at the house of a friend and it was love at first sight. A typical source described the young woman as "the sweetest little widow with dark eyes and a round little waist" (Carothers, 7). Her whole life was seen to depend on him and when the great man died, Lodge tenderly reported that she said, "All is over now. I shall soon follow him" (II, 363).

But Martha, like Mary Washington, was subjected to a reappraisal. In "The Real Martha Washington," Frank Carpenter accentuated her rather ordinary characteristics. According to him, Martha was "short and dumpy rather than tall and symmetrically shaped." She had rather large feet and a Roman nose. She was not well educated. Nonetheless, in the opinion of the author, Martha was "a good woman, good wife and good mother, and General Washington never thought that she was anything else but the best woman in the world."²⁹

According to Paul Leicester Ford, Washington was satisfied with Martha and contrary to a belief held by some, he was a faithful husband. Despite his fidelity, however, "Washington was too much of a man to have his marriage lessen his liking for women" (108). Worthington Chauncey Ford placed little credence in the love at first sight story, noting that how the two had met had not been determined. Ford saw her as the possessor of "the homely qualities" and charged that she "didn't possess the atmosphere of culture, breeding and remarkable qualities given her by tradition."³⁰ The Fords left Washington's image as a loving stepfather and grandfather unimpaired; indeed, they devoted much space to his generous dealings with relatives, especially his attempts to get his stepgrandson to continue college.

Washington's personality, character and private life were laudatory, but he was most appealing to the post-war generation in the guise of National Savior. For the generation that had recently seen the Union torn asunder by the tragedy of civil war, it was Washington the Nationalist and Washington the First American who was most worthy of praise.

Most observers were content to assign Washington a less than major role in the coming of the Revolution. Lodge was the most extravagant in his treatment of Washington's pre-Revolutionary activity, placing him among the earliest advocates of "violent separation from the mother

country" (I, 118, 156). Other writers, less motivated by Lodge's anti-British feelings, correctly presented Washington as coming more slowly to the idea of independence. British-born James Parton suggested that Washington was neither active nor conspicuous in the eleven-year verbal dispute between the colonies and England. But when the question of liberty versus loyalty arose, he was for liberty, though still "not a leader of the movement" (482). During the 1890's when ties with Great Britain were growing stronger, this emphasis became even more popular. Woodrow Wilson, an acknowledged Anglophile, portrayed a Washington slow to decide on opposition (133-36). For Professor Eugene Parsons, 1774 was the turning point in Washington's views about separation;³¹ for Paul Leicester Ford, the crucial conversion was not until early in 1776 (302).

There was more agreement as to the role Washington played after becoming head of the armies, though controversy raged over the reasons for his selection. Most commentators heartily endorsed John Marshall's earlier assertion that "Washington was the Revolution" and viewed as pre-ordained his appointment as Commander-in-Chief. Caroline Carothers declared that "there was only one answer to the question of who should command the armies" (10). John Fiske claimed that because Washington had "a military reputation greater than any other American," John Adams strongly had urged his appointment and the Continental Congress had unanimously concurred.³² The real reason for Adams' action was overlooked until Worthington Chauncey Ford revealed that the appointment had been part of a "political deal between Massachusetts and Virginia."³³ Paul Leicester Ford added that Washington's selection was not unanimous; even some Virginia delegates were cool towards him (286). This view was probably too harsh for most people, but Woodrow Wilson was among those who fashioned a compromise between the old and new interpretations. He attributed the selection both to Washington's eminence and to the need for having the colonies united (173).

Once past the controversy of appointment, the versions of Washington's role during the Revolution were remarkably similar. Assessments of his military capabilities varied, but the consensus was that he was the great thread that tied the colonies together, the indispensable man. John Fiske even compared him to Pericles.³⁴ Any doubts about the eventual success of the Revolution could only be ascribed to the many obstacles in Washington's path. When he lost a battle, it was due either to incorrect information or the incompetence of subordinate officers.³⁵ He had to overcome supply shortages, unruly troops, the Conway Cabal and Benedict Arnold. The members of the Continental Congress were depicted as inefficient, incompetent, and often villainous. Worthington Ford devoted several chapters to Washington's problems with Congress and the difficulties faced in organizing the army and keeping it in the field. Writers like Paul Leicester Ford and Virginia state legislator and former Con-

federate general Bradley Johnson who had reservations about Washington's generalship saw his ability to keep the army intact as sufficient to support his claim to military greatness.³⁶

With the Revolution over, his staunchest nineteenth-century admirers viewed Washington as the strongest link among the colonies. He was, they wrote, continually urging "the formation of a more perfect union."³⁷ Many reasons, all of great concern to late nineteenth-century Americans, were suggested for Washington's advocacy of a stronger government—his fear of anarchy, his desire for a stable financial structure, the need to gain respect in the eyes of foreign powers—but especially stressed was Washington's interest in the West and his perception of the necessity of tying that region to the older states.³⁸

Washington was depicted as repeatedly clearing away difficulties which hindered the adoption of the Constitution. According to Fiske, initial interest in the Constitutional Convention had been minimal, but the choice of Washington as a delegate from Virginia resulted in "an outburst of joy throughout the land." After the delegates assembled, his "brief but immortal speech," inspired "the mood in which they worked." Washington squelched subsequent criticisms of the document by arguing that "the Constitution is the best that can be obtained at this time, and the nation must choose between the Constitution and disunion."³⁹ In Lodge's picture, Washington, aided by Hamilton and Madison, played the major role in helping the nation choose between those alternatives (II, 29).

This view of the origins of the Constitution was not unanimous. Careful scholars questioned assertions such as Dr. J. M. Toner's that "Washington's knowledge of the institutions of his own country and of its political character . . . was probably as complete as that of any man." As proof, Toner had cited a paper in Washington's handwriting done prior to the Convention which contained abstracts of several ancient confederations. The less reverent Worthington Ford proved that the paper in question had been originally written by Madison and the extent of Washington's research had been to re-copy it. Even Lodge took issue with the traditionalists at certain points. He refuted the claims of Bancroft and Fiske that Gouverneur Morris's eulogy had contained words actually spoken by Washington on the need to produce a new Constitution rather than revise the Articles of Confederation. James Parton departed most from the popular picture of Washington's role. When it came to the history of government, Washington "had the knowledge of the average man" and was "unable to contribute anything to the Constitution from the past experience of mankind."⁴⁰

For those who had followed Washington through the Revolution and the events leading to the adoption of the Constitution, the presidency seemed the natural culmination to his efforts "to make one out of many." For some it seemed also anti-climactic, and the eight years he spent in office received a more cursory treatment than earlier periods of his life. This was especially true for children's books.⁴¹ This de-emphasis could

be expected since few youngsters cared about the development of political parties or administrative history. But even Woodrow Wilson, a student of government, devoted less than half as many pages to the presidency as to the Revolution. Lodge, whose study was part of the "American Statesman Series," spent fewer pages on his subject's years in office than on his role in the Revolution. At least four other biographies focused on Washington the soldier, none on Washington the president.⁴²

All of Washington's actions as president—especially the suppression of the Whiskey Rebellion, the avoidance of war with Britain and France, his Indian policy and his economic program—were judged to be in the best interests of the nation. Washington's Farewell Address was accepted as ordained policy for the future of the Republic, to be read and adhered to for its comments on both the domestic and foreign scenes.⁴³ The lesson drawn from the policies of the first president was clear: Washington was a nationalist. "From the moment when Washington drew his sword in defense of the liberties of his country men," wrote the popularizer Benson J. Lossing, "he labored to secure for them the blessings of Union and Nationality" (I, v). General Bradley Johnson (who was greatly indebted to Lodge's biography) spoke of Washington's "deep faith . . . in the manifest destiny of the union" (299). Chief Justice Melville Fuller declared that "[Washington] saw as if face to face that continental domain which glimmered to others as through a glass darkly" (715).

But Washington was a slaveholder and planter. Was not the continental empire he envisioned only an agency for the expansion of the slave power? Washington's position as the owner of slaves could have constituted a sharp setback for his popularity. Yet his proponents did not seek to hide this facet of his life. Pictured as bound to the institution by circumstances rather than by desire, his views on slavery became a source of strength rather than of weakness. In the introduction to an edition of Washington's papers relating to his role as "Importer and Employer of Labor," Worthington Ford noted that having slaves was natural in Virginia since they were needed for the health of the economy.⁴⁴ Lodge added that "Washington accepted the system as he found it, as most men accept the social arrangements to which they are born" (I, 101). But this hero did not merely accept slavery, he became the perfect master. The author of one children's book described him as "a just, humane and thoughtful master, considerate of their [his slaves'] comfort, welfare and happiness" (Phelps, 169). Habberton, using the conversational idiom which marked his book, asserted that there was no record of Washington's ever having "licked his nigger" (60). Instead, as Woodrow Wilson stated, Washington believed in "talking with them when he could and gaining a personal mastery over them." Wilson noted that Washington provided his body servant, Bishop, with a secure retirement, though the same sentence added that like provision was made for Washington's favorite horse (240-41). Bancroft reported that "no one of them was willing to leave him for another master. As it was his fixed rule never either to buy

or sell a slave, they had the institution of marriage and secure relations of the family.”⁴⁵ Although Paul Leicester Ford proved that slaves were bought and sold, he agreed that Washington’s kindness was reciprocated by a “real attachment” from his slaves (150, 139-49).

Despite this characterization of Washington as the model slaveowner, one that has persisted to this day, all but a few commentators emphasized Washington’s dislike of the institution and his hopes for gradual emancipation. Few, with the notable exception of the Southerner Wilson, failed to mention that he manumitted his slaves in his will and would have done so sooner but for the intermarriage between his slaves and those of his wife. One of the typical statements was made by Bancroft: “no one more desired universal emancipation” than Washington who strongly urged the Virginia legislature to endorse “gradual abolition.”⁴⁶

Northerners thus had no reason to hold Washington in disrepute for his ownership of slaves; Southerners, except for the most unreconstructed ones, could also be satisfied. Washington was the model slaveholder and reflected all that was good in the system. What could the ordinary slaveholder have done if even the great Washington remained a slave owner until his death? If Southerners could find a defense for their past, Northerners interested in the future of the country and tired of championing the Negroes’ cause could find justification for reconciliation with the former slave states.

With the obstacle of slavery removed, Washington the Nationalist could become Washington the American. Represented in him was the greatness of the American people, not only of the North and South, but of the West; not only of Southern planters, but of Yankee businessmen.⁴⁷ Woodrow Wilson, after discussing Washington’s desire for a foreign policy independent of Europe, concluded that “truly the man was the first American; the men about him were provincials merely dependent still for their life and thought upon the breadth of the Old World” (291-92). This was critical for the nation’s survival, argued Lodge, for “had he been merely a colonial Englishman, had he not risen at once to the conception of an American nation, the world would have looked at us with very different eyes” (I, 245).

Today students read about the many foreigners who helped the rebellious colonists win their independence. In the late nineteenth century the foreign soldiers, with few exceptions, were not fondly remembered. To Habberton, most of the foreigners were simply adventurers seeking rank (144). Although Henry Cabot Lodge admitted that many of the European volunteers were excellent soldiers with noble motives, “many others were mere military adventurers, capable of being turned to good account, perhaps, but by no means entitled to what they claimed and in most cases received.” Lodge emphasized that “Washington believed from the beginning and said over and over again in even stronger terms that this was an American war and must be fought by Americans.”⁴⁸

Washington’s alleged anti-foreign bias was useful to the proponents

of immigration restriction. At the New York Centenary Celebration of Washington's first inauguration one of the speaker's contrasted Washington's times when "though not all of us sprung from one nationality, we were practically all one people" to the present "steadily deteriorating situation" brought on by importation of "the lowest orders of people from abroad."⁴⁹ Chief Justice Fuller, who was greatly influenced by Lodge's biography, told the Congress of the United States that Washington "discouraged immigration except of those who, . . . could themselves, or their descendants get associated to our customs, measures and law; in a word soon become our people" (726).

Even if immigration could be restricted, what would be done with the great number of immigrants already in the country? Here again Washington proved useful. The Chicago celebration of the first inauguration was aimed particularly at persons of foreign birth. The organizers of the commemoration told the leaders "of the foreign community" that they should go to their people and say "it is time for us to become Americans." Through a program of church sermons and addresses, exercises in the schools, mass meetings and fireworks, the alien was exposed to the glories of Washington, the founder of his newly chosen nation.⁵⁰

Washington was clearly a popular subject with late nineteenth-century orators and writers. Many admirers, however, feared that Washington was losing his pre-eminence as the greatest American. Worried that he was being replaced by other figures in the hearts of their countrymen, they chafed at all criticisms of their hero. Despite the efforts made to bring Washington closer to the people, William Trent was forced to acknowledge that "some of us, to our shame, have ceased to love him" (44). Henry Cabot Lodge worried about "veiled attacks" on Washington, "all the more dangerous because they are insidious" (II, 301).

To some extent these admirers were over-reacting to the attempt to view Washington in a more critical light. Yet Washington was no longer unchallenged as the nation's most illustrious hero. A number of military heroes had emerged from the Civil War. Heading the list was Ulysses S. Grant. One assessment of Washington's military ability concluded that "he did not belong to that small column of consummate commanders which includes Caesar, Cromwell, Napoleon, and Grant, [although] he was the equal of Frederick and the superior of Wellington" (Peck, 5). That put Washington in select company, but did not make him America's foremost soldier. Other generals such as Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson also received great acclaim. The large scale battles of the Civil War led military authorities to emphasize how much simpler Washington's problems were during the Revolution.

A more serious threat was the emergence of Abraham Lincoln as Washington's chief competitor. Washington, for example, with 97 votes (the maximum possible) led the balloting for American immortals admitted to "The Hall of Fame of Great Americans" at New York University in 1900; Lincoln, with 96, was tied for second place.⁵¹ It became

fashionable to point out the parallels between the lives of the two heroes. As George Peck noted, "both were frontiersmen; both fought in Indian wars; both marched forward from small things to great . . . and each, in the appointed way and at the appointed time, led his country through darkness to light" (4). Franklin Hough observed that the spectacle of mourning after Washington's death had stood unrivaled until the death of "the illustrious Lincoln"; (I, vi) thus Washington's uniqueness was blunted. Where before there had been one, now there were two. Both shared similar traits and experiences. The work of one was incomplete without the work of the other: Washington opposed slavery, but it was Lincoln who eradicated it; Washington was the founder of the Union, but Lincoln was its preserver.

Even on his birthday Washington was not permitted to stand alone. One book for elementary schools consisted of separate exercises for Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays; in the event of joint exercises, students were encouraged to choose their favorite hero.⁵² Another book, devoted strictly to Washington's birthday, included the suggestion of having students hold signs forming a double acrostic spelling "WASHINGTON IS OUR MODEL." The remainder of the class was to say in unison what each letter stood for. All but the letter "A" began sentences associated with Washington or the Revolution; the exception stood for "Abraham Lincoln who served his country well, but was killed by a vile assassin."⁵³

It was one thing if Washington and Lincoln received equal praise, but supporters of Lincoln did not stop there. Walt Whitman, for example, left no doubt whom he considered the greater president and man. Washington "was essentially a noble Englishman"; Lincoln was "far less European, far more Western" and had "unequaled influence in the shaping of the Republic and therefore in the World."⁵⁴ This disparagement of Washington by one of the leading poets of the day was matched by the words of the most popular novelist. To Horatio Alger, Lincoln

holds a warmer place in the affections of the American people than his great predecessor, who with all his excellence, was far removed by a certain coldness and reserve from the sympathies of the common people. Abraham Lincoln, on the other hand, was always accessible and his heart overflowed with sympathy for the oppressed and lowly. The people loved him, for they felt he was one of themselves.⁵⁵

Authors employed several methods in the effort to buttress Washington's reputation. Actions or characteristics of Washington were seen as sanctioned by the later behavior of Lincoln. Lodge, when discussing Washington's policy during the Whiskey Rebellion, noted that "he waited with unerring judgement as Lincoln waited with the Proclamation of Emancipation, until he had gathered public opinion behind him by his firmness and moderation" (II, 127). Lodge also described Washington's trip to a New England village during the Revolution where "the

people recognized the great and unselfish leader as they recognized Lincoln a century later" (I, 275). George Carpenter, after saying that Washington foresaw the downfall of slavery, asked rhetorically, "Perhaps too he saw in his vision the image of the man who was to complete the work he had begun."⁵⁶

Washington's boosters sometimes directly attacked the Lincolnians, as when Lodge refuted James Russell Lowell's reference in his "Commemoration Ode" to Lincoln as "the first American" (II, 312-14). More often they chose to implicitly claim for Washington the same traits commonly attributed to Lincoln; this was one reason for the extensive association of Washington with the West. The effort to describe Washington the man was largely due to the need to humanize him so that he could hold his own in the face of new competition. Under this impetus the goody-goody prig of Weems' story was systematically undermined by all but the most traditionally minded admirers.

Lodge was in the forefront of those who denied that Washington was dull and cold. He spent nine pages in his biography arguing that Washington had a lively sense of humor, characterized by the frequent use of sarcasm, off-color jokes and urbane wit (II, 365-74). James Parton and Paul Leicester Ford were more restrained; Parton claimed only that Washington had "a homely country humor."⁵⁷ How could anyone accuse Washington of insensitivity, his defenders asked, when the evidence was clearly otherwise? Was he not the man who was overcome with emotion at the farewell to his troops and who, according to Habberton, burst into tears upon seeing the fall of Fort Washington and the suffering of New Yorkers at the beginning of the war? (104, 124) Any doubters of Washington's sensitivity merely had to look at his life-long passion for women, a passion that began when the mysterious Lowland Beauty first captured his heart.⁵⁸

In place of the man who was "against duelling, drunkenness, swearing and gambling,"⁵⁹ we find a Washington who, if not exactly a libertine, was nonetheless a lover of the good life. We hear of his fondness for Madeira at dinner, his fashionable clothes, his penchant for gambling at cards or in lotteries and of his most frequent amusement, fox hunting. We learn that he loved the theater and that he enjoyed dancing so much that he often engaged in it during the harsh winter at Valley Forge.⁶⁰ Paul Leicester Ford devoted an entire chapter to the charge that Washington was without close associates. Failure to note Washington's friendships with men like George Mason, Alexander Hamilton, Henry Knox, and the Marquis de Lafayette demonstrated to Ford "how absolutely his private life has been neglected in the study of his public career (209).

The image of Washington during the years 1865 to 1900 was, like the country itself, in the process of transformation. Searchers after the "real" George Washington, like Frank Carpenter, boldly asserted that "truly there is enough that is great and good in his character without attributing

to him virtues and qualities which he never had" (548). Yet it proved easier to urge openmindedness than to be openminded. Washington's faults were usually suggested rather than singled out for examination. A leading member of the Pennsylvania Historical Society informed his readers: "We do not pretend to claim that the life of Washington was faultless; but it is not for us to attempt to point out his defects, when the civilized world, in all its criticism, has yet failed to point out a single incident in his life that would put a slur upon his far fame" (Tyson, 11). Even such a well-trained scholar as Henry Cabot Lodge discovered the perils of trying to separate what Marcus Cunliffe has called "the Man and the Monument." "As I bring these volumes to a close," Lodge wrote, "I am conscious that they speak, . . . in a tone of almost unbroken praise of the great man they attempt to portray. If this be so, it is because I could come to no other conclusion."⁶¹

The difficulty involved in pursuing a more balanced assessment of Washington was evident in the reception accorded Paul Leicester Ford's *The True George Washington*. Two of its reviewers, B. A. Hinsdale, Professor of Education at the University of Michigan and former Superintendent of Cleveland public schools and William Wirt Henry, the politician grandson of Patrick Henry and former President of the American Historical Association, welcomed Ford's volume but had serious reservations. Each writer compared Ford's book with Woodrow Wilson's and both preferred the latter. Henry was especially unhappy with Ford's treatment of Washington's mother and the religious beliefs of the hero. Hinsdale believed that "the great idealization of history far from being sources of evil are sources of great good."⁶² In the face of such sentiments and the need of many of the nation's leaders to produce a Washington who believed in the same things they did, it is noteworthy that a critical spirit could flourish. A reviewer of Lodge's biography observed that although during the centennial celebrations

. . . the plaudits were for the traditional Washington, it is with the new Washington that historians must now deal. . . . Research has transformed the most conventionalized of figures into a singularly fresh subject of study. . . . A critical life of Washington is the desideratum of American history.⁶³

He correctly noted that Lodge's biography did not fully satisfy that need. Nonetheless, the young congressman along with the novelist Habberton, the Princeton academician Wilson and amateur scholars (among them the Ford brothers and James Parton) had come closer than any previous writers to an objective appraisal of Washington.

A segment of the American public evidently seemed as ready for this change as were the biographers. Paul Leicester Ford's major work, though coolly received by reviewers, went through fourteen printings in less than fifteen years after publication. Allan Nevins, looking back in 1931 through a host of subsequent biographies of Washington, observed that

The True George Washington "has probably done more to furnish the correct view of Washington than any other single work."⁶⁴

We can only suggest why readers were attracted to a book which pointed out the lies told by Washington and re-counted his shady land deals. During the last years of the nineteenth century, early examples of muckraking articles were beginning to attract attention. Ford's book enjoyed its greatest popularity at a time when a generation of journalists were telling the people that cherished ideas about American life needed to be revised. But this is merely begging the question: why was Washington included in the quest for truth? The answer may rest with the Civil War. For the first time there were other symbols of Americanism to rival Washington. He could be seen as he was without removing the only symbol of the nation. Lincoln was the preserver of the Union, his assassination was fresh in the minds of many and there was a belief that the post-war experience would have been better had he lived. Aside from his great accomplishments, Lincoln seemed more human; he had faults and suffered failure like everyone else. On the other hand, Washington's life seemed unimpeded in its path to greatness. Somehow Lincoln seemed more American than the father of the country. When readers learned of the new Washington, complete with blemishes, they perhaps took pleasure in seeing that he too was human.

Whether Washington's image was greatly changed among the people, however, cannot be known for certain. There was no Gallup or Harris to tell us.⁶⁵ It must be remembered that the Washington of juvenile books, holiday orations and semi-fictional biographies reached a far greater audience than did the few works of factually oriented scholars. As Marcus Cunliffe has observed, the Washington of Weems' story had a strong hold on the minds of later generations.⁶⁶ Children once indoctrinated with the traditional view were not easily re-educated as adults. But the groundwork for the future effort had at least been laid during these forgotten decades.

University of New Mexico

footnotes

1. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Americans: The National Experience* (New York, 1965); Wesley Frank Craven, *The Legend of the Founding Fathers* (Ithaca, 1956); John A. Krout, "The Washington Legend," *New York Times Book Review* (July 1, 1945), 3; Bernard Mayo, *Myths and Men: Patrick Henry, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson* (Athens, Georgia, 1959); Edward H. O'Neill, *A History of American Biography 1800-1935* (Philadelphia, 1935); Dixon Wecter, *The Hero in America* (New York, 1941). One of the few studies which realizes the importance of the writings of the late nineteenth century (but slights the period's most important writer, Paul Leicester Ford) is Marcus Cunliffe, "Parson Weems and George Washington's Cherry Tree," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, X (September, 1962), 58-96. The most extensive, though largely unsatisfactory, treatment of Paul Leicester Ford's contribution is Robert Partin, "The Changing Images of George Washington from Weems to Freeman," *Social Studies*, LVI (February, 1965), 52-59.

2. See, for example, Introduction by the Reverend William M. Thayer to [Morrison Heady] *The Farmer Boy and How He Became Commander-in-Chief*, by Uncle Juvinell (New York, 1863), 4-5; Franklin B. Hough, *Washingtoniana* (2 vols.; Roxbury, Mass., 1865), I, v; Benson J. Lossing, *Washington and the American Republic* (3 vols.; New York, 1870), I, v; John Green-

- leaf Whittier, "The Vow of Washington," *The Washington Centenary* (New York, 1889), 40. (Hereafter cited as *New York Centenary*.)
3. See *The Nation's Birthday: Chicago's Celebration of Washington's Inauguration April 30, 1889* (Chicago, 1890), *passim*. (Hereafter cited as *Chicago's Celebration*.)
 4. Melville W. Fuller, Address: *Commemoration of the Inauguration of George Washington As First President of the United States Delivered Before the Two Houses of Congress, December 11, 1889* (New York, 1890), 708.
 5. Frank Carpenter, "The Real George Washington," *The Cosmopolitan*, VI (April, 1889), 544.
 6. John Fiske, *The Critical Period of American History 1783-1789* (Boston, 1888), 84; James Parton, "The Traditional and the Real Washington," *Magazine of American History*, III (August, 1879), 468; John Habberton, *George Washington* (New York, 1886), 1; Henry Cabot Lodge, *George Washington* ("American Statesmen Series;" 2 vols.; Boston, 1889), I, 14; Paul Leicester Ford, *The True George Washington* (Philadelphia, 1896), 5; Worthington Chauncey Ford, *George Washington* (2 vols.; New York, 1900); *The Writings of George Washington* (14 vols., New York, 1889-1893); Worthington Chauncey Ford's articles included "How Washington Became Commander-in-Chief," *Nation*, XLVIII (June 13, 1889), 481-82; "Washington as an Employer of Labor," *Nation*, XLIX (September 19, 1889), 227-28; "The Forged Letters of Washington," *Nation*, XLIX (November 28, 1889), 427-28.
 7. John Fiske, *The American Revolution* (2 vols.; Boston, 1891), I, 135.
 8. Andrew Peabody, *Lessons for Our Times From the Life of Washington* (Boston, 1874), 9.
 9. George Bancroft, *History of the United States From the Discovery of the American Continent* (12 vols.; 11th revised edition, Boston, 1873), VII, 394. See also Lodge, I, 51; Fiske, *American Revolution*, I, 135; Habberton, i.
 10. W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 139.
 11. Fiske, *American Revolution*, I, 134.
 12. Heady, 39. See also Lodge, I, 46, 59.
 13. See, for example, Mrs. E. B. Phelps, *Memoir of Washington Written for Boys and Girls* (Cincinnati, 1874), 16. This highly moralistic account drew chiefly on the earlier works of Bancroft, Marshall and Irving.
 14. William Trent, *Southern Statesmen of the Old Regime* (New York, 1897), 26.
 15. Henry F. Waters, *An Examination of the English Ancestry of George Washington* (Boston, 1889); Albert Welles, *The Pedigree and History of the Washington Family Derived from Odin* (New York, 1879). See also *Nation*, XLVIII (June 27, 1889), 522; *ibid.*, XLIX (October 17, 1889), 306-307; *ibid.*, LV (November 17, 1892), 373-74; and practically any issue of the *Magazine of American History*, especially the letters to the editor.
 16. Lodge, I, 54; Trent, 26; Caroline Butler Powell Carothers, *Washington: The Most Distinctly American Character That Our Country Has Produced* (n.p., 1897), 3.
 17. Woodrow Wilson, *George Washington* (New York, 1896), 127.
 18. See, for example, Heady, 161; Peabody, 11.
 19. *Chicago's Celebration*, 163; Peabody, 18-19; see also *ibid.*, 5, 17; *Nation*, LXIX (December 21, 1899), 460; Henry Adams, *Democracy* (New York, 1961), 72-82 (first published in 1880); W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 16-17; Habberton, 258.
 20. Robert Winthrop, *Oration on the Completion of the National Monument to Washington February 21, 1885* (Boston, 1885), 25.
 21. W. Ford, *George Washington*, I, 98.
 22. George R. Peck, "George Washington," Address Delivered at the University of Chicago, February 22, 1898, 4.
 23. Address of Senator John W. Daniel, quoted Robert Haven Schauffler (ed.), *Washington's Birthday* (New York, 1925), 211; see also Fuller, 725.
 24. Peabody, 16; B. F. De Costa, "The Traditional Washington Vindicated," *Magazine of American History*, V (August, 1880), 102; Philip Slaughter, *Christianity the Key to the Character and Career of Washington* (New York, 1886), 39. See also Address of President William McKinley given February 22, 1898, quoted Schauffler, 143-44; Fuller, 720.
 25. Phelps, 70; Slaughter, 8.
 26. James Tyson, *An Outline of the Political and Social Life of George Washington and Biographical Sketches of the Lives of the Fifty-Six Signers of the Declaration of Independence* (2 vols.; Oakland, 1895), 29.
 27. During the dedication of a monument to her memory in Fredricksburg, Virginia in 1894, Senator John Daniel called her "one who possessed only the homely virtues of her sex . . . unassuming wife and mother whose kingdom was her family, whose world was her home." Quoted, Tyson, 164.
 28. W. Ford, *George Washington*, I, 17.
 29. Frank Carpenter, "The Real Martha Washington," *The Cosmopolitan*, II (January, 1887), 278.
 30. W. Ford, *George Washington*, I, 98.
 31. Eugene Parsons, *George Washington: A Character Sketch* (Milwaukee, 1898), 40.
 32. Fiske, *American Revolution*, I, 134.

33. W. Ford, "How Washington Became Commander-in-Chief," 481.
34. Fiske, *American Revolution*, II, 48. See also Parton, 482; Parsons, 41.
35. See, for example, Lodge, I, 150, 170, 192; Fiske, *American Revolution*, I, 210, 219-21, 312-17; for the opposite view, see Parton, 482.
36. Bradley T. Johnson, *General Washington* (New York, 1895), 211; P. Ford, 277, 286. See also Parton, 482; Habberton, 103.
37. Fiske, *Critical Period*, 54. See also Fuller, 727; Lodge, II, 19; Habberton, 269.
38. See, for example, Lodge, II, Chapter 1, especially 7-16; W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 88-92.
39. Fiske, *Critical Period*, 221, 231-32, 329.
40. Dr. J. M. Toner, *George Washington As An Inventor and Promoter of the Useful Arts* (Washington, 1892), 4-5; W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 130; Lodge, II, 31-33; Parton, 482-83; but see address of Associate Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, *Chicago's Celebration*, 256-57. Toner was a Washington physician and prominent medical historian.
41. See, for example, the volumes already cited by Morrison Heady and Mrs. E. B. Phelps. A third, Josephine Pollard, *The Life of George Washington in Words of One Syllable* (New York, n.d.) devoted six of its 120 pages to Washington's presidency.
42. O'Neill, 168, lists four such books; of these, I could find only two, General Bradley Johnson's book, already cited, and General Henry B. Carrington, *Washington the Soldier* (Boston, 1898). O'Neill does not account for this emphasis, but it was probably the result of interest in military affairs generated by the Civil War, Spanish-American War and the numerous war scares in between.
43. Authors agreed that the Farewell Address, though presenting Washington's ideas, owed much of its phrasing to Hamilton and Madison. See, for example, Habberton, 311; W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 266; Phelps, 151.
44. Worthington Chauncey Ford (ed.), *Washington As An Importer and Employer of Labor* (Brooklyn, 1889), 5.
45. Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States of America* (New York, 1882), 179. See also Lodge, I, 103.
46. Bancroft, *History of the Constitution*, 179. See also the remarks of President McKinley, quoted Schauffler, 160; Lodge, I, 102.
47. See, for example, Edward Everett Hale, *Chicago's Celebration*, 163; Trent, 42; Heady, 260; W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 118-27; P. Ford's chapter on Washington as planter.
48. Lodge, I, 185. See also W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 233-34; Parsons (who relied heavily on Lodge), 45. Washington's strictures against foreign entanglements were used to remind Americans of the need to pursue a limited role in world affairs. Fuller, 721; *Nation*, LXIX (December 21, 1889), 460. Other writers found evidence linking Washington with the country's new, more aggressive, foreign policy. Carrington, 368-70; W. Ford, *George Washington*, II, 66; Bancroft, *History of the Constitution*, 182.
49. Bishop Potter, *New York Centenary*, 36.
50. *Chicago's Celebration*, 7, 8-9.
51. Louis Albert Banks, *The Story of the Hall of Fame* (New York, 1902), 17. Tied with Lincoln was Daniel Webster who represented no threat to Washington's popularity.
52. Lydia Avery Coonley and Marion M. George (eds.), *Lincoln and Washington for the Story Hour, Language and Literature Lessons and Birthday Exercises in Primary and Intermediate Grades* (Chicago, 1899), 19.
53. Alice M. Kellogg (ed.), *How to Celebrate Washington's Birthday in the Schoolroom* (New York, 1894), 38.
54. Quoted Allen Thorndike Rice (ed.), *Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1885), 473.
55. Horatio Alger, *Abraham Lincoln the Backwoods Boy or How a Young Rail Splitter Became President* (New York, 1883), 263.
56. George Moulton Carpenter, *Washington the Founder of the Nation* (Providence, 1889), 16. (Carpenter was a United States District Judge.) This was a popular theme. See, for example, President McKinley's speech, Schauffler, 150; speech of the Reverend Gunsaulus, *Chicago's Celebration*, 175; Bancroft, *History of the Constitution*, 279.
57. P. Ford, 184; Parton, 480.
58. P. Ford, 84; Wilson, 101.
59. Phelps, 164.
60. Johnson, 72; P. Ford's chapter on "Tastes and Amusements"; Habberton, 58-59; Parton, 480; Heady, 261; Lodge, I, 111-14; Wilson, 109-11.
61. Lodge, II, 387-88; see also *ibid.*, 284-85. See the *Atlantic Monthly*, LXIV (November, 1889), 707-14 for a review of the Washington, Lincoln, and Benjamin Franklin volumes in the American Statesmen series. The reviewer criticizes Lodge's concern for challenging false views of Washington.
62. William Wirt Henry, "Review of Woodrow Wilson and Paul Ford Biographies," *American Historical Review*, II (April, 1897), 539-45; B. A. Hinsdale, "Two New Books on Washington," *The Dial*, XXII (March 16, 1897), 178-80, quote, 179. On the value of "hero-

worship," see also the remarks of former United States Senator and Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz, *Chicago's Celebration*, 162.

63. *Nation*, XLIX (August 1, 1889), 96.

64. Allan Nevins, "Paul Leicester Ford," *Dictionary of American Biography*, edited by Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (20 vols.; New York, 1931), V, 518.

65. There was at least one crude attempt at opinion polling the Washington Image. After fifteen years of asking people their view of Washington, Kendall Otis Stuart, a prominent businessman, reported his findings in "The Popular Opinion of Washington," *The Independent*, LI (July 6, 1899), 1814-17. The responses indicated a great lack of knowledge and probably echoed the schoolbook accounts.

66. Cunliffe, "Parson Weems and George Washington's Cherry Tree." See also *George Washington: Man and Monument* (New York, 1958).