ably the best-known sculptor in America. Long after his death, yet another work from his hand made its way into the collection. In 1930, Mrs. Horace Gray bequeathed Saint-Gaudens’s relief portrait of her husband to be placed in the new Supreme Court building.

Other Irish-Americans who carved portrait busts for the Capitol are Martin Milmore (1844–1883) and Robert Cushing (1841–1896), both of whom were born in Ireland, and Ulric Dunbar (1862–1927), whose father was Irish. Milmore’s bust of abolitionist politician and senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts is located in the east corridor outside the Senate Chamber (fig. 6). The bust is signed by the sculptor, dated 1875, and identifies Rome as the location where it was carved. Sumner already had contact with Irish-American sculptors by way of his friendship with Thomas Crawford, who carved his bust in 1842.26 The extent of their friendship is evidenced in Sumner’s serving as one of the pallbearers at Crawford’s funeral. Sumner took an interest in “the Irish Question” (the issue of British rule in Ireland and increasing Irish nationalism), and when Frederick Douglass visited Ireland in 1845 he carried a letter of introduction from Sumner to local nationalist politician Daniel O’Connell. All these connections indicate that Sumner will have had a particular interest in Martin Milmore, who, born in Sligo in the West of Ireland, was brought to America by his mother in 1851 in the aftermath of the Great Famine. Raised in Boston, Milmore attended the Boston Latin School, where Sumner had also been a student several decades earlier. Sumner sat to Milmore in 1863, after which the two became friends and maintained a lengthy correspondence, living, as they were mostly, in different cities.

Milmore was to be widely commissioned for Civil War monuments, most notable among them his Soldiers and Sailors Monument for Boston Common, erected in 1877. However, well before that he had made his name as a portrait sculptor. His original bust of Charles Sumner (1864) was considered a highlight of the genre, although Milmore recognised how lucky he was “to have had a Sumner for a subject.”27 The bust is prominently displayed in a photograph showing the inside of Milmore’s workroom in the Studio Building, Boston. After the completion of the work, the Boston Transcript noted Milmore was “a young sculptor of more than common promise . . . [who] thus early in his career . . . evinces so strong a hold on the spiritual requirements of his art.”28 The bust, in plaster form, was first exhibited at Boston commercial galleries Hendrickson, Doll & Richards29 and later Williams & Everetts.30 Fellow abolitionist Wendell Phillips, who would be portrayed by Milmore just a couple of years later, was fulsome in his praise of the bust, indicating that Sumner needed no other artist to represent him.31 Activist Lydia Maria Child was glowing in her praise of the bust, describing it as “not only a good likeness, but it is a wonderfully speaking likeness, full of the noble soul of the man.”32 In 1869, a group of Sumner’s friends proposed to have the work transferred to marble, to be offered to the state government.33 It was installed in the State House in Boston in January 1870.34

The bust in the Capitol is an enlarged version of the plaster original, which is now lost. Commissioned by the commonwealth of Massachusetts in the aftermath of Sumner’s death and carved by Milmore during his time in Rome in the early 1870s, the bust was then presented to writer George William Curtis, in recognition of the eulogy of Sumner that he delivered in Boston in 1874, three months after the senator’s demise. The Curtis-owned bust was on display at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York for several years.35 However, in January 1894, two years after Curtis’s death, his widow Anna Shaw Curtis offered the bust to the Senate, where it was immediately accepted. Among the many busts of Charles Sumner executed in his lifetime, Martin
Milmore’s has been generally considered the most outstanding.\textsuperscript{36}

The vice-presidential busts by Cushing and Dunbar are all located within the Senate Chamber. Cushing’s Millard Fillmore (twelfth vice president, fig. 7) was carved in 1895 and Dunbar’s busts of Thomas A. Hendricks (twenty-first vice president, fig. 8) and Martin Van Buren (eighth vice president) were carved in 1890 and 1894 respectively. All three sitters are depicted in contemporary costume rather than \textit{à l’antique} in the manner of Sumner and have not been in receipt of similar praise. Milmore had the advantage of working from life in his portrait, whereas Cushing, with Fillmore long dead by the time of the commission, had difficulty sourcing imagery and descriptions of the man. He ended up relying on “two old but very good engravings of the ex-President to make the bust,” and on a bust he borrowed from Fowler & Wells, who were proponents of phrenology.\textsuperscript{37} When the clay model was completed late in 1894, Cushing made several, mostly unsuccessful, attempts to get people who had known Fillmore to visit his studio, to hear their comments on the portrait likeness.\textsuperscript{38}

Born in Ireland and based in New York, Cushing was described in an obituary headline as “A Catholic Artist Who Advanced Sculpture in This Country”—this America, where he had auspicious beginnings, studying first with J.Q.A. Ward, before going to Rome to work in the studio of Randolph Rogers.\textsuperscript{39} His familiarity with Italy, coupled with the high cost of marble cutting in America, prompted him to dispatch the plaster model for the Fillmore bust to Carrara in 1895, where it was translated to marble.\textsuperscript{40} The finished marble bust was returned later that year and was Cushing’s last work.

Ulric Dunbar, more forthright in his pursuit of work, offered his services to the Capitol when he became aware of the resolution adopted by the Senate to acquire busts of former vice presidents. In June 1886, he approached the chairman of the Library Committee of the U.S. Senate with the offer of a bust of Hendricks that he had already modeled and on which he was willing to carry out further work.\textsuperscript{41} A group of friends of the late Hendricks, who were invited to comment on the plaster bust, deemed it a “faithful likeness,” after which the sculptor was permitted to proceed to the marble version, which was completed in 1890.\textsuperscript{42} For his Van Buren bust, Dunbar, clearly intent on seeing what his eminent predecessor had done, requested access to the Hiram Powers’s White House portrait of the sitter, which in turn was loaned to him to serve as a model.\textsuperscript{43}

Among the many portrait statues in the Capitol only one can be attributed to an Irish-American sculp-
Andrew O’Connor’s (1874–1941) marble statue of General Lewis Wallace (fig. 9) joined the collection in Statuary Hall in 1910 to represent Indiana. Wallace, a distinguished Union general in the Civil War, is perhaps even better known as the author of the hugely successful book *Ben Hur* (1880). The statue is replicated in bronze in Wallace’s hometown of Crawfordsville, Indiana. That O’Connor’s representation of Wallace shows some similarity with the work of Saint-Gaudens, particularly the latter’s Farragut statue in Madison Square Park, New York, is not surprising. In his early career O’Connor studied with the older sculptor, and the Wallace portrait has a similar aliveness and vigor to that encountered in Saint-Gaudens’s depiction of the naval hero; it makes use of the same wind-blown movement in the coat.

O’Connor is unique amidst this group of Irish-American sculptors who carried out work for the Capitol, in that he is alone among them to have spent part of his active career in Ireland. Born in the U.S., O’Connor was particularly proud of his Irish ancestry. His grandfather was born in Ireland and his Scottish-born father, from whom he learned his trade, was raised there. Based in Paris at the time of the Wallace commission, O’Connor subsequently moved to live and work in Dublin, and it was there that he died. The Wallace commission was concurrent with O’Connor becoming embroiled in the controversy over the statue of the Revolutionary War hero Commodore John Barry for Washington, D.C. While O’Connor was the sculptor favored for that commission, members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians objected to his design, and ultimately, their position determined the commission going to John J. Boyle.

It is perhaps surprising that there are not more portrait statues in the Statuary Hall from the hands of these sculptors. However, they are particularly well represented in the Thomas Jefferson Building of the Library of Congress (LOC), in the form of ideal and classical work. Augustus Saint-Gaudens, along with J.Q.A. Ward and Olin L. Warner, was selected to oversee the vast sculptural program of the LOC. These three sculptors were in charge of selecting fellow practitioners to carry out the work, as well as having responsibility for the approval of their designs, while it was architect Edward Casey’s role to ensure that there was some consistency across the disparate works from so many different hands. Four Irish-Americans were among the nearly 20 sculptors who were commissioned, and their work can be seen among the historical (bronze) and allegorical (plaster) statuary figures positioned respectively at a considerable height on the balustrade of the gallery and in the spandrels of the arches in the Rotunda Reading Room. John J. Boyle (1852–1917),
who would later prove he had sufficient Irish ancestry to satisfy those involved in the Barry commission, was responsible for the Plato and Sir Francis Bacon statues (fig. 10); John Donoghue (1853–1903) for Science and St. Paul; John Flanagan (1865–1952) for Commerce (fig. 11); and Louis Saint-Gaudens (1854–1913), younger brother of the more famous Augustus, for the representation of Homer. Among them, Flanagan had the distinction of a separate commission, to model the clock for the Reading Room (fig. 12).

The clock, which has considerable prominence, is positioned over the main entrance, and the figure of Father Time is probably the most familiar of all the sculptures in the room. After all, who doesn't have occasion to check out the clock when making use of a library! It is an elaborate structure comprising several figures and decorative elements worked in different materials: bronze, colored marbles, and mosaic. The energy and dynamism in the sweeping movement of the group of Father Time and the attendant Day and Night are countered by the calm concentration of the figures of a Reader and Writer, positioned on either side of the clock. In its fluid Beaux Arts style the group reveals no connection with the work of Crawford a half a century...
earlier. Flanagan, who had trained with Saint-Gaudens, was based in Paris when he carried out the work, and his sculpture breathes the influence of French art, whereas Crawford’s, which by comparison is stiff and formal, remains rooted in the Italian. A contemporary newspaper article, commending Flanagan’s sculpture for the LOC and offering some biographical information to the reader—including his being the son of a master stonecutter—claimed him to be an Irish-American sculptor. The clock was installed in its location in a piecemeal fashion over several years until its completion in 1902, causing some irritation to Superintendent of Construction Bernard Green. In a journal entry in that year, he noted: “Flanagan present and nosing about, talking irrelevantly, asking questions and giving directions as usual.” However, it was apparent from the beginning of the Flanagan/Green association that Green, formerly of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, was easily exasperated. In one of the early letters from the sculptor to the engineer, Flanagan makes passing reference to Green’s pique, and there was a continuing dissonance underlying their correspondence, with money occasionally the issue.

A contemporary of Flanagan’s, John Donnelly...
(1867–1947), was also to carry out work in the Library of Congress, as well as in the Capitol and the Supreme Court building. In the census of 1910, Donnelly, who was born in Ireland, lists his profession as sculptor. However, he was less a fine art sculptor and more a stone carver like his father before him, mostly producing decorative architectural motifs. Donnelly established an eponymous firm of architectural sculptors and, although based in New York, it was noted in his obituary that he “was reported at one time to have done about 90 percent of all the stone carving work in Washington.” John Donnelly created the working models of the Supreme Court building for architect Cass Gilbert, as well as creating models for “exterior stone work, orna-

Figs. 13 and 14. The East Pediment of the Supreme Court (Justice the Guardian of Liberty) was designed by Hermon A. MacNeil (1866–1947) in 1935. The inclusion of John Donnelly, Sr's name on the east pediment marks his work on it as a carver.
mental bronzework, ornamental plastering, architectural ornamental interior marble work and ornamental carved wood.” The contract was signed 18 April 1932, and the work completed in May 1935 at a cost of $35,924.50.49 A photographic record of many of his models remains extant.50 The name John Donnelly is incised as carver on the east pediment of the Supreme Court building, where he worked to the design of his friend, the sculptor H.A. MacNeil,51 who was pleased with the resulting pediment (figs. 13 and 14).52 MacNeil acknowledged the careful and thorough nature of Donnelly’s carving. Donnelly was also commissioned at this time to model the doors, designed by Lee Lawrie, for the John Adams Building of the Library of Congress. The figure sculptures on the doors represent different aspects of the written word, including Ogma (Oghma), an Irish mythological figure who, it is said, invented an alphabet that was named for him—the Ogham alphabet.

Donnelly’s son John worked in the firm until it went out of business in the early 1940s and was responsible for the entrance doors to the Supreme Court (fig. 15a and b), which he signed (fig. 16), as well as the flagpole bases for the plaza.
in front. Cass Gilbert was an enthusiastic supporter of the Donnelly firm, often making use of them in his buildings. The architect noted in a memo dated 12 April 1934, and specifically with regard to their work at the Supreme Court, that “Mr. Donnelly, Jr., and the firm of John Donnelly, Inc., have rendered most excellent services in this modelling throughout.”

There can be no doubt that the Donnellys had as much input to work at the Capitol in the early twentieth century as Crawford had in the nineteenth. And yet the largely disparate nature of their respective input has ensured that where the latter’s name is embedded in the history of the building, the Donnelly name is rather overlooked. Such has been the treatment of mason and architectural sculptural work, dating back to an earlier age when their names failed even to be recorded. When Lorado Taft, in his 1924 version of The History of American Sculpture, noted that those “who practise the delicate art of beautifying architecture with sculptural adjuncts are almost without exception men from over the sea,” he was writing just a little too early to have been in a position to include the Donnellys.

By way of conclusion, while it can be identified that there has been considerable input from Irish-Americans sculptors in different aspects of the decoration of the Capitol, the question remains to be asked, whether the gathering together of this information has any significance or is simply an indulgent exercise on the part of an Irish art historian who specialises in the study of sculpture. It goes without saying that if all of the works created by these sculptors for the Capitol were removed from the various buildings, the complex would be the lesser for it. But it can also be argued that, in the absence of the aforementioned sculptors, others would have been offered the commissions. What is perhaps more important, therefore, is to recognise the prominence of Irish-American sculptors among those carrying out work for the buildings—as the Italians had been dominant in the early periods of the construction—and in so doing to acknowledge their place in the profession.

Thomas Somma, writing in 2010, identified nearly 20 sculptors who carried out work for the Library of Congress. The strongest representation among them was American, followed by Irish-American, with the remainder comprised of sculptors of French, British, and German descent. This seems to suggest that those with Irish blood excelled at this particular art form, a suggestion that can be confirmed by comparison with commissions for sculptural work in London in the nineteenth century. It was not for nothing that a writer for the Art Journal would claim, in 1862, that “the best British sculptors are Irishmen.” The writer was referring in particular to John Henry Foley (1818–1874) and Patrick MacDowell (1799–1870), who were born in Dublin and Belfast respectively and who, having established their careers in London, were to receive many of the most prominent sculpture commissions of their day in both England and Ireland. These two sculptors are therefore known in Ireland, unlike the Irish-Americans discussed in this essay, among whom only Augustus Saint-Gaudens and Andrew O’Connor are represented by work in Ireland.

If Irish sculptors made their way to London in the course of the nineteenth century, Irish stoncutters traveled further afield to America, and several among the Irish-American community of sculptors to be found there were their descendants. Seamus Murphy (1907–1975), an Irish stonecutter turned sculptor who remained in Ireland, wrote a book on Irish “stonies” that described their working life in the early twentieth century. Murphy acknowledged that the future held little store for these men as the profession of stoncutter could not be expected to survive long. He would not have been aware of their descendants in the U.S. who had become sculptors. In his book he highlighted an important aspect of the life of a stony that would disappear with them—the “companionship and friendliness.” One cannot expect there to have been much in the way of camaraderie among the Irish-American sculptors whose work—well beyond that of the stonecutter—is to be found in the Capitol. They were not all living in the same city, nor even in the same period. However, in cases where there are links and connections and overlaps—and Saint-Gaudens tends to emerge as the linchpin in this regard, given the extent of his studio and his role within the profession—there is a temptation to move beyond art history into the realm of the creative and to conjure up conversations between them that occasionally made reference to Ireland, conversations that may even have taken place.

---

**Paula Murphy** is professor emerita in the School of Art History and Cultural Policy at University College Dublin. Her publications include *Nineteenth-Century Irish Sculpture, Native Genius Reaffirmed* (Yale Univer-
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By Wednesday morning, the 7th of November 1860, sufficient election returns had been reported so as to leave little doubt: Abraham Lincoln (fig. 1) had been elected president of the United States. Despite only winning about 40 percent of the popular vote, his margin of victory in the Electoral College had been substantial, comfortably giving him virtually all of the electoral votes for states north of the Mason-Dixon Line (fig. 2).

It took well over a week for returns from the far-flung, still-new states of California and Oregon to come in, and there, it was a different story. In California, Lincoln’s plurality over nearest rival Stephen Douglas was a bit over 700 votes, and in Oregon, his lead over opponent John Breckinridge was around 300 votes. No other states gave Lincoln such a narrow margin of victory. It was, as the president-elect later declared, “the closest political bookkeeping that I know of.”

Immediately, the southern slave-holding states began to agitate for secession. Lincoln tried to placate them, but to no avail; his many speeches, over many years, against slavery convinced the South that they had no choice but to make preparations to declare their independence from the United States and create their own Confederate States of America.

Geographically, the split-up in the East was—with the exception of a handful of border states—fairly clear. But in the West, the situation was not nearly as obvious. Beyond a line of states stretching...
from Minnesota in the north to Texas in the south, the country was a collection of sparsely-populated territories and—at the westernmost extremity, bordering the Pacific Ocean—the equally lightly-settled states of California and Oregon. The only means of communication with those far-flung states and territories was the stagecoach, the popularly-named Pony Express mail service, and sporadic sail- and steam-vessel visits to river and coastal ports. Further clouding the western scene were the periodic proclamations by some Californians that, if they didn’t like the way they were treated within the Union, then their state just might declare itself a republic and go its own way.

When the lame-duck Thirty-Sixth Congress returned to Washington in December of 1860, not only was the status of the South in question; so was that of the West.

But in the mind of one U.S. senator, the West had already been won. Sen. William H. Seward (fig. 3) of New York had been Lincoln’s principal rival for the Republican presidential nomination. He also had played an important role back in 1850, when—in what some called the “War of the Giants”—he fervently supported California’s petition for statehood. And with the admission of the free state of Kansas in January 1861, he rose yet again in the Senate, to ask: “Kansas is in the Union, California and Oregon are in the Union,… What is the extent of the Territories which remain…How many slaves are there in it?” The answer, Seward declared, was 24—just two dozen slaves in all the Territories. The issue of slavery in the West, he continued, “has ceased to be a practical question.”

Seward’s widely-reported speech helped secure the West for the Union as the slave-holding southern states began to secede. It also very likely further convinced President-elect Lincoln to select the New Yorker to be the next secretary of state.

As states, soldiers, and siblings chose sides and the rebellion took form, at least some parts of the
federal government carried on as before. The newly expanded Capitol, with new House of Representatives and Senate chambers, needed decorating. Prominent among the many new spaces were four enormous 20- by 30-foot walls that formed part of the staircases which led to the visitors galleries for both chambers. Montgomery Meigs—the U.S. Army officer responsible for overseeing the Capitol’s expansion—had spent years trying to hire artists to paint one or more of these walls. By early 1861, he had finally succeeded in lining up someone to do so, by the name of Emanuel Leutze.

Leutze (fig. 4) was a German-born immigrant who had gained great fame as the creator of Washington Crossing the Delaware, which had made both the painter and the painting household names in 1850s America. For the southwestern staircase of the House, Leutze had for some time proposed painting a depiction of emigrants heading west. With Meigs suitably impressed by the concept, Leutze began painting a two-and-a-half by three-foot study, to show more precisely what he had in mind.

It didn’t take long for the Confederacy to begin targeting the West. Shortly after Lincoln’s inauguration in March 1861, Union newspapers were foaming about plots to “revolutionize” California and Oregon. Later that spring, reports reached the White House that a rebel force was headed to El Paso, Texas, with the objective of invading the New Mexico Territory and pushing even further west to conquer southern California. There was even information reaching Washington which, as Seward put it, “wears an air of authenticity,” that suggested the rebels were planning to seize Mexico’s Lower California and use it as a base to attack shipping along the Pacific coast.

The president, overwhelmed by an avalanche of events in the East, instructed Seward and the State Department to thwart this threat to the West.

Near the end of spring 1861, Leutze had completed his study of what would be called Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way, which was shown to not only Montgomery Meigs, but to Members of Congress, the president, and members of his cabinet.

The study depicted a wagon train of emigrants laboriously struggling to the top of a mountain pass, with a view to the west of fertile land bathed in a setting sun. At the bottom was a separate, thin panoramic view of the entrance to San Francisco Bay, with a small collection of sailing vessels well within the bay, seemingly just off San Francisco, which was shielded from view by a ridgeline. All of these vessels were framed—and seemingly protected—by the fortifications at Fort Point on the right and the more distant fortifications of Alcatraz Island on the left.

Among the many that were taken by Leutze’s study was William Seward. The prolific artist had painted a full-length portrait of Seward as senator in 1859 and would complete a second portrait of him as secretary of state by the end of 1861. The two men got along quite well, which seemingly would have surprised no one who had ever met Emanuel Leutze. As one government official who knew him well declared, the artist was “a genial, kind hearted gentleman, generous to a fault, and exceedingly companionable.”

Seward liked the study of Westward so much, that he asked Leutze if he would make a copy for him. Naturally, the artist agreed, and by mid-June was busily re-creating the study for Seward. This copy would not always have the same detail as the original study; the

Fig. 4. Numerous acquaintances described artist Emanuel Leutze as an amiable and kind man. Napoleon Sarony (1821–1896) took this photograph in the 1860s.
San Francisco Bay scene, for example, depicted the fortifications in a rather blurry fashion, and there were no sailing vessels in the distance between the forts (fig. 5). But otherwise, it was a fine rendition.8

Leutze’s studies and sociability did the trick. In early July, he was awarded a contract to paint Westward on the wall of the west staircase of the House wing, for $20,000. With papers signed and agenda clear, the artist headed out West, to see as much of the Rockies as he could and sketch the details that would bring the painting to life.

This addition to the Confederacy stretched—according to the rebels—from the Texas border, through Mesilla and Tucson, and ended at the border with California. The creation of such a long, thin territory by the Confederates sent an unmistakable message: the Golden State was at risk.

As the summer of 1861 turned to autumn, it became increasingly clear to the northern public that the rebellion was not going to end quickly. Further still, the risk of Confederate action appeared—at least from Seward’s perspective—to be taking on an almost global dimension.

On the 25th of October, Seward received a dispatch from U.S. Commissioner to the Kingdom of Hawaii Thomas Dryer: “It is the opinion of nautical men here,
that even a schooner of not more than two hundred tons burden, could in one hour, with perfect ease, burn or destroy the whole whale fleet which congregates here during the winter months.” This was no small concern. The American whaling fleet in the northern Pacific was upwards of 75 vessels. Their loss would hurt not only economically, but psychologically.  

Unfortunately, the Hawaiian government of King Kamehameha (the Fourth), which was practically bankrupt, had no protection to offer the American whaling fleet. As Dryer declared, “The universal plea is the utter inability of the Hawaiian Government to prevent an armed vessel from entering the harbors. They say, ‘we have no forts, no armed vessels, no army and no cannon.’ My reply is ‘give us the best you have; if it be only paper cannon, give us that.’” This plea for protection touched a nerve in Seward, for he soon forwarded an extract from the dispatch to Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles (fig. 6).  

But at that stage, there was little Welles could do. All four eastern squadrons of the U.S. Navy were fully occupied with a publicly-declared blockade of Confederate ports, and the Navy’s Pacific Squadron— with about 8 armed vessels—had its hands full trying to patrol from the coast of the Washington Territory all the way down to Panama. There simply were no vessels to spare.  

Closer to home—in the Gulf of Mexico—the situation was about to become even more complicated. The Republic of Mexico had borrowed heavily from the major European powers, particularly Great Britain, France, and Spain. Unable to service this debt, Mexico had defaulted on its loans in July 1861. 

The European “allies,” as they came to be called, reacted with fury. Newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic were soon filled with speculation that if the Mexicans did not honor their obligations, the allies would send a military force to compel them to pay up. 

Such an action by the European powers would be a gross violation of the Monroe Doctrine. This policy, initiated by Pres. James Monroe in 1823, declared that any European armed intervention in the Americas would not be tolerated by the United States. But given the ongoing rebellion, the Union was hardly in a position to enforce it. Seward had already been charged by the president with preventing the use of Mexican ports by Confederate armed vessels. The potential for a large European naval force in the Gulf of Mexico introduced yet another complexity to his task. 

The danger soon became even more unsettling. Diplomatic dispatches received in early November from U.S. Minister to Spain Carl Schurz and U.S. Minister to France William Dayton indicated that some of the Europeans might want a lot more than just money. Schurz reported that the Spanish press and some government officials were talking of encouraging the Mexicans to call a national congress “for the purpose of voting a constitutional monarchy and electing a king.” Dayton added that the more precise plot involved having a member of Spain’s royal family “called upon by the people of Mexico to assume the throne.” 

These purported intrigues did not overly bother Seward, who replied to Dayton:

We cannot observe the proceedings of France, Great Britain and Spain in regard to Mexico without deep concern. But the effects upon our interests are likely to be only incidental. If it were possible that we should lose our national integrity, there is no knowing how we should stay its foreign consequences. Since, however, I feel well assured that we shall restore the power and the prestige of the Union in good time I am not disturbed by the external accidents of the war.
Perhaps contributing to Seward’s sanguine expectations was the recent news that after a Herculean three-and-a-half month effort, the transcontinental telegraph had been completed in late October 1861. California and Oregon, while still isolated, must have suddenly seemed a little bit closer to the Union.

In the midst of growing reports of possible allied action against Mexico, Emanuel Leutze returned to Washington. His trip to the Rockies had been a success; he was now armed with ample drawings of the mountains, as well as the pioneers who were making a new life for themselves out on the frontier.

By late October, the artist had set up a studio in a room reserved for him in the Capitol. With everything he needed now at hand—workspace, sketches, supplies, and vision—Emanuel Leutze began to paint.15

As 1861 drew toward a close, the war’s complications multiplied.

In mid-November, a Union warship yanked two Confederate diplomats off a British-flagged vessel, the Trent, igniting a firestorm of criticism across the pond. Some British newspapers didn’t just want the diplomats released; they wanted a declaration of war against the United States.

At precisely the same time that the Trent affair was inflaming the press on both sides of the Atlantic, fleets of the British, French, and Spanish navies steamed and sailed west. Their destination: Vera Cruz, Mexico. The allies had agreed on a plan of action to compel Mexico to honor its debts, at the point of many guns.

The Spanish navy arrived first, in mid-December, and the 6,000 soldiers brought along quickly occupied Vera Cruz. By early January 1862, the French and British fleets arrived. In total, the allies had mustered more than 30 warships and over 9,000 troops for what some Europeans termed a “bondholders’ war.”16

To the Americans, the true purpose soon looked far less benign. That the Confederates might take advantage of the Mexican crisis was obvious, and continuing rumors, both public and diplomatic, that the Spanish or the French had motives beyond money continued to bubble. Union newspapers began running stories on the precise composition and armament of the allied navies in the Gulf.17

Even the Californians began to wonder. In mid-January, the Sacramento Daily Union ran a front-page article listing the “ships of war in the Pacific,” and what it showed was sobering. The Union Navy’s Pacific Squadron consisted of just six cruising warships and two storeships, of which only three were steam-powered, while the British had fourteen steamers out of a squadron of sixteen, and the French had two large steamers out of a squadron of five vessels. In every respect—tonnage, horsepower, and armament—the U.S. Navy in the Pacific was outgunned.18

As Washington endured its first winter of the war, Emanuel Leutze continued to paint.

The Union press took due note. “Leutze is busy at work upon his great picture for the western staircase of the House gallery,” reported the The Evening Star of Washington, “and [it] is in many respects the finest of Mr. Leutze’s works.”19

Lots of people with business on Capitol Hill made a point of stopping by to see how Leutze’s painting of Westward was coming along. They included Lincoln, Seward and, of course, many Members of Congress.

That Leutze was in the process of making a significant contribution to the building must have been clear to any observer when the government celebrated George Washington’s birthday on 22 February 1862. Marching up to the Capitol and into the House chamber for the official celebration came a long procession of officials, as well as throngs of the citizenry, who packed the gallery to overflowing (fig. 7).

Nearly everyone was there: Vice Pres. Hannibal Hamlin, members of the Cabinet, the Senate, the Supreme Court, diplomats, and senior military officers, including Gen. George McClellan. So too—as a special guest on the floor of the House—was Emanuel Leutze.20

Even though the Trent affair had been settled diplomatically, there continued to be great speculation as to whether the British or French might intervene in America’s ongoing insurrection. Newspapers repeatedly fanned these rumors, including reports claiming that if the British did go on the offensive, California would certainly be attacked.21

By late February, the California legislature felt compelled to take action of its own, debating whether to appropriate funds for munitions and the erection of defensive works above and beyond what the federal
government had already completed. Further still, the legislature—by joint resolution—ordered Gov. Leland Stanford to send a telegraphic message to Seward, specifically asking him “…whether in the opinion of the Federal Administration, our foreign relations are at present such as to make it necessary or expedient that California should take active measures towards putting the Harbor of San Francisco in a state of defense.”

By early March, it had become increasingly clear to Lincoln and Seward that the situation in Mexico was getting worse—much worse. Accordingly, Seward felt it necessary to outline more explicitly the administration’s position to Dayton (fig. 8):

We observe indications of a growing opinion in Europe that the demonstrations which are being made by Spanish, French and British forces against Mexico, are likely to be attended by a revolution in that country which will bring in a monarchical government there in which the crown will be assumed by some foreign prince…

After noting prior European representations to the contrary, Seward then continued:

The President…deems it his duty to express to the allies, in all candor and frankness, the opinion that no monarchical government which could be founded in Mexico, in the presence of foreign navies and armies in the waters and upon the soil of Mexico, would have any prospect of security or permanence.

By the end of the month, continuing reports of France’s imperial ambitions led Seward to ask Dayton for a more explicit, if unofficial, response from the French foreign minister, Édouard Thouvenel:

You will intimate to Mr. Thouvenel that rumors of this kind have reached the President and awakened some anxiety on his part. You will say that you are not authorized to ask explanations, but that you are sure that if any can be made which will be calculated to relieve that anxiety, they will be very welcome…

Dayton dutifully carried out these instructions and met with the French foreign minister in mid-April. His description of the response proved deeply illuminating:
[Thouvenel] stated in reply...that they had no purpose or wish to interfere in the form of Government in Mexico. All they wanted was that there should be “a Government,” not an anarchy... He said that in point of fact there was no Government in Mexico now. That if the people of that country chose to establish a republic, it was all well; France would make no objection. If they chose to establish a monarchy, as that was the form of Government here, it would be charming (“charmant”)...  

Such an “explanation” could hardly be seen as relieving the anxiety of Lincoln, or Seward. 

By the time Dayton’s dispatch arrived in Washington, snippets of State Department communications regarding Mexico, which Congress asked to see, had found their way into American newspapers. Among the bits that editors found most tantalizing was the president’s prior delegation of responsibility for thwarting any rebel threats to Mexico’s Lower California to the Department of State. What had been privileged information was now public: if the west coast was lost by way of Mexico, everyone would know who to blame. 

Once the spring of 1862 was well advanced, the true nature of the danger to the West Coast had become much clearer. In late March, the Confederates had been turned back at the Battle of Glorieta Pass in the New Mexico Territory. The rebel threat to the West—on land, at least—appeared to recede. 

And in Mexico, the British and the Spanish—upon realizing that the French government of Emperor Napoléon III truly did have imperial ambitions—had withdrawn their forces from that country. This left the French, and Confederate raider vessels, as the primary threat to the Pacific Coast. 

Congress had not been idle all the while; indeed, it had tried to do its part to bring California and Oregon closer to the East. After years of discussions and months of wrangling, it finally passed a bill for the building of a transcontinental railroad, which the president signed into law on 1 July 1862. A railroad to California would take years to build, but symbolically it sent an important message to the world: the Union was going to be connected from coast to coast, no matter what.

Fig. 8. William L. Dayton represented New Jersey in the Senate as a Whig from 1842 to 1851. In 1856, he was the Republican Party’s candidate for vice president under John C. Frémont. Lincoln appointed him minister to France 18 March 1861; he held the position until his death in Paris on 1 December 1864.

The very same day that the Pacific railway bill was signed into law, the Senate took up a measure to allow Emanuel Leutze to finish his work on Westward. With government finances stretched to the limit by the rebellion, questions had arisen as to whether efforts to decorate the Capitol should continue. 

Sen. Solomon Foot of Vermont rose to offer an amendment that would exclude Leutze’s Westward from any suspension of work. Foot argued that since much of the painting was already complete, “both economy and justice required that the picture should be completed.” The Senate concurred, and Leutze was allowed to return to his task.

By late summer, it had become clear that Napoléon III
intended to double the stakes in Mexico.

Reports from France indicated that the major shipyards at Toulon, Brest, and Cherbourg were humming with activity. The French Navy was to receive a fresh supply of ships, some of which were said to be for a new French naval squadron that would be stationed in the Gulf of California, off the coast of the Mexican state of Sonora.

Why there?

Because the state of Sonora, which was just south of the New Mexico Territory and stretched all the way to the southeastern tip of California, had been and continued to be a major source of silver. The rumors circulating in Paris suggested that the French government was angling to seize Sonora and its silver, while her forces near Vera Cruz pressed inland from the east.

For the U.S. Navy, responding to such a challenge would prove difficult. While it had grown nearly five-fold since the beginning of the rebellion, the Union Navy was still concentrated overwhelmingly in the East. In fact, according to newspaper reports that October, the U.S. Pacific Squadron was listed as down to just five armed vessels capable of patrolling the coast, of which only three were steam-powered. If France, or even a well-armed Confederate raider, tried to make a play for the California coast, the Union Navy would be hard-pressed to counter them.

As the rebellion dragged through the autumn, the need for fresh soldiers and sailors to defend the Union grew stronger. Among those newly appointed to the rank of midshipman in the Navy was Emanuel Leutze’s first-born son, Eugene. On 10 October, Eugene received his first orders to report for examination at the Naval Academy, which had temporarily been moved to Newport, Rhode Island.

By that time, the artist was putting the finishing touches on Westward. In November, newspapers began reporting that Leutze was almost done, and by month’s end they were announcing that the painting would be “exposed to public view” right after Thanksgiving.

From that moment on, waves of visitors came to Capitol Hill to see Westward, day after day. The newspapers responded accordingly. Leutze’s art, wrote The Baltimore Sun’s local correspondent, was “a brilliant and striking representation of Western emigration.” Even Leutze’s arrangement to have a three-section photograph of the painting taken in early December was considered newsworthy enough by the press to warrant a story. But of all the accolades that showered Westward, there was none more insightful than that from the District’s most widely-read newspaper, the Daily National Intelligencer: “It is, beyond question, the most thoroughly national picture that we have; the purest revelation of what is in the minds of us all—our cherished hopes and habits of thought. It flashes upon the soul in an instant, and an hour’s study deepens the impression.”

On Saturday, 29 November—just as the public began to see Westward in large numbers—Seward had the Pacific Coast on his mind. Accordingly, he wrote a letter to Welles: “A letter was received at this Department today from the Collector of Customs at San Francisco, Ira P. Rankin, Esquire, in which he states that ‘it would be well if a ship of war could be kept constantly on the Northern Coast of Mexico for the protection of our interests in that quarter’…” That Seward had forwarded this request to the Navy so quickly was telling. Clearly, he was worried about what the French might do in Mexico, or elsewhere. Within weeks, even the press thought it knew the secretary’s thinking, with newspapers declaring, “It is…claimed by many intelligent persons that Mr. Seward confidently expects the intervention of the French government in our affairs, and that he has shaped the foreign diplomacy of this government of late, wholly in reference to such a danger.”

As crowds continued to flock to the Hill to see Westward through mid-December, great political trouble was brewing elsewhere in the Capitol. The Republicans had taken a drubbing in the November congressional elections, and news from the front was yielding yet another disaster: the Union Army had been defeated at Fredericksburg, Virginia. Republican senators met in caucus and concluded that they had to force the president to make changes to his Cabinet. Their number one target was Seward, whom many thought possessed an outsized influence over Lincoln.

“The town all in a bug,” wrote Attorney Gen. Edward Bates in his diary, “all the Cabinet to resign—new schemes + programs in abundance.”

Seward actually did tender his resignation to the president, but Lincoln deftly held off accepting it, while
Fig. 9. Secretary of State William Henry Seward and his daughter Fanny, c. 1860–65, by Mathew Brady (1823?–1896)
he met with the senators and defended his secretary of state. The president’s steadfast conduct won the day; the senators backed off, and Seward kept his job.

Back at work on 23 December, Seward had several important matters to attend to. Foremost among them was forwarding an extensive report from Dayton to Welles on the French Navy’s shipbuilding surge. He also needed to respond to an invitation just received to attend a dinner in New York, taking place that very evening!

So Seward quickly wrote a telegraphic reply:

GENTLEMEN: I received only at this time your kind letter of the 16th instant, inviting me to meet the sons of Orange and Sullivan [Counties] at the anniversary celebration in New York this evening. Thus far, although electricity consents to convey our thoughts, yet it…absolutely refuses to go into competition with steam in carrying either passengers or freight—of course I cannot come…

Seward then closed his letter by noting that if men are forced into a war, they must fight it “with vigor,” but just as importantly, “…they can and must unite sons of Orange with sons of Erie, sons of New York with sons of Massachusetts, sons of Missouri and sons of California—brothers in fact as they are in name—as inseparable members of the American Republic.”

New Year’s Day in nineteenth-century Washington was a very grand occasion. By tradition, the president and first lady hosted a reception at the White House, first for senior government officials and diplomats, then followed by the general public. While the latter was admitted, cabinet members often retired to their homes to host receptions of their own.

Seward arrived at the White House at a little past 11 o’clock that morning, with his 18-year-old daughter Fanny (fig. 9). Seward had to peel off to oversee the president’s official signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. With that task completed, the first couple began receiving guests. As Fanny later recorded, “Mr + Mrs Lincoln both remembered me, and Mr L was very cordial.”

Unfortunately, Seward and his daughter couldn’t stay; they had to rush home to open their own reception. The Seward household was soon flooded with guests, including the British and French ambassadors, as well as many other members of the diplomatic corps. Also present, recorded Fanny, were Emanuel Leutze and his son.

There also appeared to be something else quite interesting in the Seward’s reception room: Leutze’s second study of Westward. Just when the Sewards hung it there isn’t clear, but as Fanny wrote less than a fortnight later, “the study of Leutze’s picture…every one notices, it is the easiest thing in the world to talk, with that in the room.”

So by 1 January 1863, everything with regard to Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way, seemingly, was in place.

Leutze’s second study of it—done for Seward in the summer of 1861—was on display in the family’s reception room, there for any visitor to inspect.

Leutze’s actual painting of the work in the Capitol had garnered widespread publicity, and praise, including the National Intelligencer’s declaration that “it is, beyond question, the most thoroughly national picture that we have.”

And, as a result, thousands were flocking to the Capitol to see it, including, presumably, the many diplomats and their families who had seen the study in the Seward’s home.

And what did the finished Westward in the Capitol show?

In the main portion (see front cover), more or less precisely what the two studies had depicted: a wagon train of settlers struggling their way up to a mountain pass to gain their first view of the western side of the Rockies. The most readily noticeable change was the addition of a settler handing an American flag to the scout standing atop the central rock.

But down below, in the lower panorama portion that depicted the entrance to San Francisco Bay, there were two changes that would have been noted by any keen observer. First, the fortification guarding the entrance to the bay—Fort Point—now featured an American flag flying from a tall pole. The message would have been obvious to anyone who thought about it: that fort was American, and so was California. Taken in conjunction with the new flag about to be planted atop the Rocky Mountains in the main portion of Westward, the bigger message was just as clear: all of the territory between the Rockies and the Pacific was American and would be defended.

The second change to the panorama was even
more obvious. As with the first study (but not the second done for Seward), there were sailing vessels moving about far inside the Bay, between Alcatraz Island and an unseen San Francisco behind Fort Point. But unlike either of the two studies, there was an additional vessel in the Bay, much closer to the viewer. Smoke was rising from it at an angle, and upon closer examination, it could be seen to have a funnel, paddleboxes, and three masts. It was, unquestionably, a steamship (fig. 10).

Further still, unlike the sailing vessels in the distance that seemed to be simply sailing to-and-fro within the protective safety of the forts, this steamer was not; instead, it was nearer, and heading straight at the viewer. The implication seemed to be that this steamship wasn’t afraid of the viewer, but rather, was coming out of the bay as if in challenge. Logically, only one type of vessel would do such a thing, and that was a warship.

And if a careful observer inspected this steamer’s masts and yards, they might possibly conclude that its rigging was very close to that of the USS Saranac, the only three-masted paddlebox steamer in the Pacific Squadron (fig. 11). The Saranac had been on the West Coast for years, and her paddleboxes made her readily

![Fig. 10. Westward Ho’s newly-added steam vessel and the newly-added American flag at Fort Point (detail, Emanuel Leutze, Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way)](image10)

![Fig. 11. The USS Saranac was part of the U.S. Navy’s Pacific Squadron during the Civil War; here it is shown during the 1870s, moored in a Pacific Coast harbor.](image11)
identifiable at sea, unlike the profile of more modern screw-propeller vessels in the fleet.\(^4\) It was, without a doubt, a very clever depiction. Anyone looking at this addition to the panorama might conclude that it was simply a commercial steam vessel departing San Francisco. But an informed individual—such as a diplomat—could easily wonder whether this new vessel was meant to send a message above and beyond the new flags: the United States had the means to defend the entire Pacific Coast, thanks to the power of steam (fig. 12).

If there was one person who had the motive to make such a declaration, it was Seward. It was he who had fought for California’s admission as a U.S. senator. It was he who had been tasked by Lincoln with thwarting any attempt to capture the Golden State. And it was he who seemed to remember California in his communications, both public and private.

Furthermore, it was Seward who had such close personal ties to Leutze, a friendship that would continue as the artist painted additional portraits of the Seward family in the years to come.\(^4\)

There was perhaps no better evidence of Seward’s ongoing state of mind than the communication he wrote to Dayton in early February 1863, as the French continued to commit more ships and soldiers to their Mexican adventure:

It is a great mistake that European Statesmen make if they suppose this people are demoralized. Whatever in the case of an insurrection the people of France or of Great Britain… would do to save their national existence,… just so much and certainly no less the people
of the United States will do, if necessary, to save, for the common benefit, the region which is bounded by the Pacific and the Atlantic Coasts…

For a native of—and former governor and U.S. senator for—the state of New York, who was sitting on the East Coast as he wrote this, it most certainly was odd for Seward to define his country as being “bounded by the Pacific and the Atlantic Coasts” (as opposed to the other way around). His geographic definition of the United States—just three months after the unveiling of a steam ship charging out of San Francisco Bay to challenge the viewer of Leutze’s Westward—made it abundantly clear that whether it was pen on paper, or paint on plaster, William Henry Seward sought to defend the Union in every way he knew how.

JOHN LAURENCE BUSCH is an independent historian who focuses upon the interaction between humanity and technology, with a specialization in first- and early second-generation steam-powered vessels. His book, STEAM COFFIN: Captain Moses Rogers and The Steamship Savannah Break the Barrier (2010), has been widely reviewed by magazines and academic journals on three continents. He regularly speaks to both public and professional audiences.
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NEW USCHS PRESIDENT

FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

On behalf of the entire Board of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, I am proud to announce the appointment of the Hon. Jane L. Campbell as our fourth President/CEO. As a career public servant with a passion for history, she will lead the Society to fulfill its civic education role at the intersection of Congress’ history and our future in this transformational time.

When Ron Sarasin retired last March after a distinguished 17 years as our President/CEO, the Board established a Search Committee, which I led. This committee worked through the remainder of 2018, with the assistance of outside counsel and a professional search firm, Development Resources, Inc. We considered over 40 candidates before reaching a final decision in January. Jane Campbell was the unanimous choice of both the Search Committee and the Board. She officially assumed her new role on February 1.

I am deeply grateful for the commitment and efforts of the Search Committee members, as well as DRi’s hard work and the patience and flexibility of Society staff throughout this period.

We look forward to working with all of our members, volunteers, partners, and supporters as we begin this exciting next chapter for the Society.

FROM THE NEW PRESIDENT

I accepted the Board of Trustees’ appointment to serve as President/CEO of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society with honor and excitement. Even before I officially started I met so many Society supporters at the Volunteer and Partner Appreciation Event on January 30—in spite of the snow nearly 80 people gathered to hear the Hon. Stephen T. Ayers, the recently retired Architect of the Capitol, describe the challenges of restoring the Dome. In the beginning of my tenure I am learning about the hopes and dreams, challenges and frustrations of our talented staff, volunteers, partners, and trustees as we work together to meet the mission of the Society to share the history of the Capitol and the men and women who work here.

The U.S. Capitol stands as the symbol of our republic. Around the world the image of the Capitol is the best-known image of American democracy. Our work at the Society strengthens civic education, especially for disadvantaged students. We continually add to the public history of congressional debates and decisions as we bring together Members of Congress, staff, and interested citizens. Surely we can find the example of our “better angels” to guide us.

I look forward to leading the Society into our next chapter, and I thank you for your ongoing support.

Jane Campbell

The first female mayor of Cleveland, Jane L. Campbell came to the U.S. Capitol Historical Society with considerable congressional experience. She served Sen. Mary Landrieu of Louisiana as chief of staff, as staff director for the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and as a senior advisor to Sen. Maria Cantwell of Washington. Campbell’s public service career also included serving five years as county commissioner for Ohio’s largest county, six terms in the Ohio House of Representatives, and a term on the Regional Transit Authority Board.

Following her work in the Senate, Campbell led the Washington Office of the National Development Council. She is the immediate past president of Women Impacting Public Policy, a coalition of women business organizations advocating for federal policy to support women entrepreneurs. She continues to serve as a senior advisor at both Public Private Strategies and the International Economic Development Council, the country’s largest organization of economic development professionals.

Campbell currently serves on the boards of the Lincoln Land Policy Institute, the Faith and Politics Institute, and the Association for Enterprise Opportunities. She is the proud mother of two accomplished daughters: Dr. Jessica Merrill of Little Rock, Arkansas and Catherine Campbell-Morrison, a Yale divinity student.
ANNUAL AUGUST BROWN BAG SERIES

This year’s annual August lecture series bled into September and drew large crowds; as a whole, speakers focused on more recent congressional history, often through a political science lens, and on issues related to congressional capacity, which is the ability of the institution to function.

The John W. Kluge Center at the Library of Congress co-sponsored the first two talks, which were held in beautiful spaces in the Library of Congress Jefferson Building. Matthew Green* (Catholic University) opened the series with a look at House leadership races, including examples from 1965 and 1973. Green returns to USCHS on March 10 with co-author Douglas Harris to talk more about their archival research and work examining leadership races. Next, Colleen Shogan* (Library of Congress) and Jacob Straus* (Congressional Research Service) dove into their work on how social media platforms have changed how Members of Congress understand their roles and interact with the public. They posited a new model for congressional representation—interactive representation—that includes continued interactive communication between voters and Members throughout the term.

Seth Masket* (University of Denver and the 2018 Kluge Chair in American Law and Governance) spoke about his research on the Democratic Party’s response to the 2016 election, which looks at ways that a narrative about the election may emerge and influence changes the party makes in areas such as delegate selection rules. Laura Blessing* (Georgetown University) examined some of the effects of the 2011 earmarks ban on Congress, including how the change has contributed to dysfunction within the institution. For example, leadership now has fewer tools with which to keep party members in the fold.

Kristina Miller (University of Maryland) drew on research for her recent book to explore how the behavior of House members since the 1980s does and doesn’t address poverty and the poor; for instance, a tiny percentage of laws in the last 50 years focus on poverty or related topics, but a few Members consistently introduce such legislation in Congress after Congress. Kevin Kosar* (R Street Institute and Legislative Branch Capacity Working Group) concluded the series with an examination of congressional staff members, especially the rise and fall in the overall number of staff through Congress’ history and the effects of those changes on congressional capacity.

* C-SPAN recorded most of the August lectures, which are now available at c-span.org. Search for the speaker’s name, or try “Capitol Historical Society” to find all of our events on C-SPAN!

USCHS HOSTS “CONGRESS AND THE SEPARATION OF POWERS” FORUM

On Tuesday, 25 September 2018, the United States Capitol Historical Society in partnership with the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center presented “Congress and the Separation of Powers: Audacious Vision, Uneven History, and Uncertain Future,” a forum organized by the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies at American University. The panel discussions brought together an ideologically diverse group of academics and experts to take a closer look at the relationship between the three branches of government, and in particular the role of the Congress, in shaping the executive and judicial branches over time. Nearly 200 people attended the day’s discussions.

Beth Plemmons, CEO of the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, and Connie Tipton, vice-chair of the USCHS board of trustees, gave opening remarks. Dr. David Barker, director of the Center for Congressional and
Presidential Studies, served as the event’s emcee and noted that the constitutional separation of powers fulfilled James Madison’s vision for “ambition checking ambition.”

Dr. John Haskell, director of the John W. Kluge Center at the Library of Congress, moderated the first panel, “Audacious Vision: Why a Separation of Powers.” The panel featured Gene Healy, vice president at the Cato Institute; Dr. Alison LaCroix, Robert Newton Reid professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School; and Dr. James I. Wallner, senior fellow at the R Street Institute. The panelists discussed concepts of “productive friction” and how the framers of the Constitution, especially James Madison, viewed the inherent conflict between and within the branches of the federal government as an asset rather than a liability.

The second panel, “Uneven History: Separation of Powers and the Struggle for Equal Rights,” was moderated by Ron Elving, who is senior editor and correspondent on the Washington desk for NPR News. The panel featured Jesse J. Holland, a race and ethnicity reporter for The Associated Press; Dr. Yuval Levin, vice president and Hertog Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center; and Victoria Frances Nourse, a professor of law at the Georgetown University Law Center. The panelists debated how the separation of powers shaped the evolution of civil rights, and in particular how the courts came to be the primary decision-making body.

Dr. James A. Thurber, who is a distinguished professor of government at American University in Washington, D.C., moderated the third and final panel, “Uncertain Future: Party Polarization and Legislative-Executive Balance.” The panel featured Dr. Sarah Binder, a senior fellow in governance studies at the Brookings Institution; Dr. Norman Ornstein, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; and Manu Raju, a senior congressional correspondent at CNN. The panelists discussed how party polarization has shaped the separation—and balance—of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the federal government.

C-SPAN was on hand to record the event; full videos of the panels are available on c-span.org.

USCHS HOSTS SYMPOSIUM, RECEPTION HONORING WILLIAM THORNTON

On 30 November 2018, the United States Capitol Historical Society—in partnership with the University of Aberdeen in Scotland, the Octagon, and Tudor Place—presented an academic symposium and reception in honor of Dr. William Thornton, the First Architect of the Capitol. 2018 marked the 225th anniversary of both the acceptance of Thornton’s plan for the Capitol and the laying of the Capitol’s cornerstone.

The day’s commemoration began with a morning symposium entitled “Imagining the Capitol: The Enlightened Life of Dr. William Thornton.” Officials and academics discussed the life and work of Thornton at the historic Octagon House, one of his designs in the capital city. William C. diGiacomantonio, chief historian of the USCHS welcomed attendees to the event, as did Christine Merdon, acting Architect of the Capitol, and Richard Wells, vice-principal of international partnerships for the University of Aberdeen. C-SPAN3 was on hand to record the talks. Videos of the lectures are available on their website, c-span.org.

With “Thornton’s Capitol, 1793, and the Atlantic Revolutions,” Michael Brown of the University of Aberdeen placed Thornton in the political context that surrounded his design of the Capitol, as both France and Haiti experienced republican revolutions and the United States embarked on creating a large, vital, commercial republic built on debate rather than purity. Independent historian Gordon Brown offered “William Thornton—Polymath,” which offered a brief biogra-
ogy of Thornton—including some of his more visionary ideas—and argued that he and his wife Anna Maria were a Washington power couple despite his public quarrels and their lack of money for entertaining. Matthew Costello of the White House Historical Association highlighted Thornton’s relationship with George Washington, which benefited both men, in “George Washington’s Capital and Thornton’s Capitol.” Finally, Ellen Miles, curator emerita of the National Portrait Gallery, offered “The Thorntons: Capital Portraits,” which examined portraits of Thornton, his wife Anna Maria, and other Washington, D.C. figures, including some copies painted by Anna Maria herself. The program ended with a final Q&A session with all the speakers.

The celebration concluded with an evening tour and reception at Tudor Place, another of Thornton’s grand designs in Washington. Guests were welcomed with light refreshments before exploring the manor open house. At the end of the tour, participants had an opportunity to sample the Balvenie Single Malt Scotch Whisky, which is a unique range of single malts produced in Scotland’s Speyside region by the world’s longest-serving malt master, David C. Stewart MBE. Sharing this meaningful spirit served as the day’s final toast to Thornton’s life and work.

LECTURES: PEOPLE, PLACES, PAINTINGS

A variety of speakers in the second half of 2018 headlined lunchtime lectures on disparate topics. In May, historian Matthew Gilmore* took attendees through the many formats and places President and former Member of Congress James Garfield has been remembered in Washington, D.C.—including an exhibit at the National Museum of Medical History that shows several of Garfield’s vertebrae and the path the assassin’s bullet took through them. Former Capitol Fellow Heidi Irre came all the way from Germany to explore artist Emanuel Leutze’s work, including the Capitol’s Westward the Course of Empire Takes its Way; this year is the sesquicentennial of his birth.

Environmental historian Scott Einberger* kicked off the fall portion of the program with a look at Stewart Udall’s tenure as secretary of the interior; Udall had also represented Arizona in the House and was a prolific author. Einberger signed copies of his book, With Distance in His Eyes: The Environmental Life and Legacy of Stewart Udall, as did historians David and Jeanne Heidler* (The Rise of Andrew Jackson: Myth, Manipulation, and the Making of Modern Politics), who spoke about their work on the way Andrew Jackson’s supporters crafted a smear-centric response to Jackson’s loss in the 1824 election and the way that smear—accusing John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay of a “corrupt bargain”—lives on in histories of the episode. Finally, John Laurence Busch, author of Steam Coffin: Captain Moses Rogers and the Steamship Savannah Break the Barrier, previewed his article in this issue (see p. 45) with a talk that placed Leutze’s Westward the Course of Empire painting in its political context.

Stay tuned to our website, uschs.org, for announcements about upcoming lunchtime lectures. To commemorate Women’s History Month, on March 27 Capitol Fellow Sandra Weber will present an illustrated lecture about the woman suffrage Portrait Monument displayed in the Capitol Rotunda. On April 3, John Brady of the Flagship Olympia Foundation will speak about the USS Olympia’s role transporting an unknown WWI soldier to lay in state in the Capitol before his Arlington burial. Matthew Green returns on April 10, along with co-author Douglas Harris, to speak about their new book on leadership elections in the House of Representatives.

*These lectures were broadcast on American History TV. Visit c-span.org and search for the speaker’s name or U.S. Capitol Historical Society for these talks and more!
On Thursday, 12 July 2018, the United States Capitol Historical Society hosted a panel discussion featuring four female chiefs of staff and moderated by legendary journalist and USCHS Trustee Cokie Roberts. The bipartisan, bicameral group was comprised of Muffy Day, chief of staff for Rep. Karen Handel (R-GA); Rhonda Foxx, chief of staff for Rep. Alma Adams (D-NC); Kristen Gentile, chief of staff for Sen. Bob Casey (D-PA); and Stacy McBride, chief of staff for Sen. Roy Blunt (R-MO).

In a room of USCHS Leadership Council and Constitution Signers members, Roberts began her lively moderation by noting both how far women have come as Congressional employees and the progress yet to be made. After introducing themselves, the panelists gave thoughtful and candid answers to the questions Roberts presented. One of the afternoon’s recurring themes referenced the strength of the sisterhood of female chiefs of staff, frequently panelists’ best source of advice and guidance.

Foxx shared the story of winning her first job on Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand’s campaign through confident perseverance; she also described how her professional experiences inspired her to found the Congressional Black Alliance. Bipartisanship among both chiefs of staff and their bosses was another common theme throughout the discussion, but McBride noted that much of that cooperation and friendship is not seen or reported by the media.

In response to an audience question, Day spoke about how she tries to help younger staffers in her office grow professionally by giving them the mentorship and advice she wished she had had access to when she first began her career on the Hill. Gentile, a mother of three, fielded an audience question about the demanding schedules of being a working mother and a chief of staff. She discussed the importance of keeping lines of communication open, knowing the needs of her employees, and fostering a family-friendly office culture.

Upon the conclusion of the panel, USCHS Chairman Donald Carlson thanked the panelists for their time, insights, and service to the Congress before guests took the opportunity to take photos with them and Roberts.

USCHS wishes to thank Altria for generously hosting and Bank of America for exclusively supporting this event.
CAPITOL COMMITTEE RENEWALS, UPGRADES, AND NEW MEMBERS
JUNE 1, 2018–NOVEMBER 30, 2018
The Society deeply appreciates all the Capitol Committee members for their continued involvement and support of its educational mission.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
($25,000 & UP)
Bank of America
Express Scripts
Johnson & Johnson
Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals
PricewaterhouseCoopers
UPS

CONSTITUTION SIGNERS
($15,000–$24,999)
American Society of Civil Engineers
Chevron
The Home Depot
Nestlé USA
Norfolk Southern Company

For more information about the many benefits available to Capitol Committee Members, please contact Director, Corporate Giving Marilyn Green at (202) 543-8919 x21 or mgreen@uschs.org, or Manager of Development and Outreach Jennifer Romberg at (202) 543-8919 x23 or jromberg@uschs.org.

225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPITOL CORNERSTONE LAYING

On Tuesday, 18 September 2018, the 225th anniversary of the laying of the Capitol cornerstone was commemorated with a ceremonial reenactment. Organized by the office of Sen. Ron Wyden of Oregon, the event featured Members of Congress, officials from the United States Capitol Historical Society and George Washington’s Mount Vernon, and a group of Washington-area Freemasons bearing with them artifacts from the original ceremony.


Richard J. Bautista, grand master of the Grand Lodge of Free And Associated Masons of Washington, D.C., presided over the reenactment of the cornerstone ceremony, which featured masonic tools, corn to represent nourishment, wine to represent refreshment, and oil to represent joy. Finally, the Rev. Bilal M. Raschid, grand chaplain of the Grand Lodge of Washington, D.C., delivered a benediction.

To read more about the remarks, see the coverage on our website, uschs.org. In addition, C-SPAN was on hand to record the ceremony; a full video can be found on their website, c-span.org.
He spoke warmly about his service as Architect: “the real honor has been working with the incredibly talented men and women of the Architect of the Capitol. From a passion, commitment, talent, service and leadership perspective, there are none better on the face of the earth.”

USCHS Trustee Jeanne de Cervens then transitioned the event into the Freedom Award portion of the evening. Remarking on the history of the award, she pointed out that, “In recent years, we have honored journalist Cokie Roberts, congressional stalwarts Daniel Inouye and John Dingell, filmmaker Ken Burns, Cabinet Secretaries William Cohen and Norman Mineta, civil rights leader Congressman John Lewis, historian David McCullough, and Hamilton creator Lin-Manuel Miranda.” De Cervens then introduced fellow USCHS Trustee Jean Bordewich to speak about the unique role and important heritage of the office of the Architect of the Capitol.

Bordewich noted that “the Architect of the Capitol is faced with a constant dual mandate: to maintain an efficient, effective, and state-of-the-art office complex for the legislative branch of our federal government, and to preserve this historic edifice and its many important works of art, while making it as fully open to the public as possible. It’s not easy, but they do it with extremely well.” She then introduced Merdon, who made some remarks in acceptance of the award.

“The men and women of our agency are humble and dedicated people who serve Congress and the Supreme Court, preserve America’s Capitol, and inspire incredible memories on a daily basis,” said Merdon. Reflecting on the scope of their work—and the assets at their disposal—Merdon shared, “I like to think of this work as three ’P’s: People, Projects, and Preservation. This award honors our most important agency resource: our people. It’s wonderful to hear the essential work of the Architect of the Capitol being acknowledged and celebrated. We have some of the most talented and widely admired architects, tradesmen, artists, engineers, and scholars, and I’m proud to have some of them here tonight.”

Society Board of Trustees Chairman Donald Carlson closed the program by recognizing event donors—Bank of America, The American Institute of Architects, and the American Society of Civil Engineers—and other special guests including three Architects of the Capitol: 10th Architect of the Capitol Alan Hantman, Ayers, and Merdon. Each of the Architects was presented with a USCHS replica of the Capitol made from reclaimed marble taken from Capitol steps during the 1995 restoration.

C-SPAN was on hand to record the evening’s proceedings for their American History TV program. The full video can be seen on their website, c-span.org.

**Freedom Award (cont. from back cover)**

Sen. Roy Blunt

He spoke warmly about his service as Architect: “the real honor has been working with the incredibly talented men and women of the Architect of the Capitol. From a passion, commitment, talent, service and leadership perspective, there are none better on the face of the earth.”

Society Board of Trustees Chairman Donald Carlson closed the program by recognizing event donors—Bank of America, The American Institute of Architects, and the American Society of Civil Engineers—and other special guests including three Architects of the Capitol: 10th Architect of the Capitol Alan Hantman, Ayers, and Merdon. Each of the Architects was presented with a USCHS replica of the Capitol made from reclaimed marble taken from Capitol steps during the 1995 restoration.

C-SPAN was on hand to record the evening’s proceedings for their American History TV program. The full video can be seen on their website, c-span.org.
Leaving a Legacy

By including USCHS in your bequests, you can instill and foster informed citizenship for generations to come.

If you are considering a bequest to USCHS, here is some suggested wording for your attorney:

After fulfilling all other specific provisions, I give, devise, bequeath _____% of the remainder
[or $_____] to the United States Capitol Historical Society, a District of Columbia charitable corporation
[Tax ID #52-0796820] currently having offices at 200 Maryland Ave., NE, Washington, DC 20002.

For more information please contact Laura McCulty Stepp, VP, Membership and Development at 202-543-8919 x22.
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**DOME COOKIE JAR**

The United States Capitol Dome may well be the most famous man-made landmark in America. It is such a fitting finale for the building it crowns, so familiar and dignified, that it seems surprising that its design and construction came late in the U.S. Capitol's architectural evolution. This ceramic cookie jar (cookies not included) crafted from the marble removed from the East Front steps during renovations. The marble particles are ground into a fine dust and added to the ceramic mold to create this beautifully accurate reproduction of the Capitol Dome. Gift boxed. (10”T x 7½”W x 7½”D)
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**PORCELAIN CAPITOL BOWL**

Designed especially for the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, this heavy weight porcelain bowl is the perfect presentation piece or gift item. Four images of the Capitol framed in wreaths of green and highlighted with 22kt trim give this bowl a very distinctive look. Gift boxed. (Approximately 8¾”D x 4¼”T)
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**MARBLE TILE MAP COASTERS**

These custom marble coasters are inspired by the beautiful artwork in the Society’s newest publication, *Creating Capitol Hill*. These fine pieces honor a people’s history, culture, art, and architecture. This set of four marble coasters features an antique map of Capitol Hill. (4” x 4” set of 4)
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MARBLE DOME BOOKENDS

The inspiration for these handsome bookends is the iconic Capitol Dome. Crafted from the marble of the East Front steps removed during the 1995-96 renovations, the marble is ground into a fine powder and added to resin to achieve the detail in the molding of this classic desk or shelf accessory. Gift boxed with provenance. (Approximately 7 1/2"H x 5 1/2"W x 2 1/2"D)

#001903 $79.95
Members $71.95

5" STATUE OF FREEDOM

The Statue of Freedom is a classical female figure with long, flowing hair wearing a helmet with a crest composed of an eagle’s head and feathers. This replica of the Capitol’s crowning symbol of freedom and democracy is crafted from the marble of the steps removed from the East Front of the Capitol during the 1995-96 renovations. Made in the USA

#002716 $36.00
Members $32.40

CREATING CAPITOL HILL: PLACE, PROPRIETORS, AND PEOPLE

This book recounts Capitol Hill’s convoluted and fascinating history. In four essays the story is revealed, recounted, and unraveled. The three essayists, Charles Carroll Carter, William C. diGiacomantonio, and Pam Scott have succeeded in bringing a fresh perspective. 2018, 304 pp.

#003030 (softcover) $29.95
Members $26.95
#003031 (hardover) $49.95
Members $44.95
On 28 November 2018, the United States Capitol Historical Society presented the 2018 Freedom Award to the office of the Architect of the Capitol. Christine Merdon, acting Architect of the Capitol, accepted the award on the agency’s behalf. The evening’s ceremony also featured the unveiling of the official portrait of retiring 11th Architect of the Capitol, the Hon. Stephen T. Ayers, FAIA, CCM, LEED AP.

Following the presentation of the colors by the U.S. Capitol Police Ceremonial Unit and a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, the program was opened by USCHS Trustee Sen. Roy Blunt of Missouri. “It is an incredible building with an incredible heritage and incredible story told every day. It wouldn’t be an easy thing to sign up to be responsible for that building... but that’s what Stephen Ayers decided to do.” Following his remarks Blunt unveiled the portrait of Ayers.

Ayers spoke of his appreciation for the Society: “We work together to award scholarships to academic researchers and have added significantly to the documented history of the Capitol over the years. We partner with [the Society] on a fabulous program to provide tours, lunch, and content to at-risk children right here in Washington, D.C. We work together to bring academics, pundits, politicians, writers, researchers, and personalities to the Capitol to provide enlightening content to the public...and so, so much more.” (cont. on page 65)