The Appearance and Personality of Stephen A. Douglas

ROBERT TAFT

THE motives that caused Stephen A. Douglas to include the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in the act organizing the territories of Kansas and Nebraska "have occasioned one of the great debates of American historians"; 1 and constitute "one of the most arresting enigmas in all American history." 2 The problem has been discussed at some length by a number of leading historians; as we all know, this subject has been a favorite one of our own Prof. James C. Malin for some years. To my mind, the origin of human motives is so baffling, so elusive, so intricate a problem that I am more than willing to let these abler minds grapple with such an important but perplexing question.

Whatever were the motives of Douglas, whatever were the errors made, whatever were the moral indignations that swept the North, that convulsed the nation in 1854, the outstanding event of 1854 as far as it concerns most Kansans of today, was the fact that the territory of Kansas was organized, that the initial step in the beginning of a great commonwealth had been taken. As Prof. Frank H. Hodder so aptly stated over half a century ago though we may not approve the mode and the motive of some of our territorial acquisitions, we must admit that our splendid territory and unprecedented national development are the result of the policy of which Douglas was the ardent supporter. We cannot accept the doctrine that evil may be done that good may come, but candor compels us to recognize the fact that good has come." 3

To Stephen A. Douglas more than any other man must go credit for this initial event in Kansas history. The statement that has been credited to Douglas: "I passed the Kansas-Nebraska Bill myself." 4
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has not been challenged, as far as I know, by any historian in the years since the troublous question was debated with so much fury in congress and the nation.

It has seemed to me as we approach the centennial year of 1954 that it is fitting and proper that we pause for a moment in this brief hour and recall the “Little Giant” by inquiring:

What manner of man was he? What was his appearance?

To answer the first question, in part, there are a number of current estimates of his personality and what are more important, a number of contemporary descriptions of the man available. Several of these I shall quote. To answer the second question, there are many photographs of Douglas available and a number of these I shall show you. Possibly any originality which this address possesses lies in the fact that, as far as I know, no one has previously made a study of Douglas photographs.

It is true that historians who have written on Douglas have used photographs of Douglas extensively but seldom if ever have these picture records been treated with serious respect; and little study of source, authenticity, date, etc., has been attempted. Indeed, I strongly suspect that on several occasions there have appeared portraits, said to be Douglas, that are not Douglas at all. All of these factors make any attempt to study photographs of Douglas at this late date difficult, but, as a beginning, I shall list the photographs of Douglas known to me and the sources from which they have been obtained, as well as such other information as is available.

Let us return, however, to a brief review of descriptions of the personality of Douglas before we discuss his photographs. First, we shall quote several modern opinions of his personality.

Douglas, wrote Nevins in 1947:

was a leader of extroverted personality, of rapid decisions and headlong action, and of pronounced love of combat. He was never disposed to give prolonged meditation to the complexities of a situation, or to undertake a careful weighing of forces and futurities. He did not think before he acted; he thought while acting. . . . Relying upon a brain teeming with points and a marvelous memory, he was always quick to improvise.

Again Nevins wrote in referring to Douglas during the Kansas-Nebraska debate in congress in 1854:

Day after day Douglas was in his seat when the session began, and still there when it ended. Week in and week out, his quick, piercing eyes watched every move with tigerish intentness. Whenever a stroke was needed, he was on his feet, tossing his mass of dark hair like a lion’s mane and scowling at his enemies. . . . He was doubtless the most formidable legislative puglist in all our history. . . . When in the right, he could present a statement of surpassing
clarity; when in the wrong, he could skilfully twist logic or cloud the subject with irrelevancies; and at all times, he could rend an opponent with unscrupulous savagery. . . . His scornful visage, his insolent gestures, his insulting epithets, threw his opponents into hot but utterly helpless dudgeon."

It is well to remember in reading any modern estimate of the personality of Douglas that he must be judged by the times in which he lived and by the actions of his compeers. The senate of 1854 was no Sunday school. When one senator openly called another colleague a "hollow-hearted demagogue"; when a statement of one senator was called "an infamous falsehood" not once but four times in succession by a fellow senator; when one senator charged that another senator and his friends were "howling like fiends attempting to destroy the country"; the need of an extremely forceful personality in securing attention is only too evident.

A more sympathetic opinion of the personality of Douglas than that expressed by Nevins is given by George Fort Milton. Milton, who has written the most extensive and scholarly of the biographies of Douglas, states he was the sort of man any of us would delight to have had the opportunity to know. Able, courageous, captivating in company, he was staunchly loyal as a friend. Yet neither his opportunistic genius nor his ability as a public speaker, nor his persuasiveness in court or Congress, chiefly distinguished him from the other politicians of his day and generation. More than all these, Douglas illustrates again that most satisfying of all human capabilities, the capacity of a man to have an organic growth of character.

In his first decade in Illinois he was little more than a bright and pleasant fellow who had learned the trick of getting on in the world. In Washington he felt the impact of mighty issues, the engaging politician grew under pressure and became a far-seeing, patriotic statesman. In the end Douglas employed his matchless talents for the glory of the Nation which gave him birth and the preservation of the Union that he loved. This change from attractive smallness to real nobility of conduct chiefly interests one in the Little Giant. This quality gave him dominance in the twilight years, and still makes him memorable in our history.

Of contemporary descriptions of Douglas, I should like to quote extracts from several sources. The first appears in a letter written in 1842 when Douglas was a member of the Supreme Court of Illinois:

The judge of our circuit is S. A. Douglass, a youth of 28, who was the democratic candidate for Congress in 1838, in opposition to Stuart, the late

---

6. The first of the above charges was made by Sen. John B. Weller, of California, against Sen. William H. Seward, of New York (Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 784); the second by Sen. John Bell, of Tennessee, against Sen. Robert Toombs, of Georgia (ibid., p. 750); the last by Sen. James M. Mason, of Virginia, against Sen. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio (ibid., p. 299).
member from this district. He is a Vermonter, a man of considerable talent, and, in the way of despatching business, is a perfect "steam engine in breeches." This dispatch is the only benefit our circuit will derive from the change. He is the most democratic judge I ever knew. While a case is going on, he leaves the bench and goes among the people, and among the members of the bar, takes his cigar and has a social smoke with them, or often sitting in their laps, being a person, say five feet nothing, or thereabouts and probably weighing about 100 pounds.\(^8\)

The Rev. William H. Milburn was chaplain of congress in 1845 and 1846 and had also known Douglas in Illinois. Writing in 1859, Milburn has left us this account of Douglas:

It must be confessed that there was formerly a dash of the rowdy in Mr. Douglas, and that even now the blaze of the old Berserker fire will show itself at times. But it must be recollected that his is a vivid and electric nature, of redundant animal life and nervous energy; that he was bred, not in scholastic seclusion, nor amid the conventional routine of a settled population, but that his character has taken shape and color from that of the bold men of the border, where pluck was the highest virtue, and "back-bone," to use a phrase of the country, compensated for many a deficiency in elegance. . . .

In society, few men are more agreeable, provided you are willing to make allowance (which most people in this country are bound to do) for the defects of early breeding, which can never be entirely hidden. He is singularly magnetic in conversation, full of humor, spirit and information, and charms while he instructs. Of course, he has one habit which constitutes a Masonic bond of brotherhood among all western men—I mean that of chewing tobacco.\(^9\)

Certainly the most celebrated writer to leave us a description of Douglas was Harriet Beecher Stowe, the author of the history-making *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. To Mrs. Stowe, the names of Stephen A. Douglas and the "Evil One" must have been nearly synonymous terms. Yet after she saw Douglas in action in the senate one April day in 1856, she wrote the following surprisingly objective description:

This Douglas is the very idea of vitativativeness. Short, broad, and thick set, every inch of him has its own alertness and motion. He has a good head and face, thick black hair, heavy black brows and a keen eye. His figure would be an unfortunate one were it not for the animation which constantly pervades it; as it is, it rather gives poignancy to his peculiar appearance; he has a small handsome hand, moreover, and a graceful as well as forcible mode of expressing it—a point speakers do not always understand.

Mrs. Stowe then turned her attention to another senator but Douglas again attracted her attention and she wrote:

Now Douglas has the floor. The first sentence shows you that he has two requisites of a debater—a melodious voice, and a clear, sharply-defined enunciation. The speech that followed was a perfect specimen of his kind of talent.

---


His forte in debating is his power of mystifying the point. With the most off-hand assured airs in the world, and a certain appearance of honest superiority, like one who has a regard for you and wishes to set you right on one or two little matters, he proceeds to set up some point which is not that in question, but only a family connection of it, and this point he attacks with the very best of logic and language; he charges upon it horse and foot, runs it down, tramples it in the dust, and then turns upon you with—"Sir, there’s your argument! didn’t I tell you so? you see its all stuff! 10

Mary Jane Windle, like Mrs. Stowe, was a writer of this same period. Unknown at present, she has left some interesting sketches of life in Washington and the South, for her home was in South Carolina. She, too, observed Douglas in action (in February, 1857) and wrote her impressions of the senator as follows:

There are few men in the Chamber whose bodily and mental lineaments make so distinct and definite an impression upon the public mind as Judge Douglas. His figure—short, stout, and thick—would have been fatal to the divinity of the Apollo Belvidere, but is precisely such as befits a man of the people. His physiognomy, too, is rather stern and heavy, and if you ever had any hint that there was a vein of acrimony in his character, you fall to imagining what expression that keen eye will take, and that heavy eyebrow, and that firmly-set mouth, when he is belaboring the Republican party. But when he rises to speak, you listen but a few moments before you forget everything, except that a man of ability is before you. He is a bold and independent speaker, and has the power of thrilling his hearers through and through; indeed, rapidity and boldness of thought are his inseparable attributes. He strikes on all the hard, strong points of his subject, till they ring again. His language is always sharp, and clear, and strong, and knotty; never soft; seldom beautiful.

There has been, during the last two years, raised against him a storm of repute and misrepresentation. Public meetings have denounced his ambition. Northern speakers have held him up to scorn, as the very embodiment of national evil. Northern journals have poured an incessant hail of accusation against him, he sternly pursues his course, breasting the storm, combating the surge. 11

The Chicago Tribune was as outspoken in the 1850’s and 1860’s as it is today. Sen. Stephen A. Douglas was not the object of the Tribune’s affections and the Tribune did not hesitate on many occasions to state bluntly its views on the senator and his activities. At the time of the death of Senator Douglas in 1861, the Tribune expressed itself at some length. To my mind, the statement of the Tribune is an unusual and important revelation of contemporary feeling and opinion, especially as it came from an avowed enemy of the senator. The Tribune account reads in part:

It is well known that the Chicago Tribune had no sympathy with the political movements of the late Senator since 1853. He was content to go his way, and

we ours. He had one line of policy, and we another. In all these years of difference, we shared with others the animosity that our prejudices or his acts provoked; and he even was not exempt from the infirmity which afflicts all partisans. . . .

There is no cabin in America to which his name has not gone. There is no man however humble or unrefined, who from the praise of his friends, often indiscreet, or the abuse of his enemies, more frequently undeserved, has not made up an estimate of the man. He was undeniably great. He had a great brain in which size did not repress activity. He had a will which was as inflexible as iron. He had courage which bordered at times upon audacity. He had great affections; and by consequence great passions—he could hate as well as love. He had great vigor of constitution and, all men said, a firm hold upon the strings of life. . . . He had great ambition, which he sought to gratify by great events. Hence he was an orator and politician; and at both he greatly excelled. . . . Another decade, when the voice of war is forgotten, would have witnessed the gratification of the object of his later strifes. His country at peace in all its parts and with all the world, the arrogant slave power humiliated partly by his courageous efforts, would have seen his elevation to the position that he would have filled with conspicuous ability.12

Finally, we shall let Douglas speak for himself. I have chosen for this purpose, a few words from the speech of Douglas in the closing minutes of the Kansas-Nebraska debate. The hour must have been close to midnight on May 25, 1854. In his concluding speech on this question, Senator Douglas said:

"The great West is indissolubly connected with the South as well as with the North. The Northwest and the Southwest, from the source to the mouth of the Mississippi, with all its tributaries, are, and forever must remain, one and inseparable. We are indissolubly connected by all the ties that make men brethren and countrymen, and we should do no act, and permit no act, inconsistent with those fraternal and patriotic relations."13

I believe these words were spoken in all sincerity and show Douglas, despite his obvious defects and mistakes, to be first and foremost a patriot. If any additional proof is needed, we may recall the conduct of Douglas during the presidential campaign of 1860. Nominated by Northern Democrats, Douglas made a vigorous campaign against Lincoln, Breckinridge (a Southern Democrat), and against Bell (old-party Whig). It seemed evident early in the campaign, because of the division of the Democratic party, that the cause of Douglas was hopeless. Yet Douglas traveled into the South, denounced secession in no uncertain terms, and flatly declared that the South's first duty was to the Union, even if Lincoln were elected. No other candidate ventured to make such statements in this field. The final popular vote (Lincoln, 1,558,000; Douglas, 1,360,000; the other two trailed far behind) is some measure of the

13. Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 33 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 788.
esteem in which Douglas was held by his contemporaries, for it must be realized that much of this vote came from the North.14

The personal appearance of Douglas is given by many portraits. These portraits include oil paintings, crayons, lithographs, engravings, cartoons, and photographs.15 I am here concerned only with the photographs of Douglas, but I have examined many of the other types of illustrative material as they throw some light on the photographs themselves. It should be stated, however, that in general the hand-executed portraits of Douglas bear little resemblance to his photographs. Only in a few such portraits is there similarity between the two types of picturization.16

The earliest "photograph" of Douglas reproduced in any of the accounts of this man is that found in Milton with the legend "Douglas Before He Went West."17 In Milton's list of illustrations, this portrait is credited as follows: "From a copy of an old daguerreotype sent to the author by H. E. Barker, Los Angeles." According to Milton, Douglas went West in 1832.18 As I have shown elsewhere, the daguerreotype (the first form of photography) was not introduced into the United States until late in 1839.19

15. The Chicago Historical Society has a photograph of an oil painting by George P. A. Healy, one of the more important of the paintings of Douglas. The original painting is now owned by the Gilcrease Foundation, Tulsa, Okla. T. R. Hay of Lee's Summit, N. Y., who is making a study of Healy wrote me under date of September 27, 1853, that as far as he knew, there was only one Healy portrait of Douglas. The Gilcrease Foundation reports that the painting was made in 1857.

The Kansas State Historical Society has an oil portrait of Douglas with the signature "L." in the lower right-hand corner. The portrait was given to the Society many years ago by Mary E. Delahay, daughter of Mark Delahay. According to Miss Delahay the portrait was painted by Lasseur in Illinois "before the civil war."—Kansas Historical Collections, v. 10, p. 541.

Little information is available on Lasseur (also spelled "Lassieur" and "Lassier") but the portrait resembles very much one of the last photographs of Douglas (No. 23 or No. 25 as discussed later). Curiously enough, the Illinois State Historical Library of Springfield, also owns an oil portrait of Douglas by Lasseur which "belonged at one time to Mark W. Delahay." It was acquired by the Springfield institution in 1927. The Chicago Historical Society also owns an oil portrait credited to "P. Lassie." These three oils are all busts, and are essentially the same pose, but vary somewhat in dimensions as follows:

Chicago Historical Society
36 7/8" x 28"*  
Illinois State Historical Library
27" x 22 5/8"*  
Kansas State Historical Society
32 5/8" x 27 7/8"*

It is my guess that all three portraits were painted after a Douglas photograph about the time of his death.

16. For example, in Ballou's Pictorial, Boston, January 8, 1859, p. 17, is a three-quarter-length portrait of Douglas. The portrait is a wood engraving drawn for Ballou's by the celebrated artist, Winslow Homer. Homer was then at the beginning of his career so that not too much expertise might be expected. He did not, unfortunately, draw the portrait from life but from a lithograph published by C. H. Brainard of Boston. Homer's drawing was in turn engraved by a Mr. Damoreau, also of Boston. The combined result of all these efforts, as might be expected, was to produce a portrait that had little resemblance to the "Little Giant."

A number of such Douglas portraits, as well as reproductions of photographs, contained in printed books and periodicals, are listed in the A. L. A. Portrait Index (Library of Congress, Washington, 1906), p. 428. The Portrait Index is an extremely useful tool, as I have found through many years' experience, in beginning search for portrait or biographical information.

18. Ibid., p. 16.
Obviously, Milton's crediting is incorrect. Either the original portrait is not a daguerreotype or the subject is not Douglas. The youth of the face portrayed seems to preclude any possibility that the portrait, if Douglas, was a daguerreotype made after 1839. Since the facial features make it seem possible that the portrait is that of Douglas, it may be that the original portrait was a miniature (or larger painting) by some unknown artist.20

It is entirely possible, of course, that a daguerreotype copy of this earliest portrait was made at some time and it was this copy daguerreotype which Barker furnished Milton. Stevens also reproduced this same portrait with the legend "Earliest Picture of Stephen A. Douglas." As in the case of all illustrations reproduced by Stevens no information at all, other than the legend, is given.21

The second portrait of Douglas, taken in chronological order, is another one reproduced by Milton with the legend "The Prairie Politician: Stephen A. Douglas. In his Early Years in Illinois Politics."22 In Milton's list, this portrait is credited "From a family daguerreotype now in possession of the Chicago Historical Society."

The Chicago Historical Society through Mrs. Mary Frances Rhymer wrote me on September 7, 1953, that the original daguerreotype referred to by Milton "does not seem to be in the possession of the Society nor is there any record of its having been here." Neither is it among the collections of the Illinois State Historical Library. It seems probable therefore that Milton secured a copy of this portrait from some other source.

If this portrait is an original (i.e., not a daguerreotype copy of a painting), it must have been made after 1839 and therefore fairly late in the Douglas career as a local politician, for Douglas was elected to Congress in 1843.

Stevens reproduced a portrait with the legend "Stephen A. Douglas, 1842-43, When First Elected to Congress."23 If this dating is correct (I believe it is too early) then the Milton portrait just described and the Stevens portrait are very nearly of the same time period. Comparison of the two portraits make it difficult to believe

20. The possibility that the portrait reproduced by Milton is not Douglas cannot be overlooked. The illustration may be a reproduction of an original daguerreotype of an unknown youngster. Some individual may have run across the daguerreotype and exclaimed "Why, that looks as if it might be Douglas in his youth," and have soon convinced himself that his assumption was correct. Passing it on to another person, the finder states "This is a daguerreotype of Douglas as a youth" and the chain of events is started that makes it almost impossible to prove the identity of the original.
that they are of the same person. The Milton portrait has the appearance of a copy of a miniature or other painting.\textsuperscript{24}

After these early portraits there appear to be none of Douglas until he reached Washington. He began his first term in the national congress in December, 1843, but did not become widely known until after his election to the U. S. senate in 1847. Indeed the earliest reproduction of a Douglas portrait found in a national periodical was one published in \textit{Gleason's Pictorial Drawing Room Companion}, v. 4, (February 5, 1853), p. 88, a very poor wood engraving after a photograph made in the Whitehurst Gallery of Washington, presumably in 1852. In fact, most of the known photographic portraits of Douglas are of the period 1854-1861, after Douglas had achieved nation-wide distinction.

Many of the Douglas photographs of this period are carte de visite photographs (\textit{carte de visites}) and, when they are contemporary prints made from the original negatives, are reasonably well dated within the two-year period, 1859-1861. The first of these dates marks the year when this form of photograph became at all common in this country\textsuperscript{25} and the later date, 1861 (June 3), marks the death of Douglas.\textsuperscript{26}

One portrait of Douglas is included in this study that is not a photograph. It is, however, based on an original photograph. This Douglas portrait is a woodcut appearing in \textit{Harper's Weekly} for December 26, 1857, and is credited to an original photograph by Whitehurst. The portrait is unique among the Douglas photographs in that it shows him with a full beard. Although no other photographs of the bearded Douglas have been found, he is depicted

\textsuperscript{24} I seriously doubt if Douglas could have been daguerreotypd before 1841 or 1842. The daguerreian artists known to have visited St. Louis (less than 100 miles from Springfield, Ill., and much more readily accessible from the East than Springfield would be), did not arrive in that city until June, 1841.—See "The Pioneer Photographers of St. Louis," Charles van Ravenswaay, \textit{Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society}, St. Louis, v. 10 (October, 1938), p. 48. The original advertisement of these "artists" appeared, Mr. van Ravenswaay wrote me, in the \textit{Daily Missouri Republican}, St. Louis, June 2, 1841. Elizabeth Baughman has written me that the first advertisement of a daguerreotypist in Chicago that she has seen, appeared in the \textit{Chicago American} for March 1, 1842, p. 2.

In this same connection, George M. Hall of the Library of Congress has examined their file of the Sangamo Journal, Springfield, Ill., from March 5, 1841, to the end of 1842. Although there are nine scattering issues of the \textit{Journal} missing from this file, he was unable to find any mention or advertisement of a daguerreotypist in the issues that were available.

\textsuperscript{25} Taft, \textit{op. cit.}, ch. 8.

\textsuperscript{26} The imprints on card photographs are of some use in tracing the origin of a photograph. So extensively were card photographs copied by one photographer from the works of another, however, that troublesome and puzzling problems arise when too great dependence is placed on this method of tracing, as will become evident in several cases discussed in the catalogue which follows. It should be borne in mind that it was the very common practice in the 1860's and 1870's for one firm, not necessarily photographers, to publish (\textit{i. e.} print and distribute) card photographs, having secured by purchase or otherwise, the negatives from the maker of the original. Sometimes credit was given by the publishing firm to the actual photographer but more usually no such credit was given. The Anthony's did, however, give Brady credit for some of the card photographs that they "published."
in cartoons of the period in this fashion. Milton dated one cartoon “1860”; Shaw dated it “1858.” The later date seems the more probable. The Kansas State Historical Society also possesses a cartoon showing Douglas with a beard, “Liberty, the Fair Maid of Kansas in the Hands of the ‘Border Ruffians.’”

Judging from the fact that photographs of the bearded Douglas are so few in number, he apparently wore the beard but for a short time. The personal description of Douglas which follows was written at the time of his second marriage on November 20, 1856, and indicates that at that time he was beardless. The account, written for the Washington Evening Post of November 20, 1856, was reprinted in the New York Tribune, for November 22, 1856, p. 5, and reads, in part, as follows:

In person he [Douglas] is short and stocky, a sort of truncated giant, whence his well known designation. He has a red, somewhat rowdyish face, large features, the nose being rather retroussé, but still with an expression indicating rather a rude, unrefined nature, and an imperious energy, than any settled meanness or malignity of disposition. In truth, I think him a very good-natured pleasant man, individually. He is perfectly willing, after abusing or being abused in the most violent manner, to extend the right hand of fellowship to his enemy though his political hostility is unrelenting.

Douglas apparently wore no beard in the well-known Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858. It seems probable, therefore, that Douglas wore the beard for about a year—1857—or less.

The fact that Douglas aged very rapidly is clearly seen in the two photographs listed in the catalogue as numbers 14 and 25. Number 14 was made early in 1860; number 25 probably in the last month of his life. Undoubtedly the great disappointment of Douglas in the presidential campaign of 1860 contributed both directly and indirectly to this rapid decline.

One further fact of importance emerges from a study of these photographs. From measurements made on the standing photographs of Douglas it becomes evident that the short height of Douglas was due primarily to his short legs. Indeed the height of the Douglas torso was only slightly over an inch shorter than the average of many “old Americans.” As the height of Douglas is given as five feet four inches, as against a value of five feet eight and a half inches for the average American, the Douglas legs were some three inches shorter than the average value.28

28. The ratio of the average leg length (taken to slightly above the crotch) to height from photographs number 13 and 14 is 0.46. Although this factor cannot be determined with the precision of modern anthropometric measurements, it is, I believe, significant. Anthropologists point out that the “height sitting” relative to stature is one of the most
A Catalogue of Douglas Photographs

As the procedure for the study of portrait photographs, illustrated here by the case of Senator Douglas, is more or less unique in this field, it seems well to state what is meant by an "original photograph," for I have been asked on several occasions to define the term. After some reflection, I would say: An original negative is the image secured on a photographic plate as the result of exposure in the camera to the person whose portrait is to be secured or to the actual incident or scene to be depicted. Once the original negative is secured, similar positive prints can be made as long as the unchanged negative exists. Prints made from the negative in the months immediately following the making of the negative are prints useful of such measures.—Alex Hrdlicka, The Old Americans (Baltimore, 1925), p. 111. Hrdlicka (Table 72) gives this average ratio of leg length to stature of 0.525. Assuming that the leg length to slightly above the crotch subtracted from the total height would give the sitting height, the Douglas ratio (sitting height to stature) would be 0.54. It may be said that, if anything, the figure 0.54 is too low for Douglas, as I am inclined to believe my measurements of leg length were probably too long. I am indebted to my colleague, Prof. James C. Malin, for suggesting that these measurements be made.

The sculptor, Leonard W. Volk, undoubtedly made physical measurements of Douglas for he reported that Douglas gave him many sittings for the modeling of a bust, and in 1858, Volk, a cousin by marriage of Douglas, modeled a full-length statue of Douglas which was afterward chiseled in marble.—See History of the Douglas Monument at Chicago (Chicago, 1880), by Volk, p. 61; and Harper's Weekly, January 8, 1859, p. 17. Volk also was responsible for the "colossal" statue of Douglas done in bronze in 1880; the statue proper being nine feet, nine inches in height.

20. The basic study in American photographic portraiture is F. H. Meserve's The Photographs of Abraham Lincoln (Privately printed, 1911). This work contained one hundred photographs of Lincoln in which the principle employed by Meserve was to arrange them in chronological order on the basis of existing records. Mr. Meserve subsequently published three supplements of eight portraits each. In 1944, the result of over 40 years study was published in The Photographs of Abraham Lincoln (New York), Frederick Hill Meserve and Carl Sandburg. This book contained reproductions of 120 Lincoln photographs. Meserve began the collection of Civil War and Lincoln photographs over 50 years ago and was able to secure perhaps eight to ten thousand negatives by Mathew B. Brady. In addition, he was able to talk personally to some Lincoln photographers or their direct descendants, to the son of Lincoln, and to others who were able to supply him with virtually first-hand information about Lincoln photographs. In addition, he drew on the amazing fund of information that has been collected on the day-by-day life of Lincoln. Such sources of information in 1953 are virtually lacking for Senator Douglas and I have endeavored to suggest and to use to some extent the possible sources of information that are available to the student of today where direct records are lacking.

In Stefan Lorant, Lincoln—A Picture Story of His Life (New York, 1933), much of the information acquired by Mr. Meserve on the photographs of Lincoln has been "borrowed" with only cursory acknowledgment (pp. 230, 231); in addition Mr. Lorant criticizes a considerable portion of Meserve's data. Some of the criticism may be justified but Lorant in turn lays himself open to criticism by the method employed in criticizing Meserve. On page 232, Lorant advances "a photographic method to determine whether or not Lincoln pictures are identical." The principle of the method is not new and has been long in use. I have used it for at least 25 years and it was old then. The method, superimposing negatives of two pictures made to identical size (copies of the two pictures to be compared), is sometimes useful and sometimes not. Slight differences in the pictures and variations in density of corresponding areas on the two pictures may lead to erroneous or futile results especially when the original negatives are lacking. For example, in the first group of pictures cited by Lorant (top set of pictures, p. 232), proof has not been made to my satisfaction that the two photographs are identical. In fact, if one may judge from the focus of the eyes in the portraits as reproduced by Lorant, the two portraits are different, although they may have been successive exposures made at the same sitting. In the second case cited by Lorant (lower set, p. 232) it is quite obvious, without going to the trouble of superimposing negatives, that the two portraits are not identical, for here the eyes in the two portraits are not focused in the same direction and there are, as well, other obvious dissimilarities. The study of Lincoln portraits, because of this confusion introduced by Lorant, needs reappraisal. Incidentally, it may be remarked, that the method of superimposing two pictures can be carried out with greater satisfaction if lantern slides of the two pictures are prepared and projected over each other. In this case any degree of enlargement can be made. Enlargement up to the maximum size possible which will still retain detail, greatly facilitates the detection of differences. Again this method has long been in use.
contemporary with the period in which the negative was made. Modern prints made from the Brady or other original negatives of the 1860’s, however, are just as satisfactory as far as records go, as prints made in the 1860’s. In fact, modern prints may be more satisfactory than contemporary prints because (1) contemporary prints are subject to fading, and (2) the range of contrasts available in modern photographic papers may make it possible to bring out detail not recorded in prints contemporary with the negative.

These prints contemporary with the period of the negative were copied extensively then and are copied extensively now. Each copying process usually results in a loss of detail although at times an early photographic print may be copied with modern materials and a somewhat more pleasing print obtained than that from which it was copied. (Photographic copying, of course, is implied.)

In the case of daguerreotypes, ambrotypes, and tintypes, the original would be that secured in the camera by exposure to the actual person, incident or scene. In general, but one daguerreotype (or ambrotype or tintype) could be secured from one exposure. All three of these photographic processes, however, were used to make copies of photographs (generic sense), of engravings, lithographs, or occasionally of paintings.

The procedure illustrated here in the study of photographs of historic value, it is hoped, will be of value to the profession generally. Some such method, it seems to me, is absolutely essential if photographs are to be treated as historic documents of importance. Collectors of photographs, both public and private, have done invaluable work in assembling their collections. Seldom, however, do collectors have supplementary information on individual photographs that is of use. No records of acquisition, of origin, or of dating that might, in some cases, have been readily obtained, are available for the modern user. The comment on the tremendously important Brady collection in the National Archives quoted on page 32 is illustrative of the general situation. To take another illustration, the Keystone View Company of New York wrote me recently “Our library is very old, and unfortunately records were not kept very carefully in former years.” The result is, that virtually no information—other than name—and even this must be accepted with caution, is many times available at the beginning of such investigations. The lack of such data makes the task of finding, collecting and synthesizing the widely scattered information tedious, but it does challenge the detective instinct which seems to be born within many of us.
Listed below are all the Douglas photographs (used in the generic sense) that I have examined either in the original or in photographic copies. I have compared them, arranged them in the order in which I thought Douglas aged, checked them with the published information and other data that I had available, and then rearranged them in what I believe is their chronological order, the order in which they appear here. No finality in this order is claimed. The accumulation of further information may make a rearrangement necessary but certainly there is more evidence and logic presented in the arrangement here than has heretofore been available for Douglas photographs. Part of the uncertainty in the sequence of Douglas photographs as here given arises from the fact that Douglas was frequently ill and at least once in his adult life was extremely careless of his personal appearance. The period was after the death of his first wife in January, 1853.\textsuperscript{30}

The period which these photographs cover, I believe, extends from about 1845 until the death of Douglas on June 3, 1861. All possible sources of information have by no means been exhausted in this study. A systematic examination, for example, of Washington, New York, and Chicago newspapers for the period 1845-1861 and of Douglas correspondence, might yield items of interest and value concerning the personal appearance of Douglas that would be useful in making a more precise order of portraits than here presented. It is possible, too, that in such an examination one might find occasionally a direct reference to a Douglas photograph or other type of portrait. Information of value might also be obtained by a more detailed examination of the work of the photographers who recorded Douglas; so our catalogue is by no means a closed one. Doubtless, too, other photographs of Douglas, now that some systematic approach to his portraiture has been made, will come to light. The writer would welcome such information.

As will be seen, precise dating of many of the portraits, even after extended study, has not been possible. Perhaps the difficulty outlined in the catalogue which follows may give pause to biographers, historians, and other writers, in their casual dating, without evidence, of any photographs used in the preparation of future work.

1. Copy of a daguerreotype by Brady (probably enlarged). Bust. L. C. Handy Studio, Washington. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] Possibly the original daguerreotype by Brady was made about 1845 as it was at this time that Brady

began the collection of his famous portrait gallery. The vest and tie worn by Douglas in this photograph appear to be similar to those shown in the reproduction of the Douglas portrait given in Stevens, facing p. 360. Stevens dated his portrait “1842-43,” which I am inclined to think is too early.

2. Probably a copy of a daguerreotype (bust) somewhat similar to No. 3. F. H. Meserve. Reproduced in Stevens, facing p. 393, where it has the legend “Stephen A. Douglas. 1846”; the same photograph is reproduced in Century Magazine, New York, n. s. v. 62, (1912) p. 598, with the legend, “From an unpublished photograph taken at Alton, Illinois, probably in 1854, for Douglas’s friend Major Nathaniel Buckmaster.” The Century also credits the ownership of the photograph to “Mr. Frank E. Stevens, Dixon, Illinois.” Apparently, since Stevens was undoubtedly the source of the information published in Century, he had changed his opinion by the time he published the life of Douglas. I believe 1846 too early and 1854 too late for this portrait. The Illinois State Historical Library has a print that Stevens used (probably); an accompanying note states that the original daguerreotype was owned by Robert Douglas.


4. Daguerreotype, bust, head slightly to right (actually to left). [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] Original in the Library of Congress measures 3½” x 5” (oval). Virginia Daiker of the Prints and Photographs Division reported: “Mr. Paul Vanderbilt, our Consultant in Iconography, has done some research on these daguerreotypes, and from various bits of evidence has identified them as the work of Mathew B. Brady’s studio somewhere in the period 1845 to 1853.” Not knowing the “bits of evidence,” I cannot, of course, confirm the above statement. The daguerreotypes referred to by Miss Daiker were a group acquired by the Library of Congress from the Army War College in 1920. This daguerreotype is said to be the basis of the engraved portrait of Douglas by T. Knight in Robert Toomes, War With the South (New York, 1862), v. 1, p. 17. I have compared a photograph of the daguerreotype with the Knight engraving and am willing to agree. The Knight engraving shows the head slightly to the left but, of course, the

31. Taft, op. cit., p. 57.
daggerreotype itself was reversed from right to left. My guess on
this daguerreotype is that it was taken in 1852 or 1853.

The daguerreotype, judging from the photograph first sent me
by the Library of Congress, was badly in need of cleaning. At my
suggestion it was cleaned and rephotographed.

5. Photographic copy of ambrotype or daguerreotype (more
probably the latter). Full-length, standing, right hand pointing.
[Reproduced on the cover and between pp. 32, 33.] On all the
copies of this photograph I have seen, it is the left hand which ap-
parently is pointing. In an original daguerreotype (or ambrotype)
the image was reversed from right to left, a fact that users of daguer-
reotypes seldom understand, or so state if they do understand. The
correct representation of such portraits is the mirror image of the
original. Copies owned by F. H. Meserve, Keystone View Com-
pany, Library of Congress, and the Chicago Historical Society. The
Meserve copy shows the metallic frame commonly used with ambro-
types or daguerreotypes very distinctly. This portrait is reproduced
by Allan Nevins as the frontispiece of volume one, *The Emergence
of Lincoln* (New York, 1950). Nevins uses the legend "(From a
photograph circa 1858)." It is not a photograph save in the generic
sense as is indicated by the border and, as suggested above, it is
incorrectly reproduced. This portrait has also been reproduced
(also incorrectly) in Stefan Lorant, *Lincoln—A Picture Story of His
Life*, p. 66. Lorant, of course, gives no information upon the por-
trait, not even crediting the source from which he secured it. This
portrait was copyrighted in 1914 by Henry H. Pierce of Boston.
The copyright certificate gives no information on the original.

The Illinois State Historical Library has a photostatic copy of a
clipping from part of a page of a publication which contains a coarse
screen reproduction of this portrait. The text accompanying the
copied illustration has the credit line "From a rare old daguerreo-
type of S. A. Douglas—at the time of the Lincoln-Douglas debates."
No evidence is available on the source of the clipping and my efforts
to trace it have been fruitless. The source itself might throw more
light on the original portrait and the statement made. I am inclined
to date this portrait "circa 1854" from the facial appearance (as
compared to other photographic likenesses) and from the fact that
it is probably a daguerreotype. Paper photography was well estab-
lished by 1858 and although daguerreotypes were still being made,
the wet plate process with its paper prints had pretty well displaced
the daguerreotype. As a matter of fact the Quincy (Ill.) Whig for
October 16, 1858 (reprinted in E. E. Sparks, *The Lincoln-Douglas
Debates of 1858, printed in Collections of the Illinois State Historical Society, Springfield, Ill., v. 3 [1908], p. 394), reported that photographic likenesses of Douglas were being hawked to the crowd attending the Quincy debate for 75¢ each; the hawker, continued the Whig, would probably reduce the price to 25¢ by the time Lincoln was through with Douglas.

5a. The head and shoulders of No. 5 enlarged. Copyrighted by George Rockwood in 1909. Library of Congress copy. Rockwood was an early and well-known professional photographer.32 No information concerning the portrait is given on the copyright certificate.

6. Daguerreotype, original in Illinois State Historical Library. Bust, oval in case 4½ x 5½ inches. This photograph in its original condition, is one of the most detailed of the face of Douglas ever made. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] I examined this daguerreotype at Springfield in the early fall of 1953 and found it in bad condition and offered to try its restoration. It was sent me on October 21, 1953, and I immediately set about the attempted restoration. Upon removal from its case, the back of the daguerreotype was found coated with a thin layer of dark, almost black varnish. After being washed in water, in a cyanide bath, and in alcohol, considerable improvement in appearance was made. One of the most important results produced by cleaning, however, was the removal of the dark varnish on the copper back of the daguerreotype, and there was then found scratched into the metal the legend, “Stephen A. Douglas.—July 21, 1855—[? ?] Kelsey.”

Douglas, according to Milton (p. 208, Footnote 34) was in Chicago on July 7, 1855, and, as nearly as can be determined from Milton’s account, was either in Chicago, or in and out of it, during the summer of 1855. Douglas gave a speech at ceremonies celebrating the completion of the Illinois Central railroad on July 17 or 18, 1855, but was apparently in Chicago again by July 19; see letter dated “Dubuque, Iowa, July 18, 1855” in the New York Tribune, July 23, 1855, p. 5; the Daily Missouri Republican, St. Louis, July 23, 1855, p. 1, and July 25, 1855, p. 2. The last account is by a correspondent of the Republican who had seen Douglas at Dubuque and who commented that Douglas was getting fat, an interesting commentary in view of the round-faced portrait of July 21.

As this account gives another glimpse of the personality of Douglas, it is reprinted here. The portion describing Douglas reads:

32. Ibid., pp. 140, 355, 374, 477.
We trust the celebrated author of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, will pardon us if we make personal allusions, but having had the honor of conversing with him for some time, we must say something about him. Besides, a great many of our readers have never met him. Judge Douglas has been christened the “Little Giant,” and a truer cognomen could not have been bestowed upon him: he is a man with a little body and a big head—his head is as it ought to be, the great feature to be observed—his body seems to have been bestowed upon, because nature found there was a necessity for an adjunct to assist the head. His face is very expressive when in conversation and he gives you at once the idea that he is a great man. He is head, all head, nothing but head, his head was made for a giant, and his body for a dwarf; his hat lies on the back of his head (fashionable, like ladies,) he does not cram it on as some orators do, covering up forehead, eyes, &c., but he merely wears one out of respect to custom; his hair is long and uncombed; his neck is not remarkable for its neat decoration, his cravat is twisted around like a rope; his coat is hung on him, and so are his white pants; in fact, he wears nothing except a cane, and that is all in all to him; he grasps it now and then as if he were taking hold of a friend’s hand, then he places it on the ground on one end, then he pokes it against the walls and leans his body against it, then he whirls it round and round to the dismay of passersby. There was nothing fearful in his appearance, and I almost believe that HORACE GREELEY might look at him without seeing the Union tumble about his head. The fact is, the Little Giant has grown fat on his bill, and his enemies will find that he will give them many a rub at the next session that will prove his abilities are not gone, neither that he is frightened by the raving of mad fanatics. We had a pleasant party, and the Judge made a capital speech at Dubuque; there were also several other orators on the occasion, but their names we have forgotten.

Elizabeth Baughman of the Chicago Historical Society informs me that a C. C. Kelsey is included in a list of Chicago daguerreotype artists in 1855. I have not been able to decipher the initials (preceding “Kelsey”) engraved on the back of the daguerreotype. The first one, and possibly the second, looks as if the author of the inscription had started to scratch one thing and changed his mind; in any case the engraving of the legend is crude. There can be no doubt, however, about “Kelsey.” These facts given above make it appear certain to me that the daguerreotype is correctly dated, “July 21, 1855.”

This daguerreotype was copied photographically 20 or more years ago by a Springfield professional, Kessberger, who practiced there from about 1855 until the late 1930’s, according to Margaret Flint of the Illinois State Historical Library. Three of these photographic copies are owned by the Springfield library (two 8 x 10 inch ones; the third measures 25 x 20½ inches) and are excellent copies although it is obvious that the prints have been retouched. Milton

reproduced one of these copies as the frontispiece of *The Eve of Conflict* and credits it "The Little Giant in His Prime—From a photograph made in 1859." The same retouched photograph of this daguerreotype appears as the frontispiece in the December, 1949, issue of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Springfield, with an article by Allan Nevins, "Stephen A. Douglas: His Weaknesses and His Greatness." The legend for the portrait here is "Stephen A. Douglas in 1859," obviously a repetition of Milton's error. Again it should be noted that since this is a daguerreotype, right and left are reversed; the apparent left side of Douglas in the portrait is actually his right side. Possibly the most important facial feature affected by this reversal is the fact that Douglas had a mole on his left cheek a few inches to the left of the left nostril (see reproduction of No. 20, between pp. 32, 33). In a daguerreotype or its unreversed copy this mole appears as if it were on the right side of his face (see reproduction of No. 4, between pp. 32, 33). The Chicago Historical Society purchased in April, 1953, the fourth replica of the Douglas life mask, presumably made by Volk. Miss Baughman of the Chicago Historical Society reported that the mole appears on the life mask as I have described it above. She further stated: "I would say that it is not very prominent, however."

6a. One of the modern photographic copies (retouched) of the daguerreotype described above in No. 6. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] The Illinois State Historical Library, which owns this copy, has no record when the copy photograph was made. Obviously it was made before 1934.


9. Card photograph, head and shoulders. Print in Chicago Historical Society. Photographer not designated. This may be a photograph of a lithograph as there is considerable artificiality about it. The Chicago Historical Society possesses a chromolithograph published by E. C. Middleton (Cincinnati, Ohio) in 1864 that is much the same as this card photograph save that the eyes are focused slightly different.

10. Photograph, oval, three-quarter-length, seated. Original in Chicago Historical Society. Size of print about 5% x 7% inches; this photograph may be an enlargement of No. 11.
11. Probably made at the same time as No. 10, seated but showing full-length. It appears to be a card photograph. F. H. Meserve. Illinois State Historical Library has a copy bought from the Stevens estate. The University of Chicago Library also has two copies of this photograph, each copy measuring 4 x 6 inches. No photographer is indicated on either copy.

Stevens (following p. 672) reproduced this photograph with the legend "Last Picture of Stephen A. Douglas, Taken at Aurora, Ill." As is usual, Stevens gives no other information about the photograph.

12. A small ambrotype, 2 x 2½ inches, owned by the Illinois State Historical Library. This portrait is nearly identical with Nos. 10 and 11, save that it is waist length. If Stevens is correct (see notes on Nos. 10 and 11) this ambrotype was probably made by a photographer at Aurora, Ill. As the image in the ambrotype faces in the same direction as do the images of Nos. 10 and 11, it is uncertain which of the three is to be regarded as the print from the original (in case No. 10 was enlarged from No. 11). The ambrotype image is not as distinct as No. 11 which makes it seem probable that the negative of No. 10 was the original negative.

13. Card photograph. Full-length, standing, top hat on chair to the right of Douglas, left hand resting on column. Photograph by Gurney and Son, 707 Broadway, New York. Library of Congress, Illinois State Historical Library, and F. H. Meserve. The carpet and the chair that appear in this photograph have the same designs as those appearing in Nos. 23 and 24 but the face of Douglas appears more youthful. There is the possibility that this card photograph may be based on a negative made at the same time as Nos. 23 and 24, an enlarged print made from this negative, the print retouched as described in Nos. 15-18, and rephotographed as a card photograph.

14. Card photograph, full-length, standing, top hat in left hand. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] A pleasing and revealing portrait, used by Carl Schurz, McClure's Magazine, New York, v. 28 (1906-1907), p. 253. Schurz dates it "1858"; from the fact that it is a card photograph, 1859 or 1860 seems more probable.

The Illinois State Historical Library possesses two copies of this card photograph. The imprint on the back of one is very simple, "Published by E. Anthony and Co., 501 Broadway, N. Y.,” and is probably one of the earliest card prints made from the negative. The second Illinois library copy bears the same imprint as above (the typography is more elaborate) and in addition has a woodcut
of the Anthony establishment with the additional legend “Manufacturers of Photographic Albums,” and was probably published in 1862 or after as the firm name became E. & H. T. Anthony, after 1862. If the conjecture on the first of these card photographs is correct, 1859 seems to be well indicated as the proper dating of this portrait. Copies in the Illinois State Historical Library, the Chicago Historical Society, and F. H. Meserve. Mr. Meserve owns the original Brady negative of this card photograph and it is a copy enlarged directly from this negative that is reproduced here through the kindness of the owner.

15. Contact print from a contemporary Brady negative measuring 17 x 20 inches in the National Archives collection. Three-quarter-length, standing. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] The negative is presumably that from which “ imperial” photographs of Douglas could be made. The imperial was introduced in 1856-1857 and prints from such negatives were almost always retouched (by India ink or colors) on the print (modern retouching is done on the negative). The pose, dress, and accessories are similar to Nos. 16-18 and for this reason I believe all to be of the same date. The date, for reasons developed above and in the discussion of Nos. 16-18 I believe, is 1860. Probably all of this group were photographs made for use in the campaign of Douglas for the presidency in 1860. The Chicago Historical Society possesses a print, nearly the same as this one (No. 15), but measuring about 9 x 13. The figure is cut off just below the hips.

The eyes are directed in this photograph in a slightly different direction and the leg length is somewhat longer than in Nos. 17 and 18. A reduced version of this photograph appears in William Garrett Brown, Stephen Arnold Douglas (Boston and New York, 1904), where it is credited to “a photograph by Brady in the Library of the State Department at Washington.” The same portrait (as in Brown) is reproduced as the frontispiece in Stephen A. Douglas—A Memorial (1914), by Edward S. Marsh, Brandon, Vt.

16. A Brady photograph, the original of which is owned by the Chicago Historical Society. The print, about 10 x 12 inches, is doubtless a copy of a retouched Brady imperial described in No. 15. The mount of No. 16 bears the imprint (in addition to the Douglas name) “Photograph by Brady, New York and Washington.” Although Brady photographed in Washington before 1858, his per-

---

34. Taft, op. cit., p. 54.
35. Ibid., pp. 130, 324.
manent Washington branch was established that year.\textsuperscript{36} Issues of Harper's Weekly, April 21, 1860, and June 15, 1861, reproduce a woodcut portrait of Douglas which seems to have been based on one of these photographs (i.e., Nos. 15-18) with the legend "Photographed by Brady 1860." The same portrait with the same legend is also reproduced as the frontispiece in James W. Sheahan, The Life of Stephen A. Douglas (New York, 1860).

The face in this portrait (and in Nos. 17 and 18) is much smoother than in No. 15, thus giving a much more youthful appearance than the portrait printed from contact with the Brady negative of No. 15. This difference must arise from the fact that these photographs (Nos. 16-18) are copies probably of a retouched photograph. Not only would retouching produce a smoother face but the copying process itself would tend to lose detail in the copy as compared to the original print.

16a. The retouched Brady photograph of 1860. Print from the Brady copy negative in the L. C. Handy Studios, Washington. The copy furnished me was an enlargement from a Brady card negative.

17. Contact print made directly from a Brady negative in the National Archives. Four images appear on the single plate. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] These images, as suggested in the notes on No. 16, seem to have been secured by copying the Brady imperial of No. 15 (more exactly an imperial made at the time) with a four-tube camera or with a single or double-tube camera by movement of the plate holder.\textsuperscript{37} The individual images are not card size but measure 3 3/4 x 4 3/4 inches, approximately.

18. Card photographs almost identical with Nos. 15 and 18. Copies owned by the Illinois State Historical Library and F. H. Meserve. The Illinois Library copy has the imprint on the mount "E. & H. T. Anthony, 501 Broadway, New York, from photographic negative in Brady's National Portrait Gallery." The frontispiece in H. M. Flint, Life of Stephen A. Douglas (Chicago, 1860), is doubtlessly based on one of this group of photographs which have been used more extensively than any photographs of Douglas for the preparation of engravings and lithographs. See, for example, the portrait of Douglas reproduced by Woodrow Wilson, A History of the American People (New York and London, 1903), v. 4, facing p. 176.

\textsuperscript{36} See advertisement in the National Intelligencer, Washington, January 26, 1858.
\textsuperscript{37} Taft, op. cit., pp. 144, 477.
19. Card photograph, half figure. Published by E. & H. T. Anthony, N. Y. Illinois State Historical Library has two copies.

20. Photograph, head and shoulders. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] This portrait appears to be an enlargement of No. 19— or a photograph made at the same sitting—and is credited in print on the mount to the Whitehurst Gallery of Washington. Illinois State Historical Library, the owner, stated that it is oval on a square mat, 9½ x 11½ inches. The print itself measures about 5½ x 7½ inches. This photograph is reproduced (facing p. 4) in E. E. Sparks, The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858 (Springfield, Ill., 1908), with the commendably cautious note “From a photograph in the collection of the Illinois Historical Library, supposed to have been made in 1858.” My judgment, equally cautious, would be to date it “1860 plus or minus a year.”

21. Card photograph, half figure, Chicago Historical Society, F. H. Meserve, Illinois State Historical Library. The copy belonging to the last institution bears the imprint “Published by J. O. Kane, 126 Nassau St., New York.” The Illinois State Historical Library’s copy came from the estate of Stevens.

22. Card photograph, half figure, vignette. “Charles D. Fredricks and Co., 587 Broadway, New York” is imprinted on the Illinois State Historical Library copy. The Illinois State Historical Society also has a card photograph of Mrs. S. A. Douglas with the imprint below the photograph “Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1861 by C. D. Fredricks and Co. . . .”. The imprint on the back is the same as on the Douglas card photograph above. This pair of photographs suggests that Senator and Mrs. Douglas visited the Fredricks gallery together in 1860 or 1861.

23. Card photograph, full figure standing, right hand on back of chair. Very prominent figures in carpet design. F. H. Meserve and Chicago Historical Society. The copy owned in Chicago has the imprint “Carte de Visite by Case and Getchell, Photographic Artists, 299½ Washington St., Boston.” The Chicago Historical Society also possesses another card photograph very nearly the same as the Case and Getchell copy. The prominent figure in the carpet is the same as that in the Case and Getchell copy but it is much subdued in this copy as is the design in the upholstery of the chair. Book shelves appear on the left hand margin and the eyes are focused somewhat differently than in the Case and Getchell print. This card photograph bears the imprint “S. M. Fassett’s New Gallery, 114 and 116 South Clark St., Chicago.” It is my guess based on
the poorer print of the latter copy, that Fassett copied one of the Case and Getchell originals, as several "sittings" on such occasions were almost always made. This guess also has some support in the listing of Fassett in Chicago city directories. Halpin and Bailey's Chicago City Directory of 1861-1862 (Chicago, 1861), p. 434, lists "Fassett and Cook, 122 and 124 Clark" as photographers. The same directory for 1862-1863 (Chicago, 1862), p. 502, lists "Samuel M. Fassett, 122 and 124 Clark." The Chicago directories were published each year, "After removals of May first," which would make it appear that the Fassett firm's change of name occurred after May, 1861. Since this Douglas card photograph bears the imprint "S. M. Fassett's New Gallery," it seems possible that the photograph was prepared by Fassett for publication after the death of Douglas.

Douglas was in Boston during the presidential campaign of 1860, so it would have been possible for Case and Getchell to have photographed him. To add further confusion to this matter there is the identity of chair and carpet design in the Case and Getchell card photograph with that of the Gurney card photograph listed as No. 13.

24. Either an enlargement of No. 23 or a photograph made at the same time (the Case and Getchell one), the print measuring 12\%\times 9\% inches. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] Chicago Historical Society. The Illinois State Historical Library also has an enlargement somewhat smaller than the one in the Chicago Historical Society.


27. Card photograph, head and shoulders, vignetted. [Reproduced with this article between pp. 32, 33.] Same imprint as No. 26. Illinois State Historical Library. These photographs, Nos. 26 and 27, were probably taken at the same time and I believe are among the last, if not the last, of Douglas to be taken. My reasons are: (1) the portraits show an aging and tired Douglas (Douglas died in Chicago on June 3, 1861). He arrived in Chicago on May 1, 1861, and during the early part of his stay at least he was able to be about. (2) John Carbutt is first listed in Chicago city directories

for the issue of 1861-1862 (published in 1861). Apparently his professional career in Chicago began in 1861; he is listed in Chicago city directories through 1870.40

The Illinois State Historical Library possesses two large framed engravings of Douglas, one of which bears beneath the print the legend “Hon. Stephen A. Douglas Engraved by Doney from a Photograph by Hesler.” The engraving is a very good reproduction of the Carbutt card photograph owned by the Illinois State Historical Library but it is obvious that the Carbutt photograph is not a copy of the engraving. Whether the engraving is incorrectly ascribed to Hesler or whether Carbutt copied a Hesler photograph it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide. Carbutt had an excellent reputation and it is difficult to believe that he would copy the work of a fellow photographer in Chicago and print it under his own name without permission. The engraving and printing were doubtless done in another establishment and some misunderstanding in crediting (in print) the engraving may have arisen. It is, of course, possible that Hesler made negatives (see paragraph 1 under “Douglas Photographs Not Seen”) and sold some of them to Carbutt.

The Carbutt photograph of Douglas (No. 26) is also apparently the basis for the portrait of Douglas reproduced in Clark E. Carr, Stephen A. Douglas (Chicago, 1909), facing p. 134. Carr gives no information, other than the name, concerning the portrait.

**Douglas Photographs Not Seen**

I have found reference either directly or indirectly to a number of Douglas photographs, originals of which have not been found. The more important of these references are listed below.

1. After the death of Douglas in Chicago on June 3, 1861, an advertisement of Douglas photographs appeared in the Chicago Tribune, June 4, 1861, p. 1. The advertisement stated that the photographs were made by Alexander Hesler of Chicago.41 The photographs advertised were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 x 5</td>
<td>$ .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 x 10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carte Visite Size</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Volk's Statuette</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Information from Elizabeth Baughman, Chicago Historical Society. For additional information on Carbutt, see Taft, op. cit., p. 503.
41. For information on Hesler, see ibid., pp. 349, 369, 471.
42. See, also, the notes on Nos. 26 and 27.
2. In *National Portrait Gallery of Eminent Americans* (New York, 1862), E. A. Duyckinck, v. 2, *facing* p. 273, there is a full-length portrait of Douglas standing (left hand in vest) credited to "Likeness from the latest Photograph taken from life." Possibly this photograph is one of the Hesler photographs referred to above.

3. I have made an attempt to find group photographs containing Douglas but so far without success. The National Archives furnished me two group photographs (B-1517 and B-1518) in which a figure identified as Stephen A. Douglas is included. Examination of the two photographs has satisfied me that the individual is *not* Douglas. The following information, from the National Archives, may be of value to other possible users of the Brady negatives in the archives collection:

The numbering of the negatives in the Brady collection was done by the War Department Library in 1880, several years after purchase of the negatives from Mr. Brady. At the time of the purchase, complaint was made that no identifications, lists, or file prints were obtained with the negatives in 1880 and they were indexed in two groups, one group alphabetically by name of person, and the second alphabetically by State and area. The subject catalog was published by the War Department in 1898. In 1928, the Signal Corps rejetted the negatives and destroyed the old jackets which could perhaps have solved some of the questions of identification if they had been saved.

A second group photograph supposed to contain Douglas was furnished me by the Chicago Historical Society: "Third and Last Committee of Conference of the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives on the Army Appropriation Bill, Sunday, August 17, 1856." An examination of this photograph shows the man identified as Douglas to be a most handsome individual—far more handsome than any photograph I have seen. The photograph may be a copy of a lithograph as even the craggy face of Senator Seward (who is identified in the group picture) appears benign and smooth.

Considering the widespread publicity and attention in Illinois on the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858, it is astonishing that no photographs of the two together or of one or more debate scenes have come to light. I have seen none and Ralph G. Newman of Chicago has recently made a similar observation.43

4. The Illinois State Historical Library possesses a large lithographic bust portrait of Douglas published by C. H. Brainard of Boston and dated with the imprint "1854." The lithograph is credited to a daguerreotype by Vannerson. Vannerson was a daguerreotypist of Washington, D. C. His establishment was advertised

PLATE I. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1845.

Reproduction of copy of daguerreotype in possession of the L. C. Handy Studio, Washington. Reversed, i.e., correctly reproduced. (No. 1 in Catalogue.)
PLATE II. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1852.

Reproduction of daguerreotype in possession of the Library of Congress. Reversed in reproduction. Note that in the original daguerreotype the mole on the face of Douglas would appear to be on the right side rather than on the left, as here seen correctly. (No. 4 in Catalogue.)
PLATE III. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1854.

Direct reproduction of copy of daguerreotype in possession of the Keystone View Co., New York City. Incorrectly reproduced; for correct reproduction see Plate IV which follows. (No. 5 in Catalogue.)
PLATE IV. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1854.

Image of Plate III reversed and therefore correctly reproduced. (No. 5 in Catalogue.)
Plate V. Stephen A. Douglas. 1855.

PLATE VI. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. 1855.

Reproduction of modern photographic and retouched copy (Kessberger) of the 1855 daguerreotype. In possession of the Illinois State Historical Library. Reversed in reproduction. (No. 6a in Catalogue.)

Reproduction of enlargement from original card negative in possession of F. H. Meserve, New York City. (No. 14 in Catalogue.)
PLATE IX. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. 1860.

Reproduction of contact print from Brady negative in the National Archives. (No. 17 in Catalogue.)

PLATE VIII. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. 1860.

Reproduction of contact print from Brady negative in the National Archives. (No. 15 in Catalogue.)
PLATE X. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1860.

Reproduction of photograph in possession of the Illinois State Historical Library.
(No. 20 in Catalogue.)
PLATE XI. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. ABOUT 1861.

Reproduction of photograph in possession of Chicago Historical Society. (No. 24 in Catalogue.)
PLATE XII. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS. 1861.

Reproduction of an enlargement made from a card photograph in possession of the Illinois State Historical Library. (No. 27 in Catalogue.)
in Ten Eyck’s *Washington and Georgetown Directory* for 1855 (between pp. 23 and 29) at No. 426 and 428 Penn. Ave. “over Lane and Tuckers Building near 4½ St.”

It seems probable that this daguerreotype was also the basis for a wood-engraved portrait of Douglas that appeared in *Gleason’s Pictorial*, v. 4 (1853), p. 88, as a note on p. 93 credits the portrait to “J. Vannerson at Whitehurst’s Gallery” and the biographical sketches are credited (p. 84) to C. H. Brainard.

5. The Illinois State Historical Library also possesses another large lithographic portrait of Douglas by F. d’Avignon and published by Charles H. Brainard, Boston, with the imprint “1858.” The portrait is credited to a daguerreotype by Fassett and Cook of Chicago. This portrait resembles somewhat the card photograph of No. 19.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted for very real aid in the preparation of the catalogue of Douglas photographs to Mrs. Mary Frances Rhymer and Elizabeth Baughman of the Chicago Historical Society; to Elizabeth Lorsy of the Keystone View Co.; to Virginia Daiker of the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress; to H. E. Pratt and Margaret Flint of the Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield; to Robert Rosenthal, curator of special collections, University of Chicago Library; and to my mother, Mrs. F. C. Ewart, who examined Douglas materials in Canandaigua, N. Y. (a boyhood home of Douglas), for me. Mrs. Rhymer, Miss Baughman, Dr. Pratt, and Miss Flint were also most helpful on my visits to their respective institutions. I must express my special appreciation to Josephine Cobb and F. H. Meserve. Miss Cobb, of the U. S. National Archives, Washington, not only gave me aid in her official capacity in the Audio-Visual Records Branch of the National Archives, but, I am sure, must have spent many hours of her own time seeking answers to some of my troublesome questions. Mr. Meserve of New York City, whose marvelous collection of American photographic portraits is without equal, not only supplied me with copies of all his Douglas photographs but generously gave information of real use during our extended correspondence.

The quotations from Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union*, are reprinted through the kind permission of the publishers, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York City; the quotation from George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, through the courtesy of the copyright owner, Mrs. Alice Milton Dwight, New York City.

Lastly, a generous grant from the general research fund of the University of Kansas has made possible this extended study of the Douglas photographs and the co-operation of the University is here cheerfully and thankfully acknowledged.