VI. The Legislature; Victory and Defeat

It is hardly surprising that at the time Lucas was penning his burning broadside in defense of the “actual settlers” and against the combined companies of moneyed men” of the East, he was also a candidate for the state legislature. Apparently, his candidacy grew out of his activity on behalf of the other settlers, for this activity was begun some months before candidates were usually chosen.

The issues in the election were certainly sharply drawn. Lucas’ opponent was Ebenezer Denny. Denny was, of course, a Federalist. More to the point, he was not only a stockholder in the Pennsylvania Population Company, but also had been its agent in Pittsburgh and the Beaver Creek area, resigning only a few months before the campaign. In addition, he continued to be in partnership with David and Dunning McNair, another group of speculators.1

In this period, the Federalists were beginning to exploit Republican sympathies with France as campaign material against the Jeffersonians. Lucas, therefore, was a prime target. It was declared that he was an avowed atheist. His wife was accused of having plowed on Sunday. Interestingly enough, Major Denny “warmly contradicted” these “calumnies.” Denny and Lucas were neighbors and remained good friends throughout the election. The attacks, apparently, were the work of other Federalists.2

Lucas was not without his defenders. The Gazette had not yet gone over completely to the Federalist cause, so its columns were open to both sides. Lucas was defended warmly in the following letter:

Some of the Electioneering band have asserted; to prove the impropriety of supporting John Lucas as a candidate for the Assembly at the next Election; that he was living in this country no longer than five or six years, & of course was two much of a stranger to hold an office. Having a perfect knowledge of the time John Lucas


did first settle in this country; I can contradict the above assertion, and declare that he is now with his family, a settler in this country, for the space of twelve years, and that his children are natives of America: perhaps it will be asked how it did happen that John Lucas, (a man of some information) could remain so long in this country, and be no more known, while others just come in two or three years ago are spoken of in every lane, and street. To account for this I shall only say, that John Lucas is a true Republican, and an industrious farmer, that he hates forwardness or intrusion, & never goes but where his business calls him.

AN ELECTOR.
St Clair township, Allegheny
County Oct. 3, 1796

Major Denny's son, William H. Denny, has left an interesting account of the election:

On one side was a native of the State, a Revolutionary officer, who but lately served with credit in three expeditions against the Indians; the last one of which he himself commanded. Many of the early settlers in the election district, and most of the influential men amongst them, had served under him. On the other hand, a foreigner, speaking the English language with difficulty—but a short time from Europe.

Lucas later told Major Denny's son about the election day, when Lucas had ridden by the neighboring Denny farm on his way to the polls. William Denny quotes Lucas' account as follows:

"Your father," (I shall give Judge Lucas' own words,) "your father asked me to wait until he got his horse; he supposed I was going to the election, and said he would go along. We rode together to the place in Mifflin township where the election was held. Arriving on the ground, the country people shook hands with him, inquired about his health, but spoke not a word to me—no man spoke to Lucas—not one. Your father, being a modest man, said to me, 'Lucas, we have no business here; let us vote and go home.' We did so. On my return, Mrs. Lucas said, 'Well, Lucas, how goes on the election?' I replied, 'Oh! they are all for Major Denny. They greeted him in the kindest manner—no one spoke to Lucas.' She agreed with me that my chance was bad. However, next morning the return judges calling with us on their way to town, stated that I had a majority in the township—in fact, I was elected."

Most of the voters, adds Denny, were former "Whisky boys," and, he notes of Lucas that "no one knew better how to avail himself of rural political prejudices."

On December 6, 1796, Lucas took his seat in the legislature, then

3 Pittsburgh Gazette, October 8, 1796.
4 Denny, Military Journal, 21.
5 Denny, Military Journal, 21-23.
meeting in Philadelphia. Samuel Ewalt was the other member from Allegheny County. In an assembly containing such notables as Michael Leib, John Smilie, and William Hoge, it is not surprising that Lucas did not take a leading role. The legislative records of the time did not report debate, so that only on roll call votes are Lucas’ sentiments recorded. Leib and Smilie seemed to have been the floor leaders for the Republicans, and Lucas almost invariably voted with them. Lucas followed legislation carefully and often offered amendments aimed at clarifying or making more precise the wording of bills. Bills with his own notations on them are preserved in his papers.

Much of the most important work of legislative bodies is carried on in committees, and Lucas managed to get on the committees most vital to his region. Unfortunately, there is no record extant of the actions of these committees. He was on the committee on roads and inland navigation. He served on the committee on the land office. Most important of all, he was appointed to the committee on “the collision of titles to the lands on the western frontier of this state.” When the residents of Allegheny County petitioned the legislature to enact a law empowering the governor to appoint an inspector of boats to oversee safety on the rivers, Lucas was named to that committee, too.

Lucas failed of reélection in the campaign of 1797. Unfortunately, newspapers for that period do not survive. He was probably a victim of the extreme anti-French feeling which swept the nation during that and the following years. One story that was used against him was that he was secretly a Spanish agent and had smuggled supplies to the Spanish and hostile Indians. After the election, he wrote to a Philadelphia friend of his disappointment at not being reëlected.

6 Pennsylvania, House Journal, 1796-1798, p. 3 (Philadelphia, 1797-1798). There is a great deal of misinformation about Lucas’ service in the Pennsylvania legislature. Th Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress, 1774-1949, 1481 (Government Printing Office, 1950) declares that he served from 1792 to 1798, and apparently other writers have accepted this statement as fact. But a check of both the Senate and House Journals from 1792 to 1801 shows that Lucas served only in the season of 1796-1797.


9 This charge is contained in a torn draft of a letter in the Lucas Papers dated 1802. It was probably a letter to a newspaper or notes for a campaign speech.

10 Draft of a letter from Lucas, probably to B. F. Bache, no date, in Lucas Papers.
concerned with the hostility toward France at this time is indicated by a letter he wrote to a French friend in Philadelphia:

Circumstances between this country and France seems to have come at last to a crisis and great pains have been taken in our country to have the public opinion ripened for the event. I hope to the last moment that we shall have no war. Yet I don’t know that my expectations be grounded upon anything stronger than my desire that it may be so. I would be happy if you would communicate to me in your next the most prevailing opinion at Philadelphia relative to that subject.11

Lucas remained active in politics, despite his defeat. He carried on an active political correspondence with Leib and with B. F. Bache, now the editor of the Aurora. The appearance of the Herald of Liberty, first Republican newspaper in the area, was reported with pleasure:

“We have at present a new press established in our western parts. A newspaper will be put immediately into circulation with the purpose of checking the tendency of the two others become shamefully partial.”

Lucas lent a hand to the new paper. On March 13, 1798, he wrote to John Israel, the editor, giving advice and encouragement and including a list of subscribers he had obtained for the paper. The new subscribers were John Wilson, Nicholas Bausman, John Metzgar, Jacob Haymaker, and Jacob Beltshover.12

Besides pushing the party press, Lucas acted as a leader of the inner circle of the party. An interesting insight into his role is provided by a copy of a letter he wrote to Gallatin in these years. Gallatin, the letter indicates, was reluctant to seek reelection to Congress. The year—there is no date on the letter draft—could have been 1796 or 1798. In 1796, Gallatin was anticipating defeat, in 1798 anti-French feeling was at its height and was being used against him.13 At any rate, Gallatin had told Lucas that he was determined not to run, and had asked Lucas to tell Brackenridge. The party would not hear of this, however, and determined to “draft” Gallatin. Lucas wrote to put on the pressure:

As the turn of affairs hath become more and more critical . . . and we are in a greater want than ever of ables and patriotiques [sic] representatives, I feel myself urged to acquaint you with what

11 Draft, Lucas to “Mr. Duplain” of Philadelphia, no date, Lucas Papers.
12 Lucas to Bache, February 20, 1798; draft of letter from Lucas, probably to Bache, no date; Lucas to Israel, March 13, 1798—all in Lucas Papers. The correspondence with Leib is not extant but is referred to in the Bache correspondence.
hath been and steadily is my desire and that of Mr. Brackenridge and of many other characters of our country. . . . Mr. Brackenridge in particular estimated the loss to be as great as any we could sustain. He appeared to be much agitated at this news and still so much more so I believe that he dreaded that the circumstance would give an opening for Mr. Woods to advance in his political carrier.

Brackenridge, Lucas explained, felt he could not sacrifice his law practice to accept the nomination. "Thus," concluded Lucas, "we shall be exposed to have Mr. Woods elected in your place unless you agree to yield to the desire of all your political friends." Whether this letter refers to 1796 or 1798, Gallatin did make the race and won.\(^\text{14}\) It was a good omen for the future.

VII. The Judiciary; Stronghold of the Opposition

In the election of 1799, the hard work of the Republicans came to fruition as they wrested the governorship from the hands of the Federalists by electing Thomas McKean to that post. This victory meant that the appointive offices at the disposal of the governor would go to Republicans. Among the first to be rewarded was Brackenridge, who was elevated to the supreme court on December 18, 1799.15

Lucas, apparently, was next in line for preferment. He heard that he was being considered for an appointment, and also that the Federalists were circulating petitions secretly to prevent that calamity. The Federalists charged that he was of a quarrelsome nature and, therefore, unsuited for the judiciary. Lucas denied this hotly. In a letter to a political friend in Philadelphia—probably either Gallatin, for Congress was still sitting there, or Brackenridge—he said he was being attacked only because of his party connections, and asked his correspondent to intercede with the governor on his behalf.16

The death, in 1800, of John Gibson, an associate judge in Allegheny County, provided an opening for Lucas.17 Apparently the Republicans were aware of the impending appointment before it was announced, for Lucas had been nominated a candidate for the legislature, but at a Republican meeting at John Marie's tavern on August 28, 1800, it was announced that new circumstances dictated that he could no longer be a candidate, and Thomas Morton was named in his place. On September 20, the Tree of Liberty announced Lucas' appointment.18

It must have been about this time that, according to Erasmus Wilson, a

15 Ferguson, Early Western Pennsylvania Politics, 149-153.
17 Erasmus Wilson, Standard History of Pittsburg, 393 (Chicago, 1898).
18 Tree of Liberty, August 30, September 20, 1800. Several writers are in error about the date of Lucas' appointment to the bench. The above-cited Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress states that he was appointed in 1794. John F. McDermott, in his account of "John B. C. Lucas in Pennsylvania" (ante, 21:224—September, 1938), repeats this statement. But Lucas was not in Pennsylvania during the first half of 1794, and during the second half he was a "leader" of the Whiskey Rebellion, which would make his appointment by a Federalist governor (Thomas Mifflin) highly unlikely.
versified diatribe against Israel, Brackenridge, Lucas, and other Republicans was published under the title, "Echo from Coal Hill." With reference to Lucas the query was "who fills the judge vacancy—one of the law bench?" "Echo" replied, "one of the low French."19

Lucas' reception as a judge by his two Federalist colleagues was chilly. On the twenty-seventh of September, the Tree of Liberty reported that when Lucas took his seat on the bench, Judge Addison, "in a most boorish and ungentlemanly manner, turned his back upon him, not even saluting him with the common forms of politeness."

The stage was now set for an explosion. The president judge, Alexander Addison, was an unbending and outspoken Federalist. He had been an acid-tongued critic of the Whiskey Boys.20 His jury charges were often long and irrelevant harangues against the Republicans. He was also blood curdling in denouncing the French. An example is below:

The French have threatened us with pillage, plunder and massacre... They have threatened us with a party among ourselves, which will promote their views. Some of them, it is said, have told us, that we dare not resent their injuries; for there are Frenchmen enow among us, to burn our cities, and cut our throats.

Vain is all our defense against enemies without, if we guard not against enemies within. If we suffer French spies to stroll through our cities... to remain here, to corrupt the minds of our citizens... to pry into our councils... influence our opinions and elections... what have we to expect but to see our homes in flame and our families in blood?21

These speeches alone were enough to stir the Republicans to try to silence Addison. By December 6, 1800, the Republican newspaper, the Herald of Liberty of Washington, was circulating petitions demanding Addison's impeachment.22

The inevitable clash between the Francophobe Federalist judge and his new Republican colleague came in the Allegheny County court of common pleas on December 22, 1800. In his charge to a petit jury, Addison denounced the French Jacobins and the German Illuminati, inferred that the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions were of a Jacobin character, and added that the election of McKean was perhaps attrib-

19 Wilson, Pittsburg, 744.
22 Tree of Liberty, December 6, 1800.
utable to secret societies akin to Jacobinism. As everyone expected such charges from Addison, Lucas had brought with him a written charge of his own in reply. Lucas began to read his charge. Addison hastily consulted with the other associate judge, John McDowell, and then interrupted and silenced Lucas, declaring that only the president judge might charge the jury.

Although the nature of Lucas' charge was not revealed until later, its contents throw some light on his position. Far from answering Addison in kind, he planned only a plea for moderation and a nonpartisan spirit in the court. He began with some dispassionate and general remarks on the duties of a jury. Both court and jury, he urged, should be concerned only with principle and with the right and wrong of the case before them. Far from defending the Jacobins, he argued that such matters were extraneous to the court.

God forbid that I should ever attempt to throw the alarm amongst you... by useless denunciations, should the Illumines of Germany and Jacobins of France be as dangerous to the societies they live in... as they have been represented to us... what could I possibly tell you on the subject, preserving my official capacity? What could a jury of Allegheny do about these things? Have we any jurisdiction over them... For my part, I cannot expose myself so much as to forget that I stand here as a Judge, and not as a speculist or historian; that this present time is at the disposal of the laws, and not at that of my fancy or imagination.

He then deprecated insinuations that the Republicans are Jacobins:

...we have no ambitious and privileged nobility, nor a proud and corrupt clergy armed with an undue temporal authority... so we have no reason to form ourselves into associations against each other. Our laws, our government holds up all and every one of us unto their bosoms with an equal tenderness and care.

After a few more remarks in a similar vein, Lucas apologized for speaking of parties in the court and expressed the hope that he would never have to do so again.

This charge, as noted earlier, was not given at the time. Lucas, perturbed that he was a judge in name but not in fact, took the matter up with some friends. Among them was Brackenridge. Brackenridge advised an affidavit to the attorney general on the matter. On February 4, 1801, Lucas swore out an affidavit. During this period, Lucas also journeyed to Philadelphia to consult with McKean on the matter. Mc-

23 Thomas Lloyd, Trial of Alexander Addison, 50, 54 (Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1803).
25 Tree of Liberty, June 27, 1801.
Kean advised him that he was in the right and should persist in the case.26

The supreme court heard the case, with Brackenridge disqualifying himself because he had advised Lucas to submit the affidavit. The court held that Addison was in the wrong, but decided that he was not indictable, since it was not shown that he had acted from malice. However, the court did hint that Addison was impeachable.27

Brackenridge wrote Lucas a long letter advising him of the supreme court's decision that associate judges had equal rights with president judges to charge juries. The situation was now far more than a technical legal squabble in a back-country court. It was now becoming the opening chapter of a new struggle between Federalism and Republicanism.

Addison's violently partisan charges, wrote Brackenridge, had been a desperate bid for political favor from the outgoing Adams administration:

On the passing the present amendment to the United States Judiciary System; or rather in contemplation of this act, by which provision was made for a great number of Judges, Addison had his view directed to a seat on a distant bench. He had written melancholy and supplicating letters to correspondents of Phila. and men in office, or delegation, or of influence at the seat of government, representing to them his woes, his persecution, that he was in a nest of hornets, and that it exceeded a common corporal, or mental strength to support the suffering or the conflict longer. [illegible name] supports or affects to support his pretentions, but remonstrances from Phila by Bar, and bench and politicians was strong against it. So that the poor fellow's object for years, is gone. He . . . [was] . . . as a tool to those who use it. However pleased aristocracy might be with his services, they had no idea of raising him to a level [with?] themselves, or indeed to suffer him to come amongst them at all.28

If Addison was actually seeking a "midnight appointment" from the outgoing administration—and his partisan activity on the bench in December of 1800 and before seems to lend color to the contention—then he badly miscalculated. His bid for attention from the heads of his party was ignored, and in making the bid, he had brought down around his ears the "nest of hornets." It is interesting to note that he made no more partisan speeches in court after Adams had left office.29

Addison's speeches, however, had become part of public political life. He had used the court as a rostrum and his speeches had been re-

26 Lloyd, Trial of Alexander Addison, 47, 51; Hugh Henry Brackenridge to Lucas, May 1, 1801, in Lucas Papers; affidavit of John Lucas, February 4, 1801.
27 For the opinion see Tree of Liberty, June 6, 1801.
28 Brackenridge to Lucas, May 1, 1801.
29 Lloyd, Trial of Alexander Addison, 55, 62, 76.
printed and widely circulated. Brackenridge wrote that printed copies of Addison's speeches were in every store window. The Republican leaders considered Addison's entire conduct as a "daring attack."30

The astute Republican leaders of Pennsylvania undoubtedly saw two vistas of opportunity opened to them by the incident. First, of course, they could impeach and silence the troublesome Addison. More important—and it is hard to believe that the idea did not first take form at this time—if they could impeach Addison, would it not then be possible to impeach other Federalist judges and thus wrest from the opposition the one governmental stronghold which was impregnable against the electoral majorities of the Jeffersonians?

Whether the party leaders had yet grasped the full implications of the Addison case or not, they certainly took an active interest in the case. Governor McKean, Alexander J. Dallas, and other leaders conferred with Brackenridge before Brackenridge wrote to Lucas. The instructions sent to Lucas were explicit: "It is expected of you that you come forward at the next court of quarter sessions, and assert your right by preparing and delivering a pointed republican charges [sic] on the very charge published by Alexander Addison and which you were about to answer at the time silence was imposed upon you." Lucas must write with an eye to publication, Brackenridge added. "This is expected of you by all the friends of liberty. . . . I feel more than I express, which, you knowing the delicacy with which I put anything upon paper will easily conceive."31

Lucas was no mere pawn in the matter, however. He was stubbornly devoted to principle and meant to assert his rights. No doubt he also possessed the usual sensitiveness of the immigrant, and therefore was doubly aggrieved. In addition, he could not have been unaware of the value of the affair to his political career; indeed, by the time the case was settled, Lucas had been elected to Congress.

In the meantime, the Republicans in the Pittsburgh area were warming to the scene. On April 11, 1801, the Tree of Liberty reported the supreme court's rebuke of Addison. The Gazette immediately took up the challenge. Being at a disadvantage, the Gazette answered with invective which, although telling, was beside the point:

The Frenchman may be excused on account of his ignorance of

30 Brackenridge to Lucas, May 1, 1801.
31 Brackenridge to Lucas, May 1, 1801.
our language and laws—indeed we fiercely pity poor Lucas, who has now become a second time the catspaw of his friend Brackenridge: He should have been cautious in following further the man who had pushed him forward to the Beaver Creek association; and then defeated him and his deluded settlers, when the warrant holders undertook to pay him well for changing sides.

This affair enraged Lucas, the article continued, so Brackenridge "set him up as an assemblyman." The people displaced him, said the Gazette, so Brackenridge had Lucas set up as a judge "so justice can be done to his Beaver Creek associates." As to Lucas charging the jury, the Gazette's version was that he had "jabbered broken French and was disorderly in court." The article pretended not to believe that the supreme court's decision was correctly reported in the Tree of Liberty. The Tree of Liberty replied by triumphantly reprinting the official court decision.\(^{32}\)

On June 22, 1801, came the opening the Republicans were fishing for. After Addison had charged the grand jury, Lucas stepped forward to read his "pointed Republican charges." Whether by chance or not, the courtroom was packed with partisans of both men. Addison and McDowell restrained Lucas from speaking to the jury. The die was cast. By the time the legislature had again assembled in December of 1801, the Republicans were ready with petitions demanding Addison's impeachment. By March 19, the house of representatives had passed articles of impeachment.\(^{33}\)

The trial did not begin until January of 1803. Addison, acting as his own counsel, did not attempt to dispute the charges. He based his defense primarily upon two points: that he had only been enforcing the customary procedure of the court, and that Lucas' conduct was instigated by Brackenridge, who was acting out of personal malice. The counsel for the house of representatives successfully blocked references to Brackenridge on the ground that Lucas' motivation was irrelevant to Addison's offense.

The outcome was never in doubt. Addison had overreached himself and had really no ground to stand on. Anyway, the vote was on strict party lines and Addison was convicted. That personal malice had entered into Brackenridge's conduct, there can be no doubt. Actually, however, this personal animosity had little effect upon the course of

\(^{32}\) Pittsburgh Gazette, April 17, 1801; Tree of Liberty, June 6, 1801.

\(^{33}\) Tree of Liberty, June 27, December 12, 1801; Lloyd, Trial of Alexander Addison, 6, 7, 56-57.
events. Dallas, as a prosecution counsel, had vigorously protested insinuations against Brackenridge precisely because Dallas, McKean, and others had also been involved as instigators of the impeachment. The offense had been political and the trial was the same.\footnote{For a brief account of the trial, see Ferguson, \textit{Early Western Pennsylvania Politics}, 168-171. Wagner, in his "Public Career of Alexander Addison," 110-117, reports the trial with emphasis on Addison's defense. The full testimony is in Lloyd, \textit{Trial of Alexander Addison}, 24-81.}
VIII. The Congress; Republicanism Triumphant

The appointment of Lucas to the bench in 1800 indicated that he had become a leading figure of the party in the western part of the state. His dramatic clashes in December of 1800 and June of 1801 with Addison, the local symbol of Federalism, could not but add to his prestige.

In the meantime, Gallatin, the perennial Congressman from the district, had been elevated to the Cabinet. On June 24 of 1801, Republicans met at John Marie's tavern to nominate a candidate who, it was hoped, would succeed to the vacant seat. Since Gallatin had held the post so long, the problem was a knotty one. Therefore, a committee of representatives from all the counties in the district was selected to choose a nominee. The men considered were John Hamilton, William Hoge, Isaac Weaver, and Lucas. The field was eventually narrowed to Lucas and Hoge, and by a close vote, Hoge got the nod.

When the results were announced, there was dissension, as some thought Hoge was not a true Republican and that the committee had been unduly influenced. Lucas quickly moved to heal the breach in the party. In a letter to the Tree of Liberty on August 22, 1801, he warned against intra-party strife. It would only help the Federalists, he warned, who were hoping that the Republicans would go to pieces without Gallatin to lead them. Hoge, he declared, was a good Republican and the decision of the committee a fair one. He declared that he would work hard for the ticket and called on all to do likewise.

During this period, the Republicans in the state had hit upon the idea of dividing Allegheny County, which then included the entire northwestern part of the state, into a number of new counties, thus putting more appointive offices at the disposal of the party. The competition for the new posts was naturally keen, and Lucas, now perhaps the leading Republican in Allegheny County, was beset with entreaties for preferment. Lucas had many friends in the northwestern parts, where the Actual Settlers were still very active, now under the chairmanship of Samuel Ewalt, one of the original delegates. Indeed, the Tree of Liberty almost never mentioned the "Anglo-Federalists" with-

35 Tree of Liberty, July 18, 1801.
out adding "speculators and land jobbers."  

In September of 1801, Ben Stokely of Mercer County wrote to Lucas deploring the lack of capable magistrates in the county and suggesting himself as a suitable candidate. Lucas was asked to intercede with the governor. In October, Thomas K. Kennedy of Meadville wrote Lucas that a letter of Lucas' endorsing William McArthur for the state senate had been copied and posted up in public places throughout the area. Kennedy seems to have doubted the wisdom of supporting McArthur and asked Lucas to send more information by Henry Baldwin. McArthur, who had a long and successful career as a Republican spokesman, was later the treasurer of the Actual Settlers. Henry Baldwin was a rising young Republican lawyer. The same month, William Wusthoff, the Republican candidate for sheriff of Allegheny County, became alarmed that the election would go to his opponent, Thomas Jones. Wusthoff wrote Lucas on October 17, 1801, begging him to come to a meeting that very day to discuss the situation. The meeting could not be postponed, as Thomas Baird, another party stalwart, had to leave for Philadelphia in the morning. Wusthoff, for all his fears, won the election.

Lucas answered his letters faithfully. About this time, an unnamed resident of Beaver County wrote to ask that Lucas recommend him to the governor for an associate judgeship. Lucas replied that he would be willing, but had already suggested another. However, he added, he would mention to the governor that the man had the "character and capacity to fill a public office."

Lucas was not, however, the sole dispenser of patronage in the county. Brackenridge, too, was interested in the matter. As early as February of 1801, after striking up a correspondence with Jefferson on literary matters, Brackenridge began to make suggestions to the President directly about appointments in the area. When Hugh Scott was appointed postmaster in Pittsburgh, Lucas was apparently not con-

36 Ferguson, Early Western Pennsylvania Politics, 158; Tree of Liberty, September 27, 1800, passim, March 28, 1801.
37 Letters to Lucas from Ben Stokely, September 28, 1801, Thomas K. Kennedy, October 4, and William Wusthoff, October 17, in Lucas Papers; Tree of Liberty, November 28, 1801, June 5, 1802; Ferguson, Early Western Pennsylvania Politics, 165, 169, 194, 191, 194; Baldwin, Pittsburgh, 178.
38 Draft, Lucas to unnamed Beaver County correspondent, no date, in Lucas Papers.
sulted, and was very much irked. In February of 1802, he wrote to a friend in Washington, Dr. Logan, and asked Logan to see Gideon Granger, the postmaster general, about removing Scott. Lucas said to tell Granger that Gallatin, Smilie, and William Hoge would vouch for him. He accused Scott of being not only an inefficient and uncivil postmaster, but also of being of questionable loyalty to the party. Gallatin, Lucas declared, had tried to block the appointment but had not seen Granger in time. Lucas suggested Nathaniel Irish, William Gazzam or John Johnston for the post. Lucas also wrote to Hoge on the matter.39

The appointment of Scott, apparently, was but one incident in a fight for party control between Lucas, Gazzam, Johnston, Lacock, and their friends on the one hand, and Brackenridge, Forward, Bates, Baldwin, and others on the other hand. This quarrel, which was not open at the time, foreshadowed the later division of the party in western Pennsylvania into radicals and conservatives in 1805.40 Apparently, the intra-party quarrel did not interfere with the common fight of both factions against Addison, which was then still under way.

Lucas poured out his grievances against Brackenridge in a long letter to Gallatin, and then, according to the notation at the top of the letter, did not send the missive off. However, the letter provides an interesting picture of the struggle.

Brackenridge, Lucas charges, was recommending “compliant” persons for appointment to office. As to Lucas, Brackenridge was trying to get him to move to one of the new counties, so he would “be out of his way.” Gazzam, also, had earned the enmity of Brackenridge. “Mr. Brackenridge is now bent entirely upon crushing Mr. Gazzam,” Lucas wrote. “Mr. Gazzam is an intelligent man, one of the most firm and independent Republicans we have and that is enough to render him obnoxious in the eyes of Mr. Brackenridge.”

Brackenridge’s sponsorship of Tarleton Bates for prothonotary also irked Lucas. “This appointment was so judiciously made,” he complained sarcastically, “that the Republican candidate for congress did not gain last year one vote by it.” Bates seemed to be an amiable young man, he added, but under the influence of Brackenridge. Therefore,

39 Newlin, Brackenridge, 234; Tree of Liberty, May 2, 1801; drafts, Lucas to Dr. Logan, February 17, 1802, and to unnamed correspondent, no date, in Lucas Papers.
40 Baldwin, Pittsburgh, 180.
Lucas felt, Bates should not be trusted. Bates had been a close friend of Meriwether Lewis when Lewis was in the army in Pittsburgh.\textsuperscript{41} Now Lewis was Jefferson's private secretary and thus provided a fine entrée to the president.

Lucas then commented upon Brackenridge's evasive behavior during the Whiskey Insurrection: "In every page of his book he endeavors to make it appear that he took the lead of the insurgents that he might have so much better opportunity to deliver them after into the hands of the Executive. Perhaps now he wishes to deal with Republicans that in time to come he may also claim the merit of having delivered them into the hands of their adversaries."

Nor, continued Lucas, was Brackenridge entirely friendly to Gallatin. In fact, he had upon occasion hinted that Gallatin really was a Jacobin, as the Federalists continually charged. Proof of this was a reference by Brackenridge in Lucas' presence, to Gallatin's Washington County followers as a Levée, a term then current to describe the armies of the Jacobins.

In fact, Lucas declared, Brackenridge had entirely deserted principle to seek financial gain.

"His pride is wounded in finding himself left . . . too far [behind?] others in point of fortune. He hath confessed to me long ago that literary fame was the sole object he once [aimed?] at but that now he was an old man and that [as?] old men in general do he had turned his affection [toward?] money. I believe he pursues money [and] not real hounour. . . . He told me that he had an eye upon the [post] of Attorney General of the United States."

In conclusion, Lucas again complains against Postmaster Scott. Scott, he writes, was suspected of holding up letters addressed to Republicans in Crawford County. The letters were to notify these men of a

\textsuperscript{41} For the friendship of Tarleton Bates and Meriwether Lewis, see John Bakeless, Lewis and Clark, Partners in Discovery, 71 (New York, 1947).
meeting at Washington to nominate a congressional candidate.42

Several motives may have contributed to this bitter letter. It was written at a time when Lucas was being passed over for the nomination to Congress, and he may have been bitter over that, despite his "unity" letter in support of Hoge referred to previously. Perhaps, as the Federalists had charged, there was bad feeling between the men over the Actual Settlers affair. Another element may have been a purely political struggle over the spoils of office and differences of ideological shading within the party. In all likelihood, all of the elements above entered in. The letter certainly puts neither man in a good light. The slippery and conniving Brackenridge was certainly capable of all of the chicanery Lucas ascribed to him. On the other hand, Lucas reveals himself as having a contentious and vindictive streak, and of possessing an unbecoming regard for the plums of patronage. But then history is customarily made by men and not by cardboard heroes. If it were not so, there would be no genuine heroism.

Why Lucas did not send the letter presents an interesting question. Perhaps he really did, despite his notation to the contrary. Perhaps he found the means to convey the information orally. He may have thought better of the matter and decided to drop it. Or, he may have decided that his relationship with Gallatin was too unsure to risk such a partisan letter. Whether sent or not, the ideas contained in the letter had substance, for Lucas continued to fight the more conservative Republicans.

Despite the machinations of Brackenridge, real or imagined, Lucas' political fortunes soon rose again. By 1802, Allegheny County had been included in a new congressional district together with the counties

42 Draft, Lucas to Gallatin, marked "not sent," no date, in Lucas Papers. Internal evidence indicates that the draft was written late in August, 1801. It would have to have been written after 1800. In it Lucas declares that Bates had not brought the party a single vote in the congressional election following Bates' appointment. Since Bates was appointed in April, 1800, the election in question would have been the one held later that year. The meeting of the delegates from the northern counties held at Washington, Pennsylvania, to select a candidate for Congress, must have been in 1801, for by 1802 Washington was no longer in the same congressional district with the northern counties. For the date of Bates' appointment as prothonotary, see Mrs. Elvert M. Davis, ed., "Letters of Tarleton Bates, 1795-1805," ante, 12:43 (January, 1929). For the erection of the northwestern counties into a new congressional district, see Ferguson, Early Western Pennsylvania Politics, 174.
of Mercer, Beaver, Crawford, Erie, Warren, and Venango. At a meeting of delegates from these counties held in Pittsburgh on August 18, 1802, Lucas was nominated by the Republicans for the new seat "with great unanimity and harmony." As a successful Republican in the Federalist stronghold of Allegheny County, and as a leader of the "actual settlers" who made up much of the population of the newer counties in the district, Lucas was a natural candidate.

The Federalists, however, were by no means willing to concede. The Tree of Liberty warned of the storm to come: "Since Judge Lucas has been nominated for congress, the citizens of this district may expect to be stunned with the sounds of French Jacobin and French devil: as if worth, merit and talents were to be ascertained by geographical line, and solely confined to native Americans."43

The "Federal Republicans" were not long in replying. On September 17, they named John Wilkins, Jr., their candidate and warned the voters:

"Have you a regard . . . for the Religion which you profess? . . . Are you unwilling to witness in your own country such scenes as have been a reproach to Republicanism . . . in France?"44 If so, they advised a vote for their candidate. On September 25, the Tree of Liberty fired back. It said: "Let Republicans then be united. The object of your enemies is to keep from . . . congress Judge Lucas. . . . They say they would rather have any other Republican sent to congress than Mr. Lucas. He therefore is the man we ought to support." Lucas' long association with Gallatin was strongly invoked by the editor.

The same issue carried another piece entitled, "Reasons why John B. C. Lucas should be our Representative in congress." First, the writer declared that Lucas had showed talents and acquired experience as a legislator and judge. Second, it was declared that his devotion to Republican principles was beyond question. Third, the article proclaimed that Lucas was not a speculator. "He is no speculator. . . . Actual Settlers, this is the man to whom you are under obligations. . . . He has not been at one period opposed to you, and at the present is in your favor." Lastly, taking the bull by the horns, the writer declared that Lucas should be elected because he was a Frenchman. "The election of Lucas," said the editorial, "will be the triumph of Republicans over

43 Tree of Liberty, August 21, 28, 1802.
44 Pittsburgh Gazette, September 24, 1802.
those narrow prejudices which dishonour human nature."

By October 8, the Federalists were warming somewhat to their task. The Democratic campaign committee had been termed "The Directory" and Lucas had become "Monsieur." The Federalist committee wrote: "There are many characters in the country we would prefer having a seat on the bench to Judge Lucas, and if Monsieur should be elected . . . to congress, we console ourselves with the hopes of being able two years hence to send a fitter person, in the meantime we shall get rid of his judgeship."

The note of pessimism here is unmistakable. In the next issue of the Gazette, however, the final salvo was fired, just in case. Said the Federalist committee: "He is a foreigner. . . . Wherever a Frenchman lives France is his country, and to cast the world at the feet of France is the first object of his ambition. . . . But it is triumphantly stated that Mr. Lucas has been a member of the assembly. . . . How did he get there? Was it not by raising a stir among the settlers . . .?"45

Lucas did not leave all of the campaigning to the party press. He turned his guns on the Gazette in reply: "Not that I mean to say this paper is good for nothing all together for before I became a subscriber for Mr. Scull's Gazette I was extremely insomnious and by using his Gazette as a soporific I have been relieved of that complaint."46

When the returns were in, Lucas had triumphed. Although Pittsburgh itself went to Wilkins by a vote of 566 to 276, the rural vote swept Lucas in.47

In Washington, Lucas boarded with seven or eight other members from Pennsylvania, including the two old party warhorses, Smilie and William Findley. Mingling with the heavily Republican majority of Congress, he found that he was not as radical as the Pittsburgh Federalists had painted him. He wrote to James Mountain: "I find every day many a member of congress whose theories and politicks are much more democratick than my own, from that I infer that I must not be eccentric on that subject as some wish to insinuate."48

45 Pittsburgh Gazette, October 8, 15, 1802.
46 This material is contained in an undated draft in the Lucas Papers. Whether it was a draft of a newspaper article or of a campaign speech is not clear.
47 Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress, 1774-1949, 1481; Wilson, Pittsburg, 748.
In Congress, Lucas showed special concern with three topics, all subjects of interest to the western farmers he represented. The first of his major speeches was on the slave trade. At the time when Congress was debating a proposed tax on the importation of slaves, Lucas was for the tax. It had been introduced by a fellow Pennsylvanian. Further, it would fall hardly at all upon Lucas' tax-conscious constituents; whatever revenue was raised would lessen by that much the chance of some other more obnoxious duty. Lucas said: "As to the nature of the slave trade, we must, in my opinion, consider slaves imported as so much produce or merchandise. This article ought, in my opinion, likewise to be taxed, because the trade is odious; also, because it affords a great profit to those who carry it on."

His reasons for finding the slave trade odious are interesting. They reveal the practical viewpoint of the yeoman farmer rather than the abstract view of the abolitionist. He continued: "The importation of slaves into the United States operates injuriously on the poor whites who draw their subsistence from labor. . . . If you increase the black laborers, so as to make them work for a lower compensation, you virtually reduce the value of the labor of the whites, and proportionately lessen the chance of a poor white man getting employment on favorable terms."49

Lucas was ever ready to break a lance with land speculators, the special bane of the frontier. In debate on the Yazoo case, he ranged himself alongside of John Randolph who was the chief enemy of that series of shady transactions. "I view land speculators," Lucas told the House, "as a separate class of men, acting upon principles quite noxious to the rest of society." He declared darkly that there were "land speculators within these walls."50

Lucas was waging an old battle in this debate, for some of the investors in Yazoo lands were the same men who had played leading roles in the Pennsylvania Population Company and the Holland Land Company.51

Lucas was quick to offer amendments to bills in the interest of clarity and precision, a characteristic which also marked his conduct in the Pennsylvania legislature. He was a hard working, attentive leg-

49 Annals of Congress, 8 cong., 1 sess., 1008, 1009.
50 Annals of Congress, 8 cong., 2 sess., 1046.
islator who knew what was going on even in complex matters. He showed also a special concern for matters affecting the judiciary. He gave evidence of being a strict constructionist constitutionally.

The third subject on which Lucas was prone to take the floor was the newly acquired Louisiana territory. As a long time traveler and trader in the area, and being able to speak French, he ranked as something of an authority and did not hesitate to advise and instruct his colleagues.\(^{52}\)

Evidence is available that Lucas did not fail to perform the indispensable favors asked by constituents. Tarleton Bates, of a distinguished and numerous Virginia family, had a brother, Frederick, who was assistant postmaster at Detroit. Frederick Bates knew that Michigan was soon to be set off from Indiana as a separate territory and he aspired to be made secretary of the new territory. He therefore wrote to his several brothers asking that they intercede with such connections as they might have on his behalf.\(^{53}\)

Tarleton Bates, who had been suspected by Lucas in 1801 of being a questionable Republican, was now on good terms with Lucas. No doubt, the fact that Bates had testified for Lucas during the Addison impeachment helped reconcile the two men. Therefore, Bates wrote to Lucas on his brother's behalf. Lucas was in an advantageous position to help, as he was chairman of the select committee on the division of the Indiana Territory, in which Michigan was at that time included. Lucas favored the appointment. Frederick Bates did receive an appointment to the Land Claims Commission in Michigan.\(^{54}\) Later, Lucas was to become an associate of the man.

Lucas performed other services for his constituents. Indeed, his papers show that the relations of Congressmen with "the folks back home" in those days were about like they are today. John Ashton wrote to ask Lucas to push a pension claim. William Gailer asked for help in recovering for damages to his property inflicted by the army which marched against the Whiskey Rebels. Tarleton Bates requested Lucas to send him a subscription for the *Universal Gazette*. Lewis Bond wrote

\(^{52}\) *Annals of Congress*, 8 cong., 1 sess., 1060.

\(^{53}\) Thomas M. Marshall, ed., *Life and Letters of Frederick Bates*, 1:8-10 (St. Louis, 1926).

to petition Lucas for aid in securing a federal job in Michigan territory, but Samuel Ewalt wrote to advise against appointing Bond. It is unlikely that Bond received much consideration, for he was a close friend of Brackenridge's.\(^55\)

Lucas kept his political fences well mended. He remained in correspondence with the Actual Settlers, sending them advice and information. Patronage was not neglected. Lucas wrote to an unnamed fellow politician on March 8, 1803, asking him to recommend William B. Irish for the post of quartermaster in charge of boat-building in Pittsburgh. Irish was the son of Nathaniel Irish, a party stalwart. The letter indicated that the labor vote was already being cultivated. "You are certainly aware," wrote Lucas, "that the office of quartermaster will afford great means of influence upon many persons . . . especially the mechanicks."\(^56\)

The Whiskey Rebellion was still an issue in politics. Sometime in 1803, Lucas wrote to Gallatin of a suit brought by John Neville against several persons implicated in burning the Neville home. The defendants, wrote Lucas, were not the real instigators, but had joined under threat of violence. Those defendants were in imminent danger of losing their farms.

Neville had received a loan of six thousand dollars from the government to rebuild his property. Lucas saw in this a solution. He wrote:

To preserve these few families from being broken and heal as gently as possible this remaining wound of the western insurrection I have thought that it was both equitable and of good policy for Congress to release Mr. Neville of all obligations towards the United States under that loan provided he acknowledges himself satisfied and compleatly indemnifyed for what his property hath suffered by the insurgents & then enter a non suit in the action now depending. Whether Neville would accept or not such terms is what I cannot [illegible] but I incline to believe that he would.

Gallatin answered that he thought the suggestion could be worked out.\(^57\)

A glimpse of family life is provided by a letter to Lucas' son, Rob-


\(^56\) Drafts, Lucas to John Grier, August 25, 1803, and to unnamed correspondent, March 8, 1803, in Lucas Papers.

\(^57\) Draft, Lucas to Gallatin, no date, and letter, Gallatin to Lucas, August 11, 1803, in Lucas Papers.
ert, in this period. From it, it appears that Mrs. Lucas was neither well nor happy. The long absence of her husband in Washington affected her adversely. Lucas urged his son to write more often. He cautions Robert to take the wheat to the mill before the rats get it, to curry the horses often, and to keep the stable clean. The wheat field is not to be used for pasture. Lucas directs that someone be hired to split five or six hundred rails from wood that Lucas has set aside for that purpose, and the son is enjoined to study hard.\textsuperscript{58}

Lucas was reelected in 1804, but he was never to take his seat in the Ninth Congress.\textsuperscript{59} Early in the spring of 1805, notification arrived from Secretary of State James Madison that the President had appointed Lucas a judge of the Upper Louisiana Territory. At about the same time, Brackenridge in Carlisle sent Lucas word that he had heard of the appointment, adding that he was proud of having assisted Lucas into public life. Later in the spring, Lucas received word from Gallatin at the capital that Jefferson had also appointed Lucas to serve as a land commissioner in the new territory. This letter makes it apparent that Gallatin had been Lucas' sponsor in Washington.\textsuperscript{60}

The appointment was welcome to Mrs. Lucas, who would now be again among French people and would not have to be separated from her husband for long periods. These considerations likewise influenced Lucas.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{58} John Lucas to Robert Lucas, February 10, 1804, in Lucas Papers.

\textsuperscript{59} Biographical Dictionary of the American Congress, 1774-1949, 1481. Pittsburgh newspapers for 1804 are not extant, so there is no account of the campaign.

\textsuperscript{60} Letters to Lucas from James Madison, March 22, 1805, H. H. Brackenridge, March 25, and Albert Gallatin, May 9, in Lucas Papers.

\textsuperscript{61} Anne Lucas Hunt, "Early Recollections," in Missouri Historical Society, Glimpses of the Past, 1:42 (May, 1934).
IX. Missouri: The Frontier Again

On the seventh of June, 1805, the Lucas family left Montpelier by chaise and drove to the river. Lucas had purchased a flatboat and the government provided five soldiers to man the vessel. A cabin on the boat furnished shelter for Mrs. Lucas and the children. The family stopped for a short time at various cities along the river where Lucas had friends, made on his earlier voyages.

At Cairo, at the mouth of the Ohio, another boat suitable for traveling upstream was to have met them. By some error, this boat was at Cape Girardeau, on the Mississippi above Cairo. Therefore, the family traveled from Cairo through the French settlements in southern Illinois to Cape Girardeau by horseback. Here they boarded the government keelboat provided for them and proceeded to St. Louis. St. Louis was reached early in September, a trip of three months. The family moved into a rented log house.

St. Louis in 1805 had less than three thousand inhabitants. French was still the dominant language. The primitiveness of the area is testified to by the fact that in the early days, the Lucas boys ran traplines in the environs of the city. Lucas himself owned and worked farmland in what is now the heart of the city.

Mrs. Lucas had never recovered from the fact that Lucas had once traded a lot in Pittsburgh for a farm horse, after which the lot had become very valuable. At her insistence, part of Lucas' salary was invested in farm land at the edge of town. As the town grew, the land increased in value and became the basis for a vast family fortune. In this early period, Lucas acquired 280 arpents (about 420 acres) for less than seven hundred dollars. By 1870, the land comprised the center of the business district and was worth about seventy millions.62 It was typical of the fluidity of early American society that a man who began his political career resisting taxes and land speculators should become a millionaire himself. And, like other contemporary large landholders—Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Thomas Hart Benton—Lucas remained a staunch Democrat. Neither physiocratic nor Democratic doctrines found fault with wealth based on land ownership, per se.

The primitive atmosphere of early St. Louis is underlined by one of Lucas' early business deals. Money was scarce with furs being the

customary medium of exchange. In 1807, Lucas bought a home in the city for six hundred dollars, payable in furs. 63

Lucas' role in the new territory was more than the title of judge would indicate. Under the act of March 3, 1805, creating the territory, the legislative power was vested in the governor and three judges acting as a council. In addition to the legislative power and judicial power, he also performed the executive function, serving as acting governor upon occasion in the absence of that official. 64

Perhaps overshadowing all three of these functions in importance, however, was his service as a land commissioner. It was this body which passed on the ownership of the land of the territory. It was a peculiarly difficult task.

During the period between the news of the Louisiana purchase and the arrival of settlers for the newly acquired area in any great numbers, speculators had obtained huge land grants by antedating (to before the Louisiana purchase date) last minute grants from the corrupt French governor, or by altering otherwise legal grants so as to extend the tracts described. To thwart these men and at the same time uphold the rights of many perfectly legitimate grantees was a herculean task. Litigation lasted for years. Lucas was a constant, energetic and unbending opponent of the holders of questionable claims. 65

Lucas' long legal, political, governmental, business, and personal career in Missouri is beyond the confines of this paper. It awaits treatment by a researcher who has access to the multitude of documents in St. Louis, Washington, and other places. The few paragraphs that follow are included only to make known to the reader some further aspects in Lucas' life after leaving Pennsylvania.

Lucas was a controversial figure politically in the new territory because of his role in the land litigation described above. There were several attempts to have him removed or retired from the bench. These proved fruitless, however, due to the influence of the powerful Gallatin in Washington. 66

An associate of Lucas, Frederick Bates, has left an interesting char-

63 Louis Houck, History of Missouri, 2:259 (Chicago, 1908).
65 Houck, History of Missouri, 3:34-51; Frederick A. Culmer, New History of Missouri, 224-225 (Mexico, Missouri, 1938).
acter portrait of Lucas in those years: "Judge Lucas . . . is a civil lawyer, and a man of superior parliamentary information. His wit, his satire, and his agreeable combination of images are surpassed by few. He is a man with all more sternly independent in principle and conduct than most of my acquaintances. If a slave approaches him in the tone and attitude of a suppliant, he spurns him from his presence. He is only acceptable to those who know the dignity of their nature, and how to speak the language of freedom."  

Lucas' oldest son, Robert, fell in the War of 1812. In 1817, tragedy again struck. The second son, Charles, had received a law education and served in the territorial legislature. He was then made United States district attorney for the territory. In the course of his work, he fell out with a young lawyer from Tennessee, Thomas Hart Benton, and was challenged to a duel. Both were wounded, after which Benton challenged again. Charles fell mortally wounded on September 27, 1817. Mrs. Lucas had died on August 3, 1811.

Lucas continued as a land commissioner until 1812, when the work of the board ended. He continued as a judge until 1820, when he resigned. When the newly admitted state held its first election, Lucas was a leading candidate for the Senate. Since the land claims question was still in the courts, however, and since the claimants hoped to have Congress act on their behalf, powerful holders of questionable titles opposed him. The hated Benton, who had been active in defense of the claims, was elected.

In the meantime, Lucas' real estate had been increasing in value as St. Louis grew from a frontier village to a bustling gateway to the west. In 1816, Lucas had branched out into banking, serving as a member of the board of directors of the first bank in the territory, the Bank of St. Louis. He had built a home in 1811 on the northwest corner of Market and Seventh streets in St. Louis, where he continued to reside until his

67 Bates to Augustus B. Woodward, June 18, 1807, in Marshall, Life and Letters of Frederick Bates, 1:147. Bates was a land commissioner with Lucas at that time.
68 Frederick Billon, Annals of St. Louis, 213-215 (St. Louis, 1888).
An interesting picture of Lucas in his later years is provided by an incident in court where Lucas happened to be a spectator. The presiding judge pleaded ignorance about a point in the Spanish land claims litigation. Lucas rose to explain, whereupon one of the attorneys in the case, an old enemy, asked that Lucas be silenced since he was not a licensed attorney. Lucas' reply was characteristic:

“If the court please, I am licensed by the God of Heaven: He has given me a head to judge and determine and a tongue to explain.” He added that he had studied in the best schools of France, had studied the common law, had made laws as a legislator and congressman and administered them as a judge in Pennsylvania and Missouri, and had, in fact, admitted the protesting lawyer to the bar.

“May it please the court,” he added with a bow, “I did not come to this country a fugitive and an outcast from my native land. I came as a scholar and a gentleman, upon the invitation of Dr. Franklin.” He then continued his explanation through three sittings of the court and later published his views.

Theodore Roosevelt, in his biography of Benton, states of Lucas that in his old age he became “melancholy and dejected . . . for six of his sons met death by violence.” This is an exaggeration, since Lucas had only five sons, and only two died violently. However, two more did precede their father in death: Adrian died in 1831 at the age of thirty-seven, and William, a bachelor attorney, died at the age of thirty-nine in 1837.

Anne, however, lived until 1879 and James until 1873. The latter, after an education at Jefferson College, had migrated to Arkansas Territory—the frontier again—where he became a planter, judge and militia officer. In 1837, his father asked him to return to St. Louis to take over the management of the now extremely valuable family holdings. This he did, performing the task with skill and energy. He became a

70 Walter B. Davis and Daniel S. Durrie, Illustrated History of St. Louis, 39-40 (St. Louis, 1876); Marshall, Life and Letters of Frederick Bates, 1:97.
71 J. B. C. Lucas, Sketch of an Argument, District Court of the United States, St. Louis, November, 1824 (St. Louis, 1825), as quoted in Houck, History of Missouri, 3:19-20 n.
72 Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Hart Benton, 28 (Boston and New York, 1886); Culmer, New History of Missouri, 223 n. The latter says that Roosevelt quotes W. V. N. Bay, Reminiscences of the Bench and Bar of Missouri, a work which is not available locally.
railroad founder and president, a successful banker, the organizer of the St. Louis Gas Company, and a director and stockholder in a score of corporations extending to California. He was a noted philanthropist, and, in politics, a Whig. From 1844 to 1848 he served in the state senate and ran unsuccessfully for mayor of St. Louis in 1847. In 1860, he supported Bell, but then cast his lot with the Union. He had a large family and long business career.\footnote{Billon, \textit{Annals of St. Louis}, 213-216; \textit{Dictionary of American Biography}, 11:484-485.}

John B. C. Lucas died on the 29th of August, 1842, in his 85th year. His portrait, a handsome, composed and kindly figure, may be found in Houck's \textit{A History of Missouri}, volume III, page 267. In the course of his 58 years in America, from the year after the winning of independence to the year that John C. Fremont mapped the trail to Oregon and the Pacific, he played a modest but substantial role in the unfolding of a nation. He was not only intimately connected with the early history of western Pennsylvania, but also played some part in the careers of such figures on the national stage as Albert Gallatin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, James Wilkinson, Thomas Hart Benton, Moses Austin, Frederick Bates, Merriwether Lewis, and a host of lesser figures.

John B. C. Lucas, immigrant and pioneer, farmer and fur-trader, pamphleteer and politician, legislator and congressman, businessman, judge and patriot made a contribution to his adopted nation that has been too long neglected.

[The End]