with storms of obloquy and hisses and interruptions. But

HE PROVES A BRAVE MAN THEN,

nerved by the purity and the spirit of his cause. There was no conscious weight of error of sin bearing upon his heart, and he was a man in all the majesty of a great and a glorious creation, and he sustained the cause of this country. I need not imitate or repeat the language of my learned and eloquent friend in telling you how successful and how noble that effort was. I agree with him wholly, unreservedly, in my reverent estimate of the motive, the ability and the success of that grand performance on the part of Mr. Beecher. But, then, my learned friend says to you, "Are you going to convict Henry Ward Beecher of adultery? Are you going to allow proud and envious England to say, 'Why, in that great crisis you sent us your greatest man, and he persuaded and overcame us.' But, after all, after all, are you, gentlemen of the jury," says Mr. Evarts, "going to convict that man so that England may say that he was really a fallen man after all?"

Oh! you must not convict him! England will laugh at us! You must not, by your verdict, send to England the announcement that the great and gifted and brave and successful Henry Ward Beecher, who subdued all your hostility and won all your convictions, has any human infirmity! You must not tell England he has seduced a woman—(Sensation)—because England will laugh at you. Her aristocracy will meet you with contempt and raillery. Ah! my friend has had too much to do with England. (Laughter.) He has too high a respect for English sentiment and English aristocracy, and if we have got so low, if the administration of justice is so grovelling and debased in this free government of ours that we cannot pronounce justice as against our great and noble men for fear of the scoffs of the aristocracy of England, then God help justice and American institutions! (Loud applause.)

Judge Neilson—Gentlemen I wish you would be silent.

Mr. Beach—Ah, my friend Evarts, you were too long at Geneva. (Laughter.) And you associated too much with these Englishmen. You played away too much of your time at Paris. You have lost the simple grandeur of American independence and individuality, and do you expect to carry and control a jury in this country by that sort of argument, by that low appeal to the vulgarest passions of our nature? Whom do you think you are addressing? What sort of minds and what hearts are you speaking to? In a cause involving the dearest questions which can attach to our society and our persons, when great interests are at stake, when far reaching and terrible consequences may follow your actions, is it to be hoped that you will descend to the debasement of such considerations as what may be the judgment of England or of anything else upon your verdict? You are men responsible in this case. No matter what other people may think or other people say, you are pledged to a higher authority than public opinion or foreign judgments, and your consciences are bound by an oath to the Judgment Seat, and we must have from you in this case the clear, honest, independent convictions of your judgment, and we will have them. Counsel mistakes if he supposes

I MISTRUST THIS JURY.

Whatever I may know in regard to the influences surrounding this case and the means which have been resorted to, full well I know and believe that they fall aimless and powerless before the independence and the truth of each member of this jury; and by no word, by no hint, by no insinuation have I ever or will I ever assail the personal integrity of the gentlemen I address. (Applause.) Yes, England will laugh at you! Well, fancy that there are people in England who are looking with considerable interest to the progress and watching the result of this case. Indeed, I know there are, having positive and personal information to that effect, and no one has a deeper respect for the civilization and intelligence of England than I have. To say I have a respect for her institutions, the mode of their operation within the sphere and limit of their application is quite another thing; but she has great men and learned men, and a great many upright ones too. But I do not fear what England will say, and I don't believe that even England, with all her reverence for potentates and dignitaries and hierarchies—I don't believe that England will stop to consider the question of Mr. Beecher's conviction or acquittal with reference to any association he may have had in former times with her government or population. England is not very apt to laugh at American justice or American effort. Indeed, we have grown so fast that even in the domain of law, in the commentaries of our distinguished civilians and jurists, we have gained the respect of England, and in her courts our authorities and adjudications are received and listened to with as much respect as we take the old teachings of the great lawyers and jurists of England of old. England will not laugh at whatever verdict you may pronounce; she will have no occasion to, and she has had no occasion to laugh at America that I have ever known. Indeed her associations with this country have rather frequently produced serious emotions on the part of England. (Laughter.) Now, says the gentleman, quoting a denunciation of the Scriptures, "Woe to him that calls evil good and good evil." What is the application of that sentence? Nobody disputes the propriety of it, or the authenticity of it. God says "Woe to him who calls evil good and good evil." We agree to the sentiment; but we had a long essay from my learned friend, Mr. Evarts, upon that subject, which led me to think that there was some terrible doom falling upon some of us. I do not know who it was going to hit. Who is it that calls "good evil and evil good?" Is it Tilton? Is it Moulton? Is it myself? Against whom is the woe denounced, and to whom is it applied in this case? This learned gentleman and great advocate ought to have some application for his theories and his moral essays. Why, Henry Ward Beecher tells us that he was charged with improper solicitations. Benjamin F. Tracy tells us in his world-wide opening (satirical laughter) that the real point in issue in this case is whether the offence was improper solicitations or adultery. Mrs. Tilton over and over again says it is improper solicitations. They don't deny it. They make that the test issue in this case. Well, Mr. Henry Ward Beecher, whom your friend Mr. Wilkeson pronounces "the greatest man on all the earth," whom everybody admits is the greatest man in the pulpit of the country—if you have been guilty of improper solicitations, addressed to one of your parishioners who worshipped you as she did her God, how comes it that these gentlemen—Mr. Tracy aided by all the rest, Mr. Porter and Mr. Evarts—paint this man as a demi-god, upon whom the stain of sin has never rested? Who is making "good evil and evil good?" Can the pastor of a great church address to his parishioner solicitations of lustful evil, undenied by his counsel in court, and then be represented to the American community and to the world as a demi-god just descended from heaven?

A SCENE.

Here a remarkable scene took place. Porter stood up like a spectre and cried out in a sepulchral tone, "I cannot permit counsel to misrepresent us. We never admitted the charge of improper solicitations." Then he sat down, while Beach—his white hair all flying about him—insisted that they did. Again Porter rose up, while repeated bursts of applause, repeatedly checked, made a noisy accompaniment to the angry discussion between the counsel. The Judge interposed. Beach cried out that he was surprised any gentleman would stand up and interrupt counsel by stating he uttered a falsehood. The feelings of the audience were highly wrought, and the preponderance was on the side of Beach.

Mr. Porter—One moment. I cannot permit the counsel to make a statement the falsity of which is known to the Court and to every juror. When have we admitted that Henry Ward Beecher made improper advances to her? (Applause from the Plymouth party.)

Mr. Beach—My learned friend forgets himself. (Laughter.) Those chords of affection which have been growing for thirty years between us will not stand the tension of an accusation like a falsehood. (Applause.)

Mr. Porter—Nor will the bonds of friendship permit me to give a statement made in open Court that we admitted a charge which Henry Ward Beecher has denied on oath, and against which each of the counsel in this case have argued.

Judge Neilson—The Court——

Mr. Porter (continuing)—The question whether the charge was improper solicitations or adultery is another thing. I am amazed that my friend should claim that either of us has on any occasion admitted that Mr. Beecher made improper advances to this lady.

Judge Neilson—No doubt the interruption on the part of Mr. Porter was, in his judgment, called for and correct; still, I think there is a misapprehension. I did not understand Mr. Beach to say you had admitted; I understood him to say, in the course of his rapid denunciation, that the charge of improper advances had not been denied—that you made it a test question—that is, that you hadn't in terms denied it when it was a subject of discussion. I don't think he said you ever admitted it. I may have misunderstood him.

Mr. Beach—Everybody understands, may it please Your Honor, and no one better than the counsel that, in discussing this case and the course of counsel, I am reasoning according to my best judgment and understanding of the case. There is no one more likely to fall in error, but it is not intentional error. I yet assert, according to my best recollection, to my fairest deductions from the arguments of the learned counsel, that not one word was said by Mr. Porter or Mr. Evarts in denial of the charge of improper solicitations.

Judge Neilson—That is as I understood your expression. (Applause.)

Mr. Beach—Yes, sir.

Judge Neilson—It is quite impossible to go on with this noise.

Mr. Beach—And I repeat the assertion that Mr. Tracy, in his opening of this case, expressly presented the issue, telling the jury that the real and practical issue in this case was whether the charge and the offence was improper solicitations or adultery.

Mr. Tracy—The charge.

Judge Neilson (to the spectators)—Silence! Gentlemen, I wish you would not compel me to adjourn.

Mr. Tracy—The question was whether Mr. Tilton charged improper solicitations or adultery.

Judge Neilson—Then I understand, Mr. Beach, that Mr. Porter misunderstood you. You didn't intend to say that they had admitted.

Mr. Beach—No, sir. But whether he misunderstood me or not no gentleman has a right to arise in this court and state that I told a falsehood.

Judge Neilson—He did not say that.

Mr. Beach—He did!

Judge Neilson—You may be mistaken.

Mr. Beach—No, sir, I cannot be mistaken when my personal honor is assailed. I am sorry the gentleman said it, because he certainly knows I did not mean to assert a falsehood.

Mr. Porter—I certainly did not suppose so, and when the gentleman first made the assertion I waited and in surprise for an explanation. When I understood him to review the charge that that was the issue, and we recognized it and had not denied it, why then most certainly I had to take him at his word, and no one can be more surprised than he himself is or will be when he comes to read it. He would be very much surprised if I were to rise here and say that he admitted Mr. Beecher is innocent and I am equally so when he asserts, as I understand him, that we admit he is guilty of improper advances.

Mr. Beach—I have exposed the

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF BOTH THESE COUNSEL

in regard to material facts, by reference to the proof; but I have not ventured to say, and God forbid I ever should say to my learned friend, whatever the provocation might be, that he has stated a falsehood. He has no right to say it to me. He knows it is not true, as I believe, that these misstatements of counsel arise entirely from a misconception of the proof and without any intention to mislead the jury or to do wrong to any human being. I know that in the ardor of advocacy we are sometimes betrayed into intemperate assertions; we are led into errors and mistakes by our zeal and by the honesty of our purpose; but we are not deceivers, gentlemen, intentionally. Neither my learned friend nor myself utter falsehoods to you intentionally, and no one can submit with more obliging grace than myself to any correction which may be made necessary by any error into which I may fall; but I tell the gentleman again that he must not charge me with falsehood. (Sensation.)

Mr. Porter—The gentleman must not charge me with admitting away the case of my client.

Mr. Fullerton—I insist that my colleague shall be permitted to go on now.

PEACE AGAIN.

Mr. Beach—Who is it, then, to whom and upon this woe is denounced? And what is the application of the pretentious philosophy of Mr. Evarts? Wherein have we called good evil? Wherein have we sought to cover the heinousness and the hideousness of wrong? Who is laboring to cover up sin? Who is trying to protect, by every device and ingenuity of outside influence and of inner effort to cover up the truth, to conceal the hideousness of guilt? Not us. We do not call evil good, and good evil. "Oh, you are not only evil, but evil continually," says Mr. Evarts; "but you have got all the profligate classes on your side. Respectable men don't believe this charge." "Well," said Mr. Evarts, "when scandal is published then at once there is a vast class of the community that give it ready and full acceptance." Then, quoting some Latin, which I beg the privilege of skipping, he says, "the idle profligates of New York believed it, and of this neighboring town, and so in every quarter where the wicked classes make their meetings and hold their gossips, with a sneer and a smile the scandal is accepted." Indeed! and how did the gentleman find that out? (Laughter.) What sort of association does he keep to make that discovery? Does he learn it from the declarations of nine-tenths of the press of the country? Well, there are some few who seem to believe it in this audience. Do they belong to the profligate classes? Do they honor us with their attendance out of love for sin and debauchery? Are they giving to this defence the countenance of their presence because of their profligacy and abandonment? Is Fairfield a profligate? Is Judge Ford, who gave a public opinion upon this question in Massachusetts, a profligate? Are the various eminent divines who declare their conviction by their absence, and who do not hesitate to declare it otherwise, are they profligate? And this jury of the vicinage, to which my learned friend refers, is this the jury from the vicinage? And are they holding up their hands in acclaim in honor of Henry Ward Beecher? No, gentlemen, the cause of this plaintiff cannot be disgraced by any such association. Hear what an oracle of my learned friend—Mr. Bartlett—says upon this subject, quoting this phrase of Mr. Evarts, "The idle profligates of New York believe the scandal" (Mr. Evarts' speech). "Mr. Evarts is mistaken. The profligate classes are on Mr. Beecher's side, and those who most fear that he is guilty are the religious, respectable people." And it is true. I know, gentlemen, that there is a large class in this community, pious and moral men, who long and pray that Mr. Beecher may be proven to be innocent, and at the outset of this investigation there was scarcely a respectable man in the whole community who did not pray and hope with all the fervor of his heart that this would turn out to be a mistaken and false accusation. But the times, sir, changed. The developments of this trial have wrought their legitimate and inevitable effects. From every section of the country came up the acknowledgments of that effect. Oh, my friend (Mr. Tracy) laughs, but I have quoted the papers. I can refer to the article, and, although he opened that great opening of his with the declaration that he was sustained by the sympathy of the world, I think my friend feels a little shorn of his supports. Now this is all aside from the true merits of this case. I grant you, but I am not introducing these topics. I have resorted and shall resort to no such devices to win the favor of this jury. My case does not demand it, and my own sense of justice does not approve it. I have no animosity to this defendant which would lead me to have resort to any such contrivances; but when these gentlemen

FLOURISH IN SUCH MAGNIFICENT MANNER,

claiming all the purity and the elevation and the dignity of the community in favor of their client, and assigning us to ignominous association with the profligate classes, why we are called upon to make some little defence.

Well, Mr. Beecher is a busy man. He had no time to commit sin. It is an argument made to you by the general advocate, Mr. Evarts—(laughter)—the man who represented, and ably represented (I mean no slight upon Mr. Evarts), and ably represented the interests of this country in the settlement of the Alabama claims. But it is really an argument made to this jury in favor of the innocence of Mr. Beecher that he was too busy a man to find any leisure for the commission of the offence. Well, that same busy man tells us, with all the wonderful products of his industry and great genius, that his work is done by ten o'clock in the morning and he has all the rest of the day for recreation and exercise. Well, that is rather more than you and I can claim. Well, then, he tells us also he takes Saturday as a holiday. Every Saturday, and it turns out that these difficulties in which he got involved occurred on Saturday—(laughter)—one of his holidays. He had time enough to visit, although he was not much of a visitor, yet he did find time to visit Mrs. Tilton, and in the absence of her husband. That's all right. He solicited it. It was very proper. (Laughter.) He found time to put the babies asleep; not only that but to engage himself for that service in the future. (Laughter.) And to request Mrs. Tilton, whenever the babies were uneasy, to send round to him and he would come at once and put them to sleep. There can be no dispute about that because Mrs. Tilton writes it. Yes, and he acknowledges it. Why, he could find time to take Mrs. Tilton out riding—no impropriety in it—and to be out walking with Mrs. Tilton and visit a sculptor's study, I believe, and photographic galleries. Well, now, how pitiful an argument that is under such circumstances. In what a desperate strait must a fruitful and ingenious lawyer be to resort to any appeal of that character would establish the proof in this case to this jury. And so with the statement of the learned gentleman that Mr. Beecher's person is so well known that he could not move anywhere without being an object of observation. Well, what if it is so? Was there no opportunity for him for intercourse with Mrs. Tilton, of whatever kind that intercourse may be? Didn't he visit her? Didn't he see her alone, where there was opportunity, if opportunity was desired? What arrant nonsense, with these known circumstances admitted by Mr. Beecher, to argue that he was too busy and too well known to commit adultery.

There is one subject which, in passing, I desire to speak of, because I would be glad to disabuse every mind of the idea that Mr. Tilton was a cruel and a brutal husband. I know

BESSIE TURNER

calls him so, but she is the only witness in this case who imputes any such conduct or quality to Theodore Tilton. If we may judge from his letters, if we may judge from her letters, if we may judge from the evidence of the man, from his demeanor upon the stand, from every revelation of his innermost character which he has given, from the sentiments he has expressed, from the doctrine he has avowed, from every act of his, so far as it is proved by any other human being except Bessie Turner, why he was a man who would revolt at any indecency or outrage toward his wife. Ah, gentlemen, except from the lips of Bessie Turner, where and when has Theodore Tilton ever breathed a lisp against the peace and the honor of Elizabeth R. Tilton? When has he ever professed anything but love and reverence and duty? He may have sinned—I don't know—but you may believe it from the evidence; but, so far as we can trace the character and the career of the man from his writings and declarations and publications, it has been a life of unswerving loyalty and of unlimited devotion to this woman; and when he comes upon the stand and swears that she confessed to him her impurity with Henry Ward Beecher his adoration for that wife was so profound and his belief in her spiritual integrity was so immovable that he, in the presence of his God, avows his belief that she is pure in soul and white as snow. Can you conceive, if he is the villain that he is represented to be, that he would have made that declaration? I shall comment upon it by and by; but it strikes every man as being an open avowal of a condition of spirituality and morality utterly at war with and inconsistent with the policy of this prosecution. But Theodore Tilton believed it. I think he believes it still. But he had the honest manliness to avow it; and not only to avow it, but without questions or inquiries to volunteer it. Why was not some one else from that household produced to prove this baseness and brutality on the part of Mr. Tilton? Why not some of the members of Plymouth church, who three or four years ago were intimately familiar with the hospitalities of that household? Why not some of the numerous ladies attached to Plymouth church and still clinging to Henry Ward Beecher, who knew of the condition of that household.

IF THEODORE TILTON WAS THE MONSTER

he is represented to be, why does the defence rest upon this pert and puerile Bessie Turner? What is the meaning of the testimony given by Joseph Richards, Catharine Lacey, by Catharine McDonald, by Mrs. Mitchel, Mrs. Bradshaw and by Mr. Maverick, pronouncing it a happy and harmonious household, a loving and cultured and beatific home? Beecher himself, too, bearing testimony to it! And yet, with this evidence, upon the simple testimony of this girl, Bessie Turner, this Court House has rung for days, and the echoes of the voices of my learned friends are still travelling all over the world in bitter and disgraceful denunciation of the conduct of Theodore Tilton in his family. I know you have prejudices against Mr. Tilton. There is not a man about me who has not, I fancy, in consequence of the storm which has been beating about him, the thunders of which were closed a day or two ago, and the echoes of which still ring in the arches of this court, and because he is a fearless, self-sustained and independent man, and will crawl at the foot of no human being, and court the confidence of no member of this jury or of this community, who stands up in his own single and independent manhood, and demands in a court of law justice, founded upon the evidence—and he will get it. Some time and somewhere he will get it. If it is denied him by this jury; if there be a Providence which overrules the destinies of men as well as nations; if there be a retributive justice which in the end overtakes sin and offence, Theodore Tilton will get vindication and justice and Henry Ward Beecher will get his due reward.

The Court then adjourned to Monday morning.

MR. BEACH'S POPULARITY.

A few minutes after the retirement of the jury Mr. Beach, with Frank Moulton on one and Judge Morris on the other arm, emerged from the court room. They found much difficulty in passing through the dense mass of people who thronged the main corridor. Upon arriving at the head of the staircase under the dome Mr. Beach found several hundred people gathered there and awaiting his appearance. As soon as the face of Mr. Beach was recognized a deafening cheer greeted him, which was taken up and repeated by those behind the counsel. Mr. Beach moved rapidly down the staircase, hat in hand, bowing to the greeting tendered him. All three of the gentlemen then entered a carriage and drove away.

MR. CARPENTER MAKES A STATEMENT.

Mr. Frank B. Carpenter, the well known artist, whose name has been connected with the "scandal" almost since that long-lived trouble first came to the knowledge of the people, has now made a final "statement" of his knowledge of Messrs. Beecher and Tilton, and of the controversy between them. Lacking the opportunity to say what he knew in court, under oath, he has accepted a chance which the *Graphic* newspaper has given him, and, through a reporter of that journal he relates to the people a lengthy tale, of which the following are the prominent features.—

MR. CARPENTER'S STATEMENT.

The assertions of Mr. Beecher's counsel that I did not "dare" to go on the witness stand are without foundation. I expected to be called throughout the trial. On the last day of the prosecution's rebuttal I went to Brooklyn and told Mr. Tilton's counsel that I was ready to go on the stand even at that late hour. The reasons why I was not called are these:—I was subpœnaed at the beginning of the trial, was telegraphed to repeatedly, and presented myself in court, expecting hourly to be called. Just before the evidence on the direct closed Mr. Tilton's counsel had a consultation, and decided to hold me back for rebuttal, supposing from Mr. Beecher's statement to his committee last summer that there would be something important for me to rebut. Mr. Tracy made blatant threats of what the defence were going to prove concerning me, and on hearing Tracy Mr. Tilton's counsel congratulated themselves on their policy in holding me back for rebuttal. When the defence closed to the surprise of the plaintiff's lawyers not one word had been produced that needed rebuttal from me. The defence abandoned those points requiring rebuttal from me, and I was not called.

THE BLACKMAIL THEORY.

Is it conceivable that this point made by Mr. Beecher to his committee last summer, and one of his strongest points then, would not have been proved on the trial if it could have been proved? The trouble was that if they had attempted to prove it Mr. Beecher would have been convicted of falsehood to his committee, and so it was abandoned. When Mr. Beecher told his committee last summer that a "demand and a threat" were made upon him he was not under oath. The fact that on the witness stand he did not affirm this statement is proof positive of its being the falsehood he knew it to be when he asserted it to his committee. The further fact that Henry M. Cleveland's sick room testimony was not read in court, and that this matter was dropped when Cleveland appeared in court, shows that Mr. Beecher's lawyers were afraid their client would be convicted of falsehood out of the mouth of his own witness and committeeman.

ACQUAINTANCE WITH MR. BEECHER.

My acquaintance with Mr. Beecher began in 1855 or 1856. After I came to New York to live I heard Mr. Beecher preach occasionally, and having been educated in the orthodox faith I had a great desire to talk with him. One day I was in Brady's photograph gallery, my studio being at that period in the same building, when I observed Mr. Beecher, and was introduced to him by Mr. Brady, and he went with me to my studio on an upper floor. Here we had a talk about "endless punishment." Susequently I painted a portrait of Mr. Beecher from life, having the sittings, by his invitation, at his house in Columbia street, during the summer of 1868, the family at the time being absent for the season.

MR. BEECHER CHARGED WITH FALSIFYING.

Mr. Evarts quoted in his speech, as a fundamental maxim of the law, "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*" How does this apply to his own client? Hundreds of people, since 1858, have seen this portrait of Mr. Beecher in my studio, and numbers know of our intercourse long before the scandal. A glowing tribute to my portrait and to the man was published in the *Evening Post* of October 26, 1858, written by a lady member of his congregation, which was the occasion of an unexpected visit to my studio by both Mr. and Mrs. Beecher. I once spent a day with him, by his invitation, at his farm at Peekskill. One evening, many years ago, I made one of a party of four especially invited to spend an evening with Mr. Beecher at his house, when the lady just mentioned was the hostess in the absence of Mrs. Beecher and the family. After Mr. Beecher's statement to his committee was made public people came to me and said, "What does this mean, Mr. Carpenter? Mr. Beecher says he never knew you till this scandal." In answer I referred them to the *Evening Post* of October 26, 1858. Mr. Beecher devoted to me in his statement to his committee last summer about the space of a finger length. Within this space I charge Mr. Beecher with six deliberate falsifications of facts.

ACQUAINTANCE AND INTIMACY WITH THEODORE TILTON.

My acquaintance with Theodore Tilton began in 1856, during the Fremont campaign. Tilton was President of the Brooklyn Rocky Mountain Club, which ordered from me a portrait of General Fremont. His love of art brought him often to my studio and we soon became intimate. With a mutual love of art there was also political sympathy that brought us closely together. Tilton and Beecher used to come to my studio together those early years of our acquaintance.

FIRST KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCANDAL.

My first intimation of wrong came from a lady intimate in the Tilton family (now dead), during a visit she made to my studio early in the year 1871, just after Tilton's rupture with Bowen. Some weeks later Mr. Tilton and myself one day lunched together, and afterward strolled into the City Hall Park. Mr. Tilton there disclosed to me in brief the facts of his rupture with Bowen. He charged Mr. Beecher with having been guilty of great misconduct in his (Tilton's) house. He told me of the charges Bowen had made against Beecher. The statement filled me with alarm. He told me, I think, of Mr. Beecher's apology. I remember that I asked him of their relations at that time to each other. His reply was that the last time they met—only a few days before, and he named the day—Beecher came up and kissed him on the forehead and said, "Theodore, you are my savior." I do not recollect any other conversation with Tilton on this subject until after the Woodhull publication of November 2, 1872. When that publication occurred I was in the country. Upon my return I found Mr. Tilton in a state of mind bordering on distraction. He told me he had been to see Dr. Storrs to ask his advice about the publication of a card; that Dr. Storrs told him a card that evaded and did not deny Mrs. Woodhull's charges would be worse than useless.

REV. DR. STORRS AND MR. BEECHER.

Until Tilton's unexpected visit to him Dr. Storrs told me he had not given the matter a serious thought. Dr. Storrs, in the confidence of friendship, wrote a note to Mr. Beecher, scouting the story and offering any service in his power. And here comes in one of the strangest parts of this history. To this note of friendship and trust Dr. Storrs told me there came no reply, and from the day of Mrs. Woodhull's publication Mr. Beecher, from being a constant visitor, never entered his house. Dr. Storrs said he (Storrs) had paid no attention to the publication by Mrs. Woodhull—had not even seen it when Tilton came to consult him about publishing a card. The Woodhull publication appeared about a month after the Plymouth church silver wedding, when Mr. Beecher publicly kissed Dr. Storrs on Plymouth platform. Dr. Storrs said Tilton came to him in great apparent distress, with a card he had prepared to meet the Woodhull story. The card did not deny. It was an evasion. Storrs frankly told Mr. Tilton so. Tilton, Dr. Storrs said, made a hypothetical case, and asked advice upon it. Dr. Storrs answered that he could not advise him upon a fictitious case. Dr. Storrs then said to Tilton that he saw he was in trouble. "Now," continued Dr. Storrs, "I will get the Woodhull story and read it, and then give you my opinion concerning it." Tilton called again, Dr. Storrs said, a day or two afterward, and he then told Tilton that there were four points to the Woodhull story which must be denied to have a denial effectual with the public.

DR. STORRS' SUMMARY OF THE WOODHULL SCANDAL.

These points were:—

1. That a criminal relation had existed between Mr. Beecher and Mrs. Tilton.

2. That it was revealed to Mr. Tilton or he discovered it.

3. That Mr. Beecher procured a written denial from Mrs. Tilton, and

4. That Moulton recovered this paper from Mr. Beecher.

Dr. Storrs said to his great surprise Tilton said, "But what if these points cannot be denied?" Dr. Storrs replied that in that case "he had no advice to give."

MRS. TILTON'S LETTER TO DR. STORRS.

I now come back to the 16th of December. As I have said, I passed the night of the 15th at Mr. Tilton's house. The next morning, after breakfast, I was in the back parlor with Mrs. Tilton, when Mr. Tilton came in and said, "Elizabeth, we have just fifteen minutes to meet the appointment at Dr. Storrs' study." It was my first intimation that Mrs. Tilton was to accompany him to Dr. Storrs'. Mrs. Tilton apparently shrank from the interview. Pitying her position—out of delicacy for her feelings—I said "Theodore, don't ask her to go; can't she write something instead of going in person?" Mr. Tilton acceded, and Mrs. Tilton, so far as I could see, voluntarily went into another room out of my sight, leaving Mr. Tilton and myself together. Before she went out of the room she said, "How can I express it?" Mr. Tilton replied, "You can put it in this way," suggesting the opening sentence of the letter, which has now become familiar. Mrs. Tilton left the room. She was gone perhaps twenty minutes. When she returned she had the completed letter in her hand. She handed it to Mr. Tilton, who read it and said:—"Elizabeth, you have stated it with exceeding delicacy; better than I could have done." This expression of Mr. Tilton, on receiving the letter from his wife, I remember with absolute distinctness. This account is in direct contradiction of Mrs. Tilton's statement to Mr. Beecher's committee, which I read with astonishment; but I can do no less than state what I know to be the truth. I was present during the entire

INTERVIEW WITH DR. STORRS.

When Mrs. Tilton's statement was read Dr. Storrs said, "Mr. Tilton, excuse me, but is that the whole truth?" Mr. Tilton replied that it was not, that it was an understatement, but he could answer no questions. Mr. Tilton read to Dr. Storrs and myself a part, and a part only, of Mr. Beecher's "letter of contrition." I recollect distinctly the sentence, "She is guiltless; sinned against." Before leaving Dr. Storrs Tilton stated positively to us that Mr. Beecher had confessed adultery to him and to Mr. Moulton in connection with one of Mr. Bowen's charges, and that Mr. Beecher at the same time named the woman, which name, however, Mr. Tilton did not disclose. At this interview, as I read from my diary, Mr. Tilton "laid his case before Dr. Storrs," that is, as much of it as he was willing to disclose. He fortified his narration with an occasional letter or document. When he finished his account, I recollect Dr. Storrs said to Mr. Tilton that it was his first duty to put the facts and documents in his possession in historical form for his own protection. I remember Dr. Storrs used this expression, "and if you have not the leisure take the leisure and do it at once." This was the advice which led to Tilton's employing himself for the following ten days in carrying out Dr. Storrs' suggestion, of which the product was what is now known as the "True Story." I find in my diary December 25 (Christmas) this entry:—"Tilton read me his statement, just completed."

THE NEWSPAPER PROJECT.

What was the origin of the newspaper scheme? One day, I think it was early in December, I was in Mr. Bowen's private office at the *Independent* rooms, and we were speaking of Beecher and Tilton, when Bowen made this remark, "Mr. Carpenter, how would it do for me to take those two men (Beecher and Tilton) and put them both back on the *Independent*?" Mr. Bowen used some such figure of speech as "seeing two men drowning, and at the risk of his life plunging in and bearing them to a place of safety." He said Mr. Beecher would return to the *Independent* if he (Bowen) wished it. Mr. Bowen said, "How does the suggestion strike you?" I told Bowen it would be a bold move, a *coup d'etat* in its way. He replied that it might be a success, and he added, "On the other hand it might sink me." I tried to induce Bowen to try the experiment, and I mentioned the suggestion Mr. Bowen made to Tilton. At first he took it as a jest, but when I advocated the plan in sober earnest he peremptorily refused to have anything to do with any project connecting him with Mr. Beecher. Then I suggested Bowen's replacing him on the Brooklyn *Union*. To this suggestion I think Tilton made no reply. Mr. Moulton entered earnestly into co-operation with me to secure Tilton's restoration to the *Union*. In pursuance of this plan Charles Storrs, H. B. Claflin and myself met at Bowen's house on the evening of December 22, 1872. Bowen suggested at this time buying the Brooklyn *Eagle* and putting Tilton at the head of that paper. I made as strong an appeal in behalf of Tilton as I could, and Bowen then offered to make a stock company of the Brooklyn *Union* and to take $30,000 worth of the stock, with the purpose of replacing Tilton as editor. Claflin would not commit himself. Not a word was said during this interview about a new paper in New York, with Mr. Beecher for editor. Nobody had thought of such a thing at the time of that meeting. It was a perfectly friendly talk of an hour. Tracy's attempt to make it appear that

CLAFLIN DENOUNCED TILTON

as a blackmailer at that interview failed. On seeing Tracy's effort to prove this (which Judge Neilson excluded) I saw Mr. Bowen and asked him if Claflin applied such a term to Tilton. Bowen said he never heard of Claflin saying such a thing, "and certainly Claflin never used such an expression in my presence." Charles Storrs, in his testimony, confounded a meeting at Moulton's house two evenings later, December 24, with the one at Bowen's house of December 22. At Moulton's, on the 24th, Claflin was not present, the party consisting of Moulton, Bowen, Charles Storrs, and, later in the evening, myself. I cannot help thinking it very strange that Charles Storrs should have left out of his testimony Moulton's princely offer to Bowen on this occasion, December 24, of $125,000 for a half interest in the Brooklyn *Union*, for the purpose of restoring Tilton as editor of that paper. Bowen has often spoken with me about this offer of Moulton. Perhaps Tracy did not want to bring this fact out in Storrs' testimony, as Tracy was subsequently one of the purchasers of the Brooklyn *Union* from Bowen, and I have been told that this very offer of Moulton was made a basis in Bowen's negotiations with Tracy of the value of the *Union*.

THIS NEWSPAPER SCHEME,

of which the defence have made so much during the trial, was treated quite differently by Mr. Beecher in his statement to his committee. He said I once "proposed" such a scheme to him, and he was greatly "amused" by it. Yes, and he said that he told me that if he should ever "leave his pulpit" he thought it "quite likely he would go into journalism," as it would be more "natural" for him "than anything else." "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*" Again, I will give you all the facts, and you can judge whether he gave me any such answer as he alleged to his committee. This "newspaper scheme" was a plan of mine to save Beecher from the impending investigation which every one knew was only a question of time and was bound to come. As a commercial project it was entered into by three prominent publishers of New York, two of whom have never been named in connection with this scandal. Two of these publishers met me at Bangs' restaurant on the 26th of December, 1872. Mr. Greeley had been dead just a month. The defection of the *Tribune* from the republican party and the decrease in its circulation offered an opening for a new republican paper, provided an editor of commanding genius and influence could be secured. The result of this interview at Bangs' restaurant was an arrangement on my part to see Mr. Beecher and on the part of one of the publishers to see the proprietors of the New York *Express* and ascertain what that newspaper could be bought for, with the Associated Press privileges. These two arrangements were carried out.

HOW BEECHER WAS TO ESCAPE INVESTIGATION.

I went, as arranged on that occasion, the same evening, December 26, 1872, to see Mr. Beecher and ascertain if he would take the editorship of the new paper. Mr. Beecher met me at his door in person and invited me to his study at the top of the house. We sat down together, and I stated the plan and suggested that he become the editor of the paper. I told him plainly in this way he would escape all danger of a church investigation. Mr. Beecher sat in silence for a few moments and then said, "I am wonderfully taken with this plan of yours." He then went on to speak of his work as a minister being ended. He said his work had been "destructive," that there had got to be a "reconstruction" of theology, and at this time of life he did not want to have anything to do with it. The plan suggested seemed a way out of all his troubles. After supper we went to Mr. Moulton's. On the way to Moulton's Mr. Beecher said to me, "I can stand anything but the suffering of others for my fault." Further on he said, "Men talk of courage in facing an enemy on a battlefield; let a man face what I have faced in my pulpit for two years, then he can talk about courage." These and similar expressions completely won my sympathy for Mr. Beecher. I would have done anything to save him. Moulton did not enter into the scheme with the heartiness that I expected. He said the plan presented one solution of Mr. Beecher's difficulties—one that promised "to protect Mr. Beecher's past and secure his future;" but I remember he said he thought Mr. Beecher ought not to leave his pulpit. Before we separated that night Mr. Beecher made a statement of his position in reference to the scandal in the presence of Mr. Moulton and myself, which, in the judgment of impartial men, warranted all that Judge Morris claimed in his opening speech that the prosecution would show by me. I had four interviews with Mr. Beecher concerning the newspaper scheme. The first, as I have stated, was the day after Christmas—December 26, 1872. The second was the next evening, Friday, December 27, after the church prayer meeting. Mr. Beecher told me on this occasion that he had "laid the matter before God and he would take the course Providence indicated," and he told me to "go on and see what could be done."

BEECHER'S DECISION.

Mr. Beecher finally asked me to let the matter rest for a few months. He said that if he should leave his pulpit then it would be attributed to the scandal publication by Mrs. Woodhull. At the interview when he said this he was greatly depressed. His words were, "I may die in my tracks, but I must keep on preaching." The only reason he gave me for a suspension of the matter was that it would be said Mrs. Woodhull had driven him from the pulpit. His last words to me on the subject were, "Let the matter rest for a few months. When the right time comes we can raise a million dollars within twenty-four hours."

OLIVER JOHNSON'S POSITION.

So far as I know the only two persons to whom Mr. Tilton, in 1870, before his rupture with Bowen, confided his wife's confession of adultery, were Mrs. Bradshaw and Oliver Johnson, his most intimate friend, whom he induced Mr. Bowen to make managing editor of the *Independent* to my knowledge, for he asked me to use my influence with Mr. Bowen to the same end, and who was, at the time of Mrs. Tilton's confession, associated with Mr. Tilton on the *Independent*. Oliver Johnson, who as Tilton's and Beecher's confidential friend, managing editor and representative, spoke with a knowledge I could not possess, told me the charge of Tilton against Beecher was adultery, long before Beecher's investigating committee put on record that no charge of adultery had ever been made by Mr. Tilton till after the Bacon letter. And yet Oliver Johnson was one of the witnesses before that committee. Oliver Johnson admitted Beecher's adulteries to me as recently as April 3, 1874, in the office of the *Christian Union*. He said that "he knew Mr. Beecher had been an awful sinner with women;" and I can name a gentleman who if called would have gone on the stand and sworn that Oliver Johnson told him that Mr. Beecher had confessed to him (Johnson) that he (Beecher) had been "an awful sinner with women." Henry M. Cleveland stated to me on the 17th of March, 1874, that Oliver Johnson told him that "Beecher had slipped his cables and must be protected." And Cleveland sat on the committee when Johnson testified before it.

BEECHER DECLINES TO SEE DR. STORRS.

The morning of December 30, 1872, I called at Moulton's, in Remsen street. Tilton and Beecher were in the back room on the second floor; Moulton was not with them. On this occasion I said to Mr. Beecher that I wished he would go and see Dr. Storrs. I said, "Mr. Beecher, go to Dr. Storrs and confide in him. You will find him the truest of friends and the best of counsellors." Mr. Tilton said upon this, "Mr. Beecher, I think it would be well for us to go together and see Dr. Storrs." Mr. Beecher replied that he would not see Storrs. Mr. Tilton then asked me to go around to his house and ask Mrs. Tilton to come there. I did so. Mrs. Tilton accompanied me to Mr. Moulton's, and I left Mr. and Mrs. Tilton and Mr. Beecher together. I understood the conference was with the view to prepare a card for the public, although the scandal was then two months old; but no action was taken. I saw little of the parties for several months.

Mr. Carpenter here detailed a meeting which occurred on the 3d of May, 1873, in the *Independent* office, between himself, Bowen and an excitable gentleman from Milwaukee, named E. D. Holton. During this meeting Mr. Holton said that "were he a member of Plymouth church

BOWEN WOULD RETRACT

his charges or prove them or be expelled." Bowen replied that in his opinion if a member of Plymouth church should rise in the next Friday night's prayer