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ABSTRACT

In 1857, armed with the best liberal education his parents and his native state could provide, David Boyd left Wytheville, Virginia, to seek his fortune on the frontier. He hoped to find work as a schoolmaster or as a civil engineer on a railroad project in East Texas, but the Panic of 1857 and the advice of some newly made friends ended those ambitions. Instead, he took a job in Homer, Louisiana, as professor of mathematics in the struggling Homer College. The position proved temporary but the vocation was permanent. For the next forty years David Boyd dedicated himself to furthering the cause of higher education in Louisiana. This thesis is a record of the hardships and heartaches he endured in that cause.

When David Boyd came to Louisiana, plans to establish a "State Seminary of Learning" for the higher education of Louisiana youth were already well advanced. By January, 1860, the school was operating under the able leadership of Superintendent William T. Sherman, a West Point graduate and a former major in the United States Army. David, one of the original faculty, taught Latin and English under Sherman until the coming of the Civil War
caused both men to leave the school for military service in opposing armies. By that time, however, David's attachment to the Seminary was so strong that he planned to resume his career as soon as possible. When influential politicians managed to secure his release from the service he left northern Virginia in mid-1863 in order to reopen the Seminary. But Federal activity in Louisiana caused him to rejoin the Confederate Army where he remained until the Trans-Mississippi Department surrendered in May, 1865. Not until the following October did the school reopen under its new superintendent, David French Boyd.

For the next fifteen years David struggled heroically to keep the Seminary, renamed the Louisiana State University in 1870, from closing its doors. Despite a costly fire, Radical Reconstruction, overwhelming poverty and growing hostility to his administrative policies, he succeeded until an unfriendly Board of Supervisors managed to remove him in 1880. He was recalled four years later but the homecoming proved a failure. Old antagonists were still active and the school no longer needed him to ensure its existence. In 1888 he resigned to start a second exile which lasted almost a decade. Finally, after years of poverty, humiliation and defeat, he returned to the
University as a professor of moral philosophy. Two years later he was dead, a sad and bitter man whose last days were plagued by overwork and the sense that no one appreciated his strenuous efforts in behalf of the school.

Although his effective contribution to Louisiana State University ended some twenty years before his death, David Boyd's life was not a failure. He saved the school from physical and political destruction, he secured a small but regular income for it to guarantee its continued operation, but most important, the charter he composed for it in 1877 provided later administrators with a broad and liberal framework within which they could construct a modern university.
CHAPTER I

THE VIRGINIA YEARS

In 1857 David French Boyd was twenty-three years old, unemployed, disillusioned and suffering the pangs of unrequited love. His father's business was moving toward bankruptcy, and the young man, discouraged at his own business failure, had little incentive to remain in his birthplace, Wytheville, Virginia.

Originally from Scotland, the Boyd family migrated to Maryland and Virginia sometime in the late seventeenth century. John and Mary Boyd left Ayrshire, Scotland, to settle near Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, in 1684. After ten years they moved on to Prince George's County, Maryland, where they farmed and ran an inn. Four generations later, their great-great grandson, Thomas Duckett Boyd and his wife, Mary Magruder Boyd, were living at Boyd's Tavern, Albemarle County, Virginia. One of their ten children, named after a prominent citizen of the place, was Thomas Jefferson Boyd, born in 1804 at Charlottesville, Virginia. It was Thomas Jefferson Boyd, the father of
David French Boyd, who established the family at Wythe County, in southwestern Virginia.¹

Thomas Jefferson Boyd was a self-made man. His "too indulgent" father, captured during the War of 1812, died soon after his release by the British. To relieve his hardpressed mother, Thomas Jefferson Boyd went to work for a Charlottesville merchant when only thirteen. Later the merchant and his wife provided him free room and board while he attended school. With an older brother he "read law" in Richmond for a year, and in February, 1826, he enrolled in the University of Virginia.² Following admission to the bar in 1828, Thomas Jefferson Boyd settled at Wytheville, Virginia, and formed a law partnership with Judge David McComas. McComas was married to Cynthia


²Copy of a letter by Thomas Jefferson Boyd to [2/2], November [?], 1890, in Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Geneological Scrapbook, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University; Marcus M. Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd: The Story of a Southern Educator (Baton Rouge, 1935), 10-11. Wilkerson claims that Jefferson often visited the University and gave lectures to the classes in law while Thomas Jefferson Boyd was a student there. However, in February, 1826, when Boyd enrolled, Jefferson's last illness began. He was nearing his eighty-third birthday and although his mind remained vigorous until the last, he moved about only with great difficulty. Saul K. Padover,
French of neighboring Giles County, and in 1833, Thomas Jefferson Boyd married her younger sister, Minerva.\(^3\)

During the next twenty-five years Thomas Jefferson Boyd practiced law, promoted Wytheville and participated in politics.\(^4\) Minerva bore ten children. David French Boyd, the first child, and the subject of this biography, was born October 5, 1834. Next came two boys, John and James, who died in infancy.\(^5\) Two more sons, William Henderson and Charles Rufus, were followed by three girls: Mary French, Cynthia McComas, and Ella Minerva. Another boy, Thomas Duckett, and a fourth girl, Elizabeth Bright,

---

\(^3\)Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd, 11-12.


\(^5\)Bill for small coffin, W. H. Brown to Thomas Jefferson Boyd, April 22, 1837, in Boyd (Thomas J.) Papers, D. F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 7, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University; List of Thomas Jefferson Boyd's children in Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Genealogical Scrapbook.
completed the Boyd family.  

To support his large family Thomas Jefferson Boyd practised law until about 1858, but he also speculated in land, promoted mining, street paving and railroad ventures, engaged in the family side line of innkeeping, and actively participated in politics. In 1839 he won election to the town council of Wytheville. He was reelected annually until his death in 1893. On the state level Boyd served in the Virginia House of Delegates and on the State Board of Public Works, both elective positions. Describing himself as a "Taylor Democrat," he ran successfully for a legislative seat in 1848. A brother-in-law, J. Henderson French, was not impressed. He wanted to know when Boyd had departed from the party and the policies of his famous namesake. Boyd had been strongly opposed to tariffs and the Bank; if he favored Taylor, "though he be a moderate

6A broken hip suffered in a fall from a horse may have contributed to Minerva Boyd's retirement from childbearing. Her husband claimed it left her an invalid while still under forty. Copy of a letter by Thomas Jefferson Boyd to [?], November [?], 1890, in Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Genealogical Scrapbook; Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd, 12.

7Copy of a letter by Thomas Jefferson Boyd to [?], November [?], 1890, in Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Genealogical Scrapbook.
Whig," Boyd must have left the faith.\textsuperscript{8}

Boyd's political position was not understood by his son David, either. The boy protested his father's independent course in the gubernatorial contest of 1851 and the father, seeking to justify his departure from the Democracy, warned his son against blind party loyalty. He candidly admitted his own partisanship in the past, but that was in an era when parties were based on principle; now party leaders in Virginia sought only self-aggrandizement. Therefore he had broken all "party shackles" and would support the man who would best serve the people.\textsuperscript{9}

In the late 1840's and early 1950's, coincident with Thomas Jefferson Boyd's legislative service, railroad promotion and building schemes were especially common in Virginia. Certainly in southwestern Virginia there was plenty of room for internal improvements and Thomas Jefferson Boyd, in public and private life, did what he could to bring them about. His favorite project was a rail line that later became a part of the Norfolk and Western. But in 1850 the aim was more modest: completion of the line between

\textsuperscript{8} J. H. French to T. J. Boyd, undated, in Boyd (Thomas J.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 5.

Knoxville, Tennessee, and Lynchburg, Virginia. At that time railroads were often financed jointly by public and private capital. States, and sometimes even cities, matched private funds subscribed by leading citizens or corporations in the community. Obviously liaison between government and private investor was essential and, in this instance, Thomas Jefferson Boyd served as a connecting link. He used his position in the legislature to promote state participation and his prestige in his home district to encourage private investment. For good measure he was also a director of the interested corporation.

Thomas Jefferson Boyd's legislative career lasted until 1853. He was so involved in Richmond that his family rarely saw him or heard from him. Minerva Boyd expressed mild discontent penciled in a letter that Boyd's business agent, James Trucks, sent his employer in 1849. "I was

10Between 1847 and 1850, the Democratic state legislature voted this project, the Tennessee and Virginia Railroad, over two million dollars in an effort to keep western Virginia Democrats from defecting to the Whigs in their search for internal improvements.

11T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 22, October 27, November 17, December 12, 1850, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University. See Bibliography, Footnote 2. T. J. Boyd's efforts were not in vain. By November of 1850 it was decided to route the railroad through his home town, Wytheville, in and around which he owned or had options on large parcels of land. Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd, 14.
sorry you did not write to me," she wrote. "I am getting a little jealous of Mr. Trucks who seems to get all the letters." A year and a half later Thomas Jefferson Boyd was still too busy to write his family regularly. Every letter to his son David, then at school in Staunton, Virginia, began with an apology for not writing oftener or an excuse for not visiting the unhappy youth.

David French Boyd received his earliest education in private day schools run by young men and women hired by the more affluent Wytheville families. Normally, the young people who conducted such schools did not plan to make teaching a career. The pay they received explained why. David's tuition bill for his first four-month term came to only eight dollars. By the time he was eleven or twelve, however, David's teachers were usually struggling young lawyers who taught school to supplement their incomes. He remembered them years later as stern disciplinarians,

12James Trucks to T. J. Boyd, June 4, 1849, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

13T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, October 27, November 17, December 12, December 25, 1850, ibid., Box 11.

14Receipt of Jane Childs, February 1, 1840; Bill to Thomas J. Boyd for tuition due James Gibboney, November 1, 1845, in Boyd (Thomas J.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 6.
"wielders of the rod of correction and enlightenment." One of them switched David for throwing gravel in a schoolmate's face. The face, incidentally, belonged to J. E. B. Stuart.¹⁵

In the fall of 1850 David enrolled in a classical preparatory school at Staunton, Virginia. The headmaster, Pike Powers, enjoyed an excellent reputation as an educator of young gentlemen. Many of his pupils later entered the University of Virginia, which was where David hoped to go. He had not been at school a full month when his mother asked him if one year at Staunton would find him sufficiently prepared for the University.¹⁶ It did not. David spent two years at Staunton and they were not altogether happy. Almost the first letter he wrote home complained of his roommate's "bad habits." His father urged him not to be "seduced" and suggested the principal, Pike Powers, assign David to another room. But all this must be done discreetly, the elder Boyd reminded his son, lest his schoolmates

¹⁵In 1896 David Boyd wrote a "school history" of J. E. B. Stuart, designed to inspire youth. It was never published. Mrs. Stuart, to whom David sent the manuscript, objected to his treatment. David's account, she thought, made her husband appear "frivolous," and to refer to him as "Jim" was "undignified." Aware of her husband's shortcomings, she did not feel that they had to be written about. Flora Stuart to David F. Boyd, April 28, 1896; David Boyd, MS, "Boyhood of J. E. B. Stuart," undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8.

¹⁶Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 28, 1850, ibid., Box 4.
consider him a tattler. 17

New roommates did not end David's problems of adjustment. Only two weeks after moving to new quarters he wrote his family about a fist fight with a fellow student. The student, David explained, has "insulted" him. Thomas Boyd answered his son at once, urging him never to start a fight but to defend himself bravely if attacked. He asked for more details, meanwhile cautioning his sensitive son against over-hasty defense of his "honor." A fuller account of the circumstances giving rise to the fight confirmed Thomas Boyd's misgivings. David had something in his hand which the other boy knocked to the ground. David told him he was "no gentleman," whereupon the fists began flying. Thomas Boyd remarked to his son that calling someone "no gentleman" was a pretty strong rebuke and that it should be based on something equally strong to be justified. "Master your temper," advised his father. He also urged David to continue his study of Greek and not to become discouraged. 18

Thomas Boyd's correspondence with his son David reveals many things about both individuals. The father, obviously a strong person, was a "booster,"--a man who worked

17 Thomas J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, September 5, 1850, ibid., Box 11.

18 Thomas J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 22, September 28, October 10, 1850, ibid.
hard in the interests of his part of the state as he understood those interests. To Thomas Jefferson Boyd "progress" (i.e., railroads, land surveys, street pavings) came before party and at times, before family. His letters to his son David reflect his preoccupation with "business" and "public service." Most of them begin with apologies for not writing or visiting the lonely young scholar. But what the father described as unavoidable the son interpreted as indifference.¹⁹

Thomas Boyd was not indifferent. He just was not very warm or demonstrative if his infrequent family correspondence is used as a criterion. Those letters he did write to his sensitive son were full of sound advice. David must avoid partisan politics; master his temper; stick with his Greek; and cultivate female companions in order to develop refinement. The trouble was that all these injunctions were delivered like so many lectures. They were edifying, but impersonal, and might just as well have been expressed by the

¹⁹As the years passed, the relationship between Thomas Jefferson Boyd and David Boyd was to grow more strained, whereas that between David and his mother remained very close. Thomas J. Boyd to David Boyd, October 27, November 17, December 12, 1850, ibid.; Minerva French Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 7, 1855, ibid., Box 5. Thomas J. Boyd was even less successful in "understanding" his second son, William, who was ordered from the house because of his penchant for "vile women," liquor and gambling. Thomas J. Boyd thought him beyond redemption but Minerva wrote David that "Willie has been treated cruelly." Minerva Boyd to
school chaplain. Nor did Thomas Boyd wax eloquent in praise of his son's scholastic achievement. The school sent report cards to parents every month along with a list of demerits for misconduct. Over a two-year period Thomas Boyd referred only three times to David's grades (they ranged from superior to perfect in every course except Bible) and twice to his conduct (in one quarter he amassed two demerits out of an allowable seventy-five). At least somebody in the family was impressed enough to comment. William Boyd wrote his father, then in the legislature in Richmond, that he was anxious to see "Brother Dave." "I wish I was as good and studious as he is," he said.

In September of 1852 David Boyd entered the University of Virginia. He was just eighteen and very optimistic. Two years, he thought, would be enough to complete the work for the undergraduate degree. He could then prepare for the Master's. An aunt, then living in Charleston, western Virginia, admired his ambition but feared for his health. "I

David F. Boyd, November 23, 1858, ibid.

20Thomas J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 22, September 28, October 10, 1850, January 7, January 12, 1851, ibid., Box 11.

21Thomas J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 29, October 15, 1851, March 1852, ibid.

22William H. Boyd to Thomas J. Boyd, May 9, 1852, ibid., Box 5.
think you are not a very healthy, or I mean strong boy in constitution, therefore you should be very careful . . .
Your health is of more importance just now to you, than everything else besides . . .”23

The University proved to be considerably more demanding than David's preparatory school. In 1852 it was composed of three separate departments: Law, Medicine and "Academic." The Academic Department embraced six schools: ancient and modern languages, natural and moral philosophy, and chemistry and mathematics. Two degrees, the bachelor of arts and the master of arts were offered. To qualify for the bachelor's a student had to graduate in two of the "literary schools," (ancient languages, modern languages or moral philosophy) and in two of the "scientific schools" (mathematics, natural philosophy or chemistry). He must also have obtained a "distinction" in the remaining two academic schools. Finally, he had to furnish the faculty an acceptable essay on some "appropriate" subject of literature or science which he might be expected to read on Public day.24 The Master's Degree, the "highest academical honor

23C. M. McComas to D. F. Boyd, January 2, 1853, ibid., Box 11.

24Catalog of the University of Virginia, 1853-54, p. 28, in ibid., Printed Pamphlets, 1854-57, Box 20; John Hammond Moore (ed.), "The Old Dominion Through Student Eyes,
of the Institution," required the student to be a graduate in all six academic schools. He must then stand a comprehensive examination in all fields, by the whole faculty, and must submit a formal thesis based upon any topic assigned him. 25

David Boyd enrolled in the schools of ancient languages, modern languages and mathematics. 26 Modern languages included French and German. The ancient languages were Latin and Greek. From the number of red pencilings on his exercise papers, it is clear that David was not adequately prepared in Greek. By the end of the year he had withdrawn from the course. The only subject in which he

1852-55; The Reminiscences of Thomas Hill Malone," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, LXXI (July, 1963), 302. Malone explained that "distinctions" were formal certificats stating that the holder had obtained a grade of at least seventy-five per cent in the final examinations of a particular school, much less than was required for graduation. He also noted that boys who failed to graduate used to send their parents these certificates claiming they were distinguished students. The Malone reminiscences afford an excellent description of the University of Virginia in the 1950's.

25Catalog of the University of Virginia, 1853-54, pp. 28-29, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1854-47, Box 20; Moore (ed.), "The Old Dominion," 302. Moore notes that the degree of Bachelor of Arts was granted by the University for the first time in 1848. He remarks that it was long considered a "sop" to those unable to complete the rigid requirements for the Masters.

26Catalog of the University of Virginia, 1853-54, p. 8, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1854-47, Box 20.
received even a "distinction" was intermediate mathematics.

Discouraged, he took the following oath:

Having failed to graduate on any of my tickets this session of 1852-1853, I do now solemnly swear, that if I return the next session, I will graduate on the tickets of Latin, French, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, or the equal thereto. So help me God.

David F. Boyd

But perseverance and hard work were not enough. At the end of the next session (1853-1854) David was still far short of his goal. He graduated in two schools, ancient and modern languages, but received only "proficiency" in advanced mathematics and German. The experience must have shattered him because he apparently refused the diplomas to which he was entitled and left abruptly for home. In August the chairman of the University faculty, Dr. Gessner Harrison, wrote David's father as follows:

August 9, 1854

My dear Sir:

When I arrived home some days ago, I found yr. letter of July 10 on the subject of your son's diploma, with the

---

27Report of the University of Virginia to parents of D. F. Boyd, June 29, 1853, ibid., Box 12; Pledge of David Boyd, June 25, 1853, ibid., Box 6.

fee of $5.00 enclosed.

The faculty alone can authorize the bestowing of the diploma which your son in his mortification refused, and they may not probably have a meeting before the first week in September. I think that they will not refuse to grant it, under the circumstances, and because of yr. son's uniformly correct deportment and excellent character and habits, although the practice and rule are the other way. It was very natural that he shd feel some mortification; but it wd have been more reasonable to remember that he had really been steadily advancing, if not so rapidly as he could wish, in the way of gaining a sound liberal education, with the certain result of making a useful cultivated man, if God spared him. A man has no more right to be discontented with the peculiar character of his mind than with the height of his body. His business is to make good use of his own faculties.

I will attend to the matter of the diploma as soon as possible. Meanwhile present my kind regards to your son ... 29

When he finally left Charlottesville in June, 1856, David Boyd had graduated in four schools: ancient and modern languages (Latin and French), "Pure Mathematics" and moral philosophy. In addition he had received a "distinction" in natural philosophy. Sometime during his four years he also studied German, Greek, chemistry and civil engineering. But he did not complete all the requirements for graduation from the University. This point is of some significance because

29 Dr. Gessner Harrison to T. J. Boyd, August 9, 1854, in Boyd (Thomas J.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 4. Harrison's letter seems to be dated 1852, but T. J. Boyd marked it 1854. Considering the years of David's enrollment at the University (1852-56), the latter date is probably correct.
most of his friends, his colleagues, and even his family thought he held not only the Bachelor's but also a Master's degree from the University of Virginia. Leroy Stafford Boyd, David's son, was certainly of that opinion. In 1902, he began compiling material for a family history and wrote the University of Virginia seeking all available information about his father's student career. A letter from the office of the chairman of the faculty listed the courses studied by David Boyd but said nothing about degrees or graduation.

Still compiling in 1913, Leroy Boyd again wrote the University about his father. An official replied that although David Boyd was a graduate in four schools of the University, he "may not properly be called a graduate of the University of Virginia." Leroy wrote back at once, apparently asking if his father were not recorded as a Master of Arts.

---


31John Patton to L. S. Boyd, October 28, 1902, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook.

graduate. But the answer was negative. Faculty records, admittedly very brief, did not list David F. Boyd as an M. A. graduate either.33

Whether David Boyd failed to finish his degree because of discouragement, disinterest or lack of funds is not clear. Whatever the reason, he left the University for his home in Wytheville in June of 1856 armed with several letters of recommendation from his erstwhile professors.34 His plans, although not fully matured in June, centered around establishing, or at least teaching in, a preparatory school similar to the one he had attended in Staunton. While still at Charlottesville, he and a friend from Lynchburg had planned such a school for Wytheville. But the friend changed his mind and studied law.35 David, meanwhile, began

---

33S. A. Steger to Leroy S. Boyd, January 26, 1913, *ibid.* The writer visited the University of Virginia August 21, 1963, to verify Leroy Boyd's findings concerning David Boyd. Neither the University Degree Book nor the Alumni Office had any record of a degree having been conferred on David Boyd. Honorary degrees have never been conferred by the University.

34Francis H. Smith, professor of natural history, recommended David to "any who want a teacher in Elementary Physics," and Professor Schele M. DeVere (modern languages) vouched for his academic record and his "personal attitude." Chairman of the Faculty S. Maupin sent David a general reference letter. Francis H. Smith to David Boyd, June 23, 1856; M. Schele DeVere to David Boyd, July 8, 1856; S. Maupin to David Boyd, July 9, 1856, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 12.

35C. M. Blackford to D. F. Boyd, July 14, 1856, *ibid.*, Box 10.
answering and inserting advertisements in several Virginia newspapers. Throughout the month of August he received several offers of tutoring positions from Alexandria, Virginia, to Quincy, Florida.36 His old schoolmaster in Staunton also found him a job, but by that time he had decided to set up for himself. On August 30, 1856, he had a prospectus printed which announced the establishment of "An English, Classical and Mathematical School" to be opened September 15, in Wytheville.37 He did open the school but it could not have been too successful. By November he had promised James Newman of Gordonsville, Virginia, to teach school at that place after February of 1857.38 Newman offered him a salary of $650 annually plus board, an arrangement David considered very generous. He also invited David to bring some of his Wytheville students with him to the new school. This last suggestion seemed to disturb both David and his father. If Newman were soliciting pupils from Wytheville, the Boyds reasoned, his school project must be in trouble. Newman

36Caleb Hollowell to David Boyd, August 27, 1856; C. H. DuPonte to David Boyd, August 18, 1856; James Newman to David Boyd, August 19, 1856, ibid.

37Pike Powers to D. F. Boyd, September 1, 1856, ibid., Box 11; Prospectus for school, Wytheville, Virginia, August 30, 1856, ibid.; Printed Materials, 1850-58, Box 19.

38James Newman to David F. Boyd, August 19, September 4, September 6, October 13, 1856, ibid., Box 10.
tried to reassure the Boyds but Thomas Boyd asked for the
cancellation of David's engagement.\textsuperscript{39} Newman responded
that his plans were too far advanced to agree to the can­
cellation. Besides, his son had known David at the Univer-
sity and had recommended him highly. In another letter
written to David Boyd, Newman repeated his reasons against
terminating the agreement, remarked that Thomas Boyd's re­
quest to end it did not seem well supported by sound argu­
ment and ended by leaving it all up to David's "candid con­
sideration."\textsuperscript{40}

Apparently around February 1, 1857, David Boyd wrote
Newman a scathing letter in which he accused Newman of in­
sulting his and his father's "honor," because on the fifth of
February Newman wrote a very correct reply to David, denying
any insult to Boyd senior or junior and expressing surprise
that any remarks of his could be so construed. He concluded
by releasing David formally from his obligation.\textsuperscript{41} Finally,
David wrote Newman on February 10 claiming that his (David's)
letter accusing Newman of insulting him and his father was

\textsuperscript{39}James Newman to David F. Boyd, January 1, 1857, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{40}James Newman to Thomas J. Boyd, January 3, 1857; James
Newman to D. F. Boyd, January 12, 1857, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{41}James Newman to David F. Boyd, February 5, 1857, \textit{ibid}.
"based on a contingency, which has been removed by yourself . . ." That is, David inferred that Newman's letter to his father was meant to be insulting. On that basis he wrote an insulting reply. If, however, as now was clear from Newman's February 5th letter, no insult was intended, then Newman should have disregarded David's letter of February 1st! This somewhat tortuous defense of his intemperate letter received no reply from Newman. 42

The Boyd-Newman correspondence reveals several facets of David Boyd's personality. He was sensitive in the extreme to any real or imagined affront, and he was extraordinarily given to long rationalizations of his own words and behavior. This tendency to "over react" appeared frequently in his later years, and he often "explained" his overreaction in lengthy, involved letters to the aggrieved parties. 43

David Boyd's decision not to leave Wytheville for employment with Mr. Newman may have been due to romantic reasons. He was at least a suitor for the hand of Ella Spiller, a Wytheville belle, and may even have been engaged to her.

42 David Boyd to James Newman, February 10, 1857, ibid.

43 For example, see his voluminous correspondence concerning the Egyptian venture in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76, and his exchanges with Samuel Lewis in 1870, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Papers, 1858-88, Box 4, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
early in 1857. But he was in no position to support a wife; he could not even support himself. By May of 1857, his private school failing and his father's business affairs foundering badly, David decided to try his luck elsewhere. He advertised in the New Orleans Delta for a teaching position and two weeks later a Mr. P. A. N. Starkes of Starkesville (Lamar County), Texas, made him a firm offer. It took him more than three months to arrange his affairs, but finally, in October 1857, David Boyd left his home in Wytheville for what he imagined were the greater opportunities on the frontier. Just twenty-three years old, he had failed in love and in business, but his physical health was intact and his mental and moral qualities won the praise of his contemporaries. A friend he had known at the University sent him off with a glowing letter of introduction to his


45 Starkes wanted someone to teach forty-five pupils between six and eighteen years old. The teacher's salary would come from the tuition fees which ranged from two to four dollars a month per child. The job was David's if his morals were good and he could furnish appropriate references. "None need apply w/o them," wrote the businesslike Mr. Starkes. P. A. N. Starkes to D. F. Boyd, June 7, 1857, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
brother in East Texas. Boyd was, he wrote, "as clever a fellow as this old State can furnish."\(^{46}\)

\(^{46}\) Morton B. Howell of Richmond, Virginia, to his brother, Alfred Howell, Greenville, Texas, October 24, 1857, *ibid.*, Box 15. For additional favorable comment on David's character see S. E. Pryor to D. F. Boyd, February 18, 1856, *ibid.*, Box 11; T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, December 2, 1857, *ibid.*, Box 5.
When David Boyd left Virginia in the fall of 1857, he intended to secure a teaching position in East Texas. But on his way south he made the acquaintance of another young Virginian, W. R. Johnson, also Texas bound and also in search of employment. Via New Orleans and Shreveport, David and Johnson ultimately reached Marshall, Texas, where Johnson took a job with a railroad company. David apparently considered the same course, but another new friend, Judge W. B. Egan, induced him to apply for a teaching position at Homer College in Homer, Claiborne Parish, Louisiana. The Egan family, Judge W. B. Egan, his brother Dr. J. C. Egan, and their father, Dr. Bartholomew W. Egan, had come to north Louisiana from Virginia sometime in the 1840s. All three men

1Morton B. Howell to Alfred T. Howell, October 27, 1857, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.

2W. C. Johnson to David Boyd, March 15, 1858, ibid., Box 11; A. A. Gunby, "Life and Services of David French Boyd," Louisiana State University Bulletin (June, 1904), 2-5; Dr. J. C. Egan, Appendix to "Life and Services of David French Boyd," ibid., 29.
were instrumental in securing David teaching positions or in promoting the educational institutions of which he later became a part. But when he met David late in 1857, Judge W. B. Egan's interests were centered on Homer College. The school probably started with one room in 1850. Five years later it was incorporated under the supervision of the North Louisiana Methodist Conference and was planning to offer both Bachelor's and Master's Degrees in Arts and Sciences. In 1856 the gift of an acre lot enabled the Board of Trustees to begin construction of a new building and the following year college classes began operation. David was professor of mathematics in the newly opened school and initially seemed pleased with his job. But Louisiana and

3 The Egans were prominent in Louisiana educational and political circles for years. Dr. J. C. Egan served as state senator 1868-72 and his brother, Judge W. B. Egan, was a justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court when he died. Judge Egan and his father Dr. Bartholomew Egan, also served on the boards of several educational institutions. Bartholomew Egan was one of the founders of Mt. Lebanon University, a Baptist college, and W. B. Egan helped organize Homer College and Louisiana State University. All three Egans served on the Board of the last named institution. New Orleans Daily Picayune, November 19, 1902; Gunby, "Life and Services of David French Boyd," 2-5, 12-13; J. C. Egan, Appendix in ibid., 31; J. W. Mobley, "The Academy Movement in Louisiana," Louisiana Historical Quarterly, XXX (July, 1947), 77; J. Fair Hardin, "The Early History of The Louisiana State University," ibid., XI (January, 1928), 13.

Louisianians were another story. His brother found his description of Louisiana so unfavorable that he doubted whether he could ever live there, and a Texas friend was sorry to hear he was living among such "rough people." He had thought David was surrounded by Parisians. A letter David wrote an old college chum in Virginia must have been very critical of Louisiana in general and Louisiana belles in particular. The friend advised him to leave the state if his job or the climate proved too demanding. As for the girls, he wrote:

I would like very much to happen in Homer on some Sunday & find you walking with one, with her "ancient" bonnet on. It would be rich. I certainly would believe that the heat had operated on your brain. But . . . should you fall upon [one] worth some $200,000, take her with all the appurtenances.  

Not every visitor to Homer and north Louisiana found the place so unattractive. J. W. Dorr took a horse and buggy tour through Louisiana in the spring and summer of 1860. He was employed by the editorial department of the New Orleans Crescent and between April and July, 1860, twenty-seven of his descriptive letters appeared in the paper's columns. Homer, which Dorr visited in mid-July, was

---

5 Charles R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, January 15, 1858, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; W. R. Johnson to D. F. Boyd, March 15, 1858, ibid., Box 11.

6 J. F. Gleaves, Jr. to David F. Boyd, February 14, 1858, ibid., Box 5.
characterized as one of "the most picturesque and pleasant places I have yet seen in Louisiana." The town boasted seven or eight hundred residents, two newspapers, numerous businesses, a Methodist and Baptist Church and many attractive homes. Construction of a new court house, the newly built Homer College and the well-attended Masonic Female College convinced Dorr of the town's prosperity. The only drawback, he wrote, was the difficulty encountered in getting there. The town's landing place was twenty miles away and visitors had to hire a horse or horse and buggy at Minden, Louisiana, to travel the hilly, crooked road.7

Whatever its charms for Dorr in 1860, Homer failed to attract David in 1858. By March his interest in Texas had rekindled. He thought of quitting his teaching job and seeking employment as a civil engineer on the Texas and Pacific. But a friend advised him to stay where he was. The railroad, he wrote, was "as uncertain as Texas weather."8 Minerva Boyd was also disturbed by her son's proposal to leave Homer College. She accused him of his father's failing: inability to stick by anything long enough to prosper from it. If he had to leave teaching, she suggested, why not study law?


8W. R. Johnson to D. F. Boyd, March 15, 1858, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11.
I am afraid of your P. R. R. (Pacific RR)—you will get over among the Rocky Mountains before you know what you are about & the first thing I hear, your scalp will be dangling from a horrid Indian's Wampum. I can't bear the idea of your going in that road. Please don't think of it.

But David continued to "think of it," although he considered other courses as well. There was a good chance that he might be offered another teaching job at Rocky Mount in Bossier Parish, Louisiana. In the meantime, for his summer vacation, he planned an extensive trip on horseback through southwest Arkansas, the Indian Territory and across Texas. He intended to leave about mid-July and, if a suitable job with the railroad did not develop before September, he would return to Homer. It is not clear how much of Texas David actually visited, but he must have been greatly impressed with the town of Paris in Lamar County. He wrote his family a long favorable description of the place and even applied for a job in the only school then operating in the town. Paris was too small to support two teachers.

---

9 Minerva French Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 12, 1858, ibid., Box 5.

10 Ibid.

11 C. R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, June 15, 1858; E. Langley to D. F. Boyd, September 9, 1858, ibid. David Boyd kept a brief diary of part of his trip during the summer of 1858. Unfortunately, he stopped making entries after crossing into Indian territory from Arkansas. David Boyd Diary, ibid., Box 15.
but it promised to keep him in mind.\textsuperscript{12}

Back in Louisiana Homer College was facing a crisis. The Trustees had failed to hire a president and therefore decided to suspend operations until they could secure a full staff and complete the building. David, with the assistance of one of the most advanced students, decided to fill Homer's educational void. In a printed folder he announced the opening of "An English, Classical and Mathematical School." He also listed his references and his educational and teaching experience.\textsuperscript{13} But instead of opening his own school, David became principal of the high school division of Homer

\textsuperscript{12}Minerva French Boyd to David French Boyd, September 7, 1858, \textit{ibid.}, Box 5; T. G. Wright to D. F. Boyd, October 27, 1858, \textit{ibid.}, Box 10.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Prospectus} for an "English, Classical and Mathematical School," September, 1858, \textit{ibid.}, Printed Materials, 1850-58, Box 19. David referred prospective patrons of his school to the trustees of Homer College and "its late President, Professor J. W. Stacy." Stacy, when Homer College did not reopen in September, 1858, became president of Homer Female Institute. But the following September he was again a professor in Homer College under the presidency of Reverend Baxter Clegg. Stacy drew up a four year course of study for the college which included Latin, Greek, algebra, trigonometry, calculus, surveying, civil engineering, chemistry, astronomy and "Evidences of Christianity." This extensive program and its author did not impress one of the former undergraduates. Alvin Kidd studied mathematics under David Boyd at Homer College, and David encouraged him to transfer to Emory and Henry College in Virginia. Early in 1860 Kidd wrote to David, then at Louisiana State Seminary of Learning at Pineville, Louisiana, thanking him for his friendship and advice. He was especially grateful for David's encouragement to transfer out of Homer College, thus taking him out of "so corrupt a society" and away from such a "low, insignificant, humbug of a College." He felt good "ventilating his mind" about a school whose staff and reputation were personified by Mr. Stacy, "an ignoramus." Course of
College which did function during the academic year 1858-59.\(^{14}\) Writing in 1915, Professor J. W. Nicholson of Louisiana State University remembered the high school as very "modern" and well-run. The principals, he recalled, were able men like David F. Boyd and Edwin H. Fay (later State Superintendent of Education), graduates of the best colleges in the country.\(^{15}\)

That Claiborne and the surrounding country were desperately in need of any sort of school is attested to by the following letter which a prospective patron addressed to David in September, 1858:

Mr. Boyd, when I saw you last Saturday in Homer I was not serten whether I wod bring my sons to your colleg or not So I did not find no plas to board them I have com to the concluson to bring them if I can git board fer them on of them is sick at present So plese looke round and if you can get eny plas fer thim to board write to me and I wil bring them direct your letter

---

\(^{14}\)W. Egan to Dr. J. S. Saunders, July 15, 1859, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11.

\(^{15}\)Nicholson, Stories of Dixie, 106. Nicholson grew up in and around Homer, Louisiana, and received his education at Homer College. He later taught there for several years. In 1877 he went to Louisiana State University as professor of mathematics. The University was then under the presidency of David Boyd. Mobley, "Academy Movement in Louisiana," 77-82.
After one full year in Louisiana, David was still unhappy in Homer. At least one cause must have been the concern he felt for his family's financial plight. Only a few days after he left Virginia they gave up their home and moved into the Depot Hotel, an investment property which Thomas Boyd had purchased some years before. In his letters to David, Thomas Boyd usually appeared quite optimistic about his chances of staving off complete financial ruin. He hoped to sell off his huge landholdings in order to cancel his other indebtedness; the hotel, he thought, would certainly support his large family when the weather improved and the new railroad brought tourists to the town.

Meanwhile, David must not think of giving up his chances in Louisiana. His offers to return to Virginia were appreciated, but only the sale of his land could rid Thomas Boyd of what he called "my embarrassment." 17

Other letters from home were more disheartening. An aunt wrote that "Your Pa's affairs are in a desperate state . . ." and asked David to help save his mother's

16David Colvin to D. F. Boyd, September 22, 1858, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 16.

17T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, December 2, 1857, January 4, 1858, ibid., Box 5.
servants. Minerva Boyd's letters confirmed the grim news. She had had to sign away her interest in all property, even her favorite slaves, and she doubted whether the sale of her husband's land would cover all the debts. Thomas Boyd's affairs, wrote Minerva Boyd, were in far worse shape than he would admit. She did not wish to burden David, but "If your Pa's insane desire to speculate will be shunned by his sons 'tis all I ask of them." Finally, at David's request, an uncle went to Wytheville in December of 1858 to determine just how serious the situation was. He reported that Thomas Boyd owed about $170,000 and stood little chance of ever paying it off. David's father, wrote the uncle, "didn't know how to use money; if he were out of this mess he'd be in another." In any event, David might as well stay in Louisiana. He could do no good in Virginia.

David was not convinced. A friend wrote him that the only newspaper around Wytheville was up for sale. If he were back in Virginia, he could make a living with the paper and study law in his spare time, something his Louisiana friend

18 C. M. McComas to D. F. Boyd, December 15, 1857, ibid.

19 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, undated 1858; March 22, 1858, ibid.

Judge W. B. Egan had urged him to consider. But David's father opposed his son's return to Virginia because "they neglected you when you were here." Thomas Boyd was probably reflecting his own growing disenchantment with the citizenry of Wytheville. By 1859 it was clear that thirty years of public service to the community was no substitute for solvency. One of his sons wanted to leave Wytheville because the people were so unfriendly, and even the maid was mortified when other servants chided her about her master's straitened circumstances. Her prestige must have slipped another notch in May of 1859 when Thomas Boyd lost his bid for reelection to the State Board of Public Works.  

Financial ruin was not the only dreary subject of the letters David received from home. William Henderson Boyd, five years younger than David, was everything his older brother was not. He drank, smoked, gambled, and caroused with scarlet women. Thomas Boyd finally ordered him out of

---

21 J. T. Gleaves to David Boyd, January 21, 1859, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8; Cynthia Boyd (sister) to D. F. Boyd, November 1, 1858, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; Thomas J. Boyd to David Boyd, February 4, 1859, ibid.

22 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, April 18, 1859 (David F.) Papers, Box 5; T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, June 28, 1859, ibid.
the house, and he sought refuge among his mother's numerous relatives. Minerva Boyd was distressed to the point of illness by the conflict in her family. She did not condone William's "evil courses." But Thomas Boyd's harsh treatment seemed to make Willie "more reckless than he would be with more gentle treatment." She asked David to write his brother and urge him to mend his ways. Other relatives also appealed to David to assume responsibility for the family's black sheep. Even William thought it was a good idea.

There was nothing much doing at his relatives' homes. They doubted his ability to learn law, and when David offered to pay William's fare to Louisiana everyone seemed satisfied.

There was, finally, one other explanation for David's apparent unhappiness in Homer during 1858 and 1859. Ella Spiller, the young woman with whom he had been in love before he left Wytheville, had married someone else. Miss

---

23 Minerva Boyd to David French Boyd, November 23, \(\text{1858}\), April 18, 1859, ibid.; T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, April 30, 1859, ibid., Box 7.

24 H. French to D. F. Boyd, January 23, 1859, ibid., Box 4; C. F. McComas to David Boyd, September 20, 1859, ibid., Box 7; C. F. McComas to David Boyd, November 20, 1859; William Boyd to David Boyd, May 21, November 12, \(\text{1859}\), ibid., Box 5. David offered to take charge of William as early as March of 1858 and Thomas Boyd, wishing to get William away from his "old associates," thought it a good idea. Thomas Boyd to David Boyd, March 21, 1858, ibid.
Spiller, as long as she was single, formed the principle
topic of the many letters David exchanged with a Virginia
friend, L. A. Auman. When she married Alex Brown, a young
attorney, in December of 1858, Auman wrote "I cannot even
conjecture how the news will effect [sic] you." 25

As the summer of 1859 approached, David was unde-
cided about his future. Homer did not attract him in spite
of the increase in salary he would receive if he remained as
principal of the high school. 26 Wytheville was without a
teacher in May, and Thomas Boyd, asked by his son about the
advisability of returning home, answered "I am almost [temp-
ed] to say, come & try the place once more." 27 But two
months later a new schoolmaster was active in Wytheville, and
the father urged his son to stay where he was. His mother,
on the other hand, wanted him home at any cost. He could be

25 Leopold A. Auman to David Boyd, February 28, June
5, 1858, January 14, 1859, ibid., Box 11. Only a few months
after her marriage Ella Spiller Brown was a widow and
David's hopes must have revived. He was still interested in
1862 when service in the Army of Northern Virginia took him
back to his home state. Leopold Auman to David Boyd, April
8, 1859, ibid.; C. R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, December 16,
1861, March 7, 1862, ibid., Box 5.

26 Leopold A. Auman to D. F. Boyd, May 2, 1859, ibid.,
Box 11.

27 T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 30, 1859, ibid.,
Box 7.
Minerva Boyd's letters urging David's return to Wytheville reflected the special relationship which existed between them. Months before she had confided that she had "so many things to tell you that I can't write, so many things I can speak of to none but you. I never thought I should miss you so much." Her other sons, who preferred their friends to her, were no comfort and her husband just buried himself in the newspapers. She must have been bitterly disappointed when David made it clear that he would not be coming home after all. In July of 1859 he accepted an offer to run a school at Rocky Mount in Bossier Parish, Louisiana.

The job at Rocky Mount was to begin in September, but even before he left Homer, David learned of his appointment as professor of ancient languages in the newly organized Louisiana State Seminary of Learning at Pineville, Louisiana.

---

28 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, June 28, 1859; Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, May or June, 1859, ibid., Box 5.
29 Minerva Boyd to David French Boyd, September 7, 1858, ibid.
30 W. B. Egan to Dr. J. S. Saunders, July 15, 1858, ibid., Box 11; Charles R. Boyd to David F. Boyd, July 25, 1859, ibid., Box 5.
Through the Governor the Seminary Board of Supervisors advertised for applicants in several New York, Washington and New Orleans newspapers in the spring and summer of 1859. When the Board met in August, it had over eighty persons to consider. Of these, forty sought the position to which David was appointed. 31 The Claiborne Advocate, Homer's newspaper, thought a better choice could not have been made: "Mr. Boyd is a talented, worthy, energetic industrious and deserving young man. He has been teaching for the last two years... in our town and has exhibited such proficiency and thorough scholarship... as to give entire satisfaction." 32

David was still unhappy in Louisiana as 1859 drew to a close. He found Bossier Parish no more appealing than Homer. But at least his stay there would be brief. In January he would begin a new job in a new institution. "I hope to hear better accounts from that new place you are going to," wrote his brother. 33 Neither one of them could know in 1859 that David's affiliation with "that new place" would last until his death forty years later.

31 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 30-32.
32 (Homer, La.) Claiborne Advocate, August 1859, quoted in Virginia newspaper clipping, unidentified and undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 16.
33 Charles R. Boyd to David Boyd, September 6, 1859, ibid., Box 5.
CHAPTER III

APPRENTICESHIP

The "new place" to which David Boyd went very late in 1859 was Rapides Parish, Louisiana. Alexandria, a town of some 1,600 people was the parish seat. Some three hundred miles from New Orleans via the Mississippi and Red River, it formed the geographical center of the state. Just above the town there were rapids which, in low water, seriously hampered travel upstream. Even below Alexandria the river's depth varied radically, causing residents and merchants much inconvenience. At times one could wade the stream; at other times it was thirty feet deep. But low water and floods did not impede Alexandria's growth. By 1860 it possessed several brick buildings, a new court house and two hotels. A third, the Ice House, was nearing completion. Soon travelers on their way to Texas by water or stage could enjoy the uncommon luxuries of steam heat, gas and water in every room. There was a theater in the new hotel, and for those who sought other diversions, the town provided restaurants, bar-rooms, billiard parlors, two newspapers and three churches.
Opposite Alexandria on the north bank of Red River, almost hidden in the pine woods, was the village of Pineville. A steam ferry connected it with Alexandria, and a wagon road, three and a half miles long, ran into the forest to the site of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning.\(^1\)

The Louisiana Legislature's decision to locate the Seminary far from any metropolitan center was in keeping with prevailing educational theories and agrarian prejudices. After considerable wrangling, the solons settled upon Rapides Parish because it was centrally located, easily reached by water and considered relatively free from disease. Perhaps the most compelling reason for their choice was the fact that Rapides was the home of General G. Mason Graham, the most ardent and dedicated supporter of the Seminary project.\(^2\)

Graham, whose formal association with the school lasted until 1835, was born in Fairfax County, Virginia, in 1807. He attended West Point for three years and the University of Virginia for one. In 1828 he migrated to Rapides Parish and ultimately became a planter of considerable means. His educational background, his brief service in the Mexican War, and Louisiana's repeated failure to establish an enduring

---

\(^1\)Prichard (ed.), "A Tourist's Description of Louisiana," 47-52.

\(^2\)Fleming, Louisiana State University, 22-24.
"classical" college convinced General Graham of the superiority of schools organized like West Point and the Virginia Military Institute. As a leading member of the Board of Supervisors, he did his uttermost to shape the Louisiana State Seminary in their image.3

The Seminary building, begun in 1856, was ready for occupancy late in 1859. It must have presented an incongruous as well as impressive sight to anyone who saw it for the first time. Walter Fleming, the historian of Louisiana State University, described it as:

Three lofty stories high, with five four-story towers. It extended around three sides of a quadrangle one hundred seventy feet front by one hundred seventeen feet deep. There were seventy-two large rooms, and to each floor was a wide gallery; the heavy walls were crenelated, and the whole building finished in white. Located on a high hill in an opening in the pine woods, surrounded by the open pine forest of trees sixty to

---

3His efforts to create a literary and scientific institution under a military form of government did not go unchallenged. Three other members of the Board of Supervisors, T. C. Manning, Dr. S. A. Smith, and James G. Campbell, wanted the institution to be a university organized somewhat like the University of Virginia. But Graham insisted that Louisianians would not support so ambitious a project. Furthermore, Louisiana youth required discipline and the citizenry as a whole needed a school which might provide some practical training in military information. Youth trained in such an institution, argued Graham, might well provide a "nucleus in every parish . . . for the organization and instruction of Military Bodies should the State . . . have need of them." G. M. Stafford, contributor, "Autobiography of Geo. Mason Graham," Louisiana Historical Quarterly, XX (January, 1937), 2-17. For a more complete discussion of the school's organization see Fleming, Louisiana State University, 27-38.
eighty feet to the first branches, the Seminary building was an imposing spectacle.4

The first course of study at the Seminary also reflected the dominant influence of General Graham. In the stern words of a Board of Supervisors' Report, a thorough knowledge of English would be inculcated and "incidental thereto, a knowledge of the construction of the Ancient Classic Languages." French or Spanish would also be taught.

However, as the Physical Sciences have so rapidly advanced of late years, and no practical education is complete without considerable knowledge of the Exact Sciences, the Board have selected Professors qualified to teach Mathematics thoroughly, with Natural Philosophy embracing Mechanics and the laws which govern all Machinery and Physical forces; also Chemistry and its application to agriculture and the Arts.

All this plus instruction in surveying, drawing, engineering, and architecture, claimed the Board, would make "this Seminary the equal of any in the U. S."5

Besides David, the Seminary's first faculty or Academic Board included William Tecumseh Sherman, superintendent and professor of engineering; Anthony Vallas, professor of

---

4Fleming, Louisiana State University, 26.

5Report of the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana Seminary of Learning, November 17, 1859, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1859-69, Box 19. According to Fleming this Report was composed by General Graham and Superintendent William T. Sherman, signed by Governor Robert Wickliffe, and sent out as a circular to advertise the Seminary. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 40.
mathematics and natural philosophy; E. Berte St. Ange, professor of modern languages, and Francis W. Smith, professor of chemistry, mineralogy, geology and instructor of infantry tactics. Sherman was a West Point graduate and a retired army major. Before his appointment as superintendent of the Seminary he had engaged in banking and law, but neither provided an adequate income for his family. In June of 1859 he wrote an old friend, Major Don Carlos Buell, then Assistant Adjutant General to the Secretary of War, inquiring about vacancies in the War Department. Buell sent Sherman a circular advertising for a superintendent of a military college about to be opened in Louisiana. He advised Sherman to apply, noting that G. Mason Graham, one of the supervisors of the new school, was a half brother of Sherman's former commanding officer, General R. B. Mason.®

Anthony Vallas and E. Berte St. Ange were Hungarian and French, respectively. Vallas left his homeland for political reasons in 1850. At the time of his appointment to the Seminary he had lived in New Orleans about eight years.

® A surgeon, Dr. John Sevier of Kentucky, was also employed by the Board. Report of the Board of Supervisors of the State Seminary of Learning to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, January, 1860 (Baton Rouge, 1860), 4-5, 9; W. T. Sherman, Memoirs of General William T. Sherman By Himself (Bloomington, 1957), 142.
Academically his credentials surpassed those of all his colleagues. He held the Ph.D. and was a minister of the Episcopal Church. St. Ange was a former officer in the French Navy. He too lived and taught in New Orleans, but when elected to the Seminary faculty was teaching private students in Rapides Parish. The fifth member of the Academic Board was Francis W. Smith, professor of chemistry and commandant of cadets. At twenty-two he was the youngest professor on the staff. He was a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and the University of Virginia. When appointed to his professorship in August of 1859, he was sojourning in Europe. 

Superintendent Sherman, in a letter to his wife, described Smith as "one of the real Virginia F. F. V.'s, a very handsome young man of twenty-two who will doubtless be good company." 

"Good company" was about all that Sherman and his staff could count on to relieve an otherwise isolated and somewhat spartan existence. Both Sherman and Vallas were married, but only Vallas, the head of a large family, managed to secure housing near the Seminary. Sherman chose to leave his

---

7Fleming, Louisiana State University, 31-33, 39.

family in Ohio and live with the single professors in the school building until suitable quarters could be built. When he first saw the Seminary in November, 1859, Sherman thought it "gorgeous" and "too good for the purpose." It was completely unfurnished but he moved in nevertheless. After engaging local carpenters to build benches, tables and blackboards, Sherman traveled to New Orleans to buy books and additional furniture so that the school might open as advertised on January 1, 1860.9

Meanwhile, the new superintendent urged his faculty to come to the Seminary as soon as possible. He warned David to bring with him everything he might need, including furniture for his room. As for books, they had to be ordered from New York. Even New Orleans was not well supplied.10

In spite of Superintendent Sherman's advice, David did not reach the Seminary until January 1, 1860, the day

9W. T. Sherman to his wife, November 12, December 12, 1859, ibid., 166-67; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 38-41.

10Boyd replied to Sherman's letter of November 27, 1859, on December 7, noting that he was ill. But Sherman answered on December 15, "I think you will be as comfortable here and your health restored as fast as anywhere in the State." He again mentioned the need to order books and noted that all the professors except David were already at the Seminary. William T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, November 27, and December 15, 1859, in Boyd-Sherman Letters, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
before school opened. He went at once to Sherman's office and reported to his superior. At this meeting a special relationship was born between the two men that neither time nor circumstance managed to erode. Sherman's son, Philemon T. Sherman, noted years later that "David Boyd . . . was his T. Sherman's closest friend; their intimacy—in spite of the widest divergence in political opinions—continued unimpaired by war and separation up to my father's death." Sherman's own estimate of David was certainly favorable. After their first meeting he wrote his wife that "Professor Boyd is a young man . . . a very clever gentleman," and, in another letter written a few years later, he described David as "my favorite among the officers (Professors) of the academy at Alexandria." The feeling was more than mutual. For David, Sherman's departure from the Seminary in 1861 was like "parting with a father and a dear, loving friend both in one

---

11Response to a toast delivered by Toastmaster Ruffin G. Pleasant at a meeting of Louisiana State University Alumni in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, January, 1910. The occasion was the semi-centennial celebration of the university; Philemon Sherman's remarks appear in Louisiana State University Alumnus, V (1909-1910), 88-90.

person. I never lost this feeling for him a jot or tittle."

David soon learned that Sherman had not exaggerated when he described the Seminary's isolation. Furniture for his room had to be shipped from New Orleans and sufficient textbooks to supply his Latin classes were simply unavailable. Until they could be obtained from New York he had to conduct his classes orally.

For David this presented no particular problem. He was extremely articulate and excelled at formal composition. Therefore he chose to begin his classes at the Seminary with a formal statement of welcome. After a brief explanation of how he came to be in Louisiana, he expounded at length on the virtues of the Seminary's liberal curriculum. Its military feature would build gentlemanliness, morality, and strong bodies. At the same time its courses in English literature,

13David F. Boyd, "General W. T. Sherman as a College President," ibid., I (1910), 7. Boyd's remarks appeared in print after his death which occurred in 1899. But they were probably delivered in the form of lectures to various veteran's groups in Kentucky and Ohio during 1895-96. Perhaps the best evidence of the warm friendship which existed between the two men is to be found in their extensive correspondence preserved in the Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.

14Bill of Sale for furniture totaling $176.01 from C. Flint and Jones, 44-46 Royal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana, to David Boyd, January 12, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 48.
Latin, and Greek would broaden the cadet's horizons, giving him some respite from more precise studies like mathematics: "To have a solely military and scientific school is to cramp the intellect."15

Audience reaction to this address was not recorded, but David's rhetorical skills soon won some reknown. Students who had to deliver speeches began seeking him out as a ghost writer. He even tailored his material to suit the occasion. One speech, prepared for delivery at the Seminary's first Public Day, July 4, 1860, urged harmony and support for the Union. "Let us then meet today as Americans, as members of one great family. . . . This day let us cease our strife . . . /and/ from Maine to California resolve that henceforth, there shall be no North--no South . . . 16 Only two months later another cadet asked David to write a speech for delivery at a Breckenridge barbecue. The famed fire-eater, William Yancey, would be there, and the cadet was

---

15 David Boyd's speech is preserved in the Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1860-61, Box 1.

16 Ibid., Box 2. These remarks appeared in a speech written for Cadet H. B. Taliaferro who served as Master of Ceremonies on Public Day, July 4, 1860. It is worth noting that of all the cadets who left the Seminary to go to war in the 1860-61 session, Taliaferro was the only one to join the Union forces. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 121.
sure David could compose a suitable address.  

Ghostwriting was extracurricular. Inside the classroom David was a serious and dedicated instructor. One of his students described him as "a man of commanding scholarship and a most thorough-going and energetic teacher, exacting yet kind. Like Nelson and England, he expected every man to do his duty." Those who did not had their shortcomings recorded. In a small roll book he kept during the first session David noted the following cadet offenses: improper language, loitering, playing chess, throwing dice, chewing tobacco in class and spitting on the floor. More serious matters he reported to the superintendent. Two student compositions were forwarded to Colonel Sherman because their authors signed them "I received and gave help" rather than "I neither gave nor received help." This "wilful /sic/ disregard" of orders rather than one composition's attack on Latin

17 L. Delahoussaye to D. F. Boyd, September 17, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11.

18 W. L. Brinhurst, a student at the Seminary in 1860-61, later became a professor at Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. His "Recollections of the Old Seminary," published first in the Dallas Morning News, August 3, 1896, were reprinted in the Louisiana State University Alumnus, V (1909-10), 16.

19 Roll book, January, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, MS Volumes, Box 22.
as a "useless study" prompted Latin Professor Boyd to report the two cadets. 20

In addition to his duties as a professor, David had to assume various family and financial responsibilities during his first session at the Seminary. To save some of his father's land in Wytheville, he pledged himself to pay five thousand dollars in five yearly installments. He also accepted full physical and financial responsibility of his black-sheep brother, William. Early in January, 1860, Thomas Boyd sent Willie to Louisiana to get him away from his "evil companions, male and female" in Virginia. Thomas Boyd promised to reimburse David at some later date. Meanwhile he hoped Willie would be a "good boy & a good student." 21 But the rehabilitation program was a failure. By April Willie had left the Seminary on the grounds of ill-health. He traveled north

20 Compositions by Cadets H. N. Phillips and T. P. Hyams, undated, ibid., Box 11.

21 T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, January 12, 1860; Minerva and T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, January 23, 1860, ibid., Box 5. David's annual salary at the Seminary was $2,000 or approximately $167 a month. He already owed a New Orleans furniture firm his entire January check. Because of its isolation, costs for board, laundry and other essentials were very high at the Seminary. Minerva Boyd worried that David would have very little left by the end of the year. Report of the Board of Supervisors, January, 1860, p. 3; Furniture bill of C. Flint and Jones, January 12, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; Minerva and T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, January 23, 1860, ibid., Box 5.
with L. A. Auman, a Virginia friend of David's who had been visiting in Louisiana. When Willie reached home a skeptical Thomas J. Boyd wrote Davis, "He appears to be perfectly well, and I incline to think he is more lazy than sick and cares nothing for education." 22

In spite of the Seminary's isolation and the demands his job and family made upon him, David did have many forms of recreation and diversion available if he chose to pursue them. Hunting, fishing and hiking, none of which particularly appealed to David, were the most common pastimes of the cadets. Visitors to the Seminary were frequent and always welcome because Sherman considered dances and parties healthy and civilizing for the cadets. The guests, composed principally of planters and their families from the surrounding area, responded by inviting the professors and some of the older cadets to their homes. 23

22 T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 22, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; L. A. Auman to David Boyd, April 13, 1860, ibid., Box 11.

23 Many of the prominent men in the parish combined planting with business and politics. Several, like Governor Thomas O. Moore, J. Madison Wells, G. Mason Graham, Judge Henry Boyce, Dr. S. A. Smith, Judge T. C. Manning, Gervais Baillio, and Judge Michael Ryan were either present or future members of the Seminary Board of Supervisors. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 42-43, 79-81; Prichard (ed.), "A Tourist's Description of Louisiana in 1860," 53-54; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, July 21, 1865.
professors were young, well-educated and single, invitations came frequently from wealthy planters with eligible daughters. Dr. Powhatan Clarke, the young resident surgeon at the Seminary, later married the principle heiress in the region. Professor Frank Smith courted so extensively that he was criticized for not restricting his activities to the young ladies of Rapides.  

But David was shy and usually shunned all social occasions, especially if young women were involved. In one of his first letters home after reaching the Seminary he described Alexandria and its people, remarking that he did not "mingle" with it. His mother urged him not to withdraw. "Nothing is more improving than the society of refined ladies," she wrote. "It will give you an ease & confidence of manner that 

---

Years later David Boyd described many of these prominent men of Rapides as "the ruling intellectual and political power of the State." D. F. Boyd, "Wm. T. Sherman, First Supt. of La. State Seminary, now the La. State University," Louisiana State University Alumnus, V (1909-10), 5. But Professor Anthony Vallas, in his History of the La. State Seminary, 1864 (Baton Rouge, 1935), 6, remarks: "The new governor, Thos. O. Moore [1859-63] filled all the vacancies in the Board with his neighbors and dependents of this parish, and this he did without regard to qualification; and by doing so, he lay open the Institution to all the untoward influences of a village neighborhood . . . ."

---

24 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 80; Powhatan Clarke to David Boyd, June 7, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
nothing else can."  David did not take her advice. It was not because he did not have opportunities. Between January and June of 1860, he received many bids to call at various homes to attend social gatherings. Someone who did not sign her name even sent him an extravagant valentine. That David accepted any of these invitations is highly unlikely.

One of his colleagues told Minerva Boyd that David ran to his room whenever ladies visited the Seminary. "He said you were certainly no ladies man which I regretted to hear." Months later Minerva was still waging her long-range campaign. "You will see the time yet, when you will regret not having gone more into society. The next time you are invited go for my sake." Even his relatives became involved.

William H. French, Minerva's brother, wrote him from western Virginia about a New Orleans girl he had met, Miss Emma S. Smith. "I do hope David you will call on her . . . I am sure you will be even more delighted with her than I was; if I

25 Minerva and T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, January 23, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

26 Cards, invitations, etc., dated January through June, 1860, *ibid.*, Box 11.

27 Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, August 29, 1860, *ibid.*, Box 5.

28 Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, October 9, 1860, *ibid.*
were of your age and had the whole earth to select from, I would take her for my wife . . . "

What Minerva Boyd and Uncle William did not at first appreciate was that David was still very much in love with Ella Spiller Brown, the young woman to whom he had once been engaged. She rejected him before he left Virginia in 1857 and, in December, 1858, married Alex Brown, a Wytheville lawyer. But Brown died a few months later, and David's hopes revived. William Auman, a Wytheville friend who ran a grocery business in Memphis, Tennessee, wrote David about a business matter. Rather casually he related some Wytheville gossip: that the widowed Ella Brown had ended her mourning and was again being courted. Auman advised David to "look sharp" and not to be "to slow." David must have responded ardently to Auman's news, for the Memphis grocer wrote in reply that he had no idea his allusion to Mrs. Brown


30L. A. Auman to David Boyd, January 14, April 8, 1859, ibid., Box 11.

31William Auman's brother, L. A. Auman, visited David at the Seminary in the spring of 1860. He left a slave boy belonging to William with David to be hired out. Now, in December, William advised David to sell the boy if the price were right. William Auman to David Boyd, December 11, 1860, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alphabetical File, Box 7.
would touch such a responsive chord. It was like "pouring oil into a hidden flame," said Auman, adding that he was sorry he ever brought up a subject upon which David's "entire happiness" and even his "very existence" seemed to depend. "I knew that you had loved Mrs. B. once and that you had even been engaged to her, but thought that absence and time had long ago effaced that love . . ." Auman advised David not to visit Mrs. Brown unless she encouraged him in some way. But James Gleaves, another Wytheville friend, thought David should try again. "If she ever loved you, she will again. . . Mrs. B\text{\textsuperscript{rown}} is a widow, she well knows that her chances for marrying are not so good now as they were before she married B . . . You know very well how a lady in her situation feels, & if you want to marry her now is the time for you to strike." Gleaves urged David to come to Wytheville at once before Mrs. Brown found someone else.  

Meanwhile, David did not write his family at all. His mother thought that he might be ill. His last letter sounded so "hopeless & sad" that she was sure something must be wrong. Minerva Boyd urged David to confide in her. Anything

---

32 William Auman to David Boyd, December 30, 1860, ibid.  
33 Jas. T. Gleaves to D. F. Boyd, January 11, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
he preferred to keep "private" he might send through a third person rather than directly to the family. Obviously Minerva guessed what was troubling her son. A friend of David's in Wytheville told her that David had never loved anyone but Mrs. Brown. The friend also thought David was corresponding with the young widow. If so, Minerva was sorry because she thought it a hopeless case: "She is now rich and ambitious, I hear--& of course would like to marry for wealth, family and position. . . . I should be truly sorry if you should be again disappointed."34

David did begin corresponding privately with his mother. He acknowledged that he still loved Ella Brown and asked Minerva for advice. She answered that she did not know Ella's feelings. But she very much feared he would be hurt again. "If she writes you 'no,' dear child, do forget her. Go into the society of other ladies; I assure you there are many quite as pretty & good--I am afraid if she were your wife, I never could love her for all the pain she has given you. What do you want to marry a widow $\sqrt{\text{sic}}$ for? Remember David she rejected you for another & call up some French pride. The Boyds have courage but not pride."35

34 Minerva F. Boyd to David F. Boyd, March 31, 1861, ibid.
35 Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, May 1, 1861, ibid.
Ten months later David was still hopelessly in love with Mrs. Brown. By that time he was with the army in northern Virginia and managed to see her at least once in Richmond before she returned to Wythe county. He wrote his brother, Charles, then in Wytheville, inquiring about Ella Brown. Charles, obviously, did not share David's regard for her: "Don't misunderstand me as trying to prejudice you against the lady of your choice, but I do say that a more scheming, ambitious woman never lived than Mrs. Brown. I say this, convinced of its truth, from personal observation. . . . Having as much self-esteem as I have thought you had, I have wondered that you could persist in your love for one who I know cares not for any man unless he be a man of wealth and fame . . . ." 36

David finally gave up. Whether he was convinced by family appeals to his pride or outright rejection by Mrs. Brown is not clear. In any case he was still melancholy in March of 1863. A Louisiana friend tried to cheer him up:

I had hoped the war would get that crank out of your brain, & that you would find out you are not the most

36 C. R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, March 7, 1862, ibid.
miserable man in the world. No. No. No. When the war is over you will resume your Chair [at the Seminary]. . . . You will & shall get a wife, you will have house & then such cart loads of 'truck' will go over the ferry from Mrs. C. Clarke to Mrs. B. Boyd with lots of stewed candy from the little C's to the little B's. I wish paper was not so scarce. I would like to give you another 1/2 sheet on this theme.37

In spite of his introverted nature, his conscientious attention to his duties, and his many personal problems, David was not blind to the national crises which developed between 1859 and 1861. In 1859 two events in particular served to alarm and outrage the South. John Brown raided the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, Virginia, and several Republican congressmen endorsed a Compendium of Hinton Rowan Helper's book, The Impending Crisis of the South. David's aunt in Virginia probably spoke for many when she wrote him following the Brown raid, "I hope Governor Wise [of Virginia] won't pardon one of them. We are now to sleep with our eyes open. You may depend we can't trust the people of the North."38 The endorsement of Helper's book also stirred Southern resentment. It affected the little isolated community at the Seminary because one of the signers was Congressman John

37Powhatan Clarke to D. F. Boyd, March 22, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2.

38C. F. McComas to David F. Boyd, November 20, 1859, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
Sherman of Ohio, the younger brother of Superintendent William Sherman. Sherman wrote his wife that "Bro. John's signing of Helper's paper" might hurt him in Louisiana. The Board of Supervisors would understand, he thought, but the Board depended upon the legislature for funds.\(^{39}\) William Sherman need not have worried. Although many legislators distrusted his "Black Republican" brother John, the superintendent's straightforward and careful explanations of his own views on slavery and abolition finally reassured them. When in the spring of 1860 he considered leaving the Seminary for a more lucrative position in London, a host of prominent Louisianians including the governor, Braxton Bragg, and P. G. T. Beauregard urged him to remain.\(^{40}\)

But the crisis building in the nation ultimately forced Sherman to depart. In the late spring of 1860 the Democratic party finally came apart in sections. The Southern wing chose John Breckenridge of Kentucky to represent their interests. Northerners rallied behind Stephen A. Douglas and those who could not follow either formed behind John

---


\(^{40}\) Fleming, *Louisiana State University*, 57-62.
Bell and the Constitutional Union party. Composed of old Whigs and American Party men as well as Democrats, the Constitutional Unionists hoped, somehow, to hold the states together. Meanwhile, the Republicans found their leader in Abraham Lincoln who, compared to William Seward with his "irrepressible conflict" approach to the nation's problems, represented the more conciliatory wing of the party.

Sherman and David corresponded during the summer and fall of 1860, and their letters reflect in microcosm the anguish undergone by thinking Americans everywhere in that fateful period. Sherman left David in complete charge of the Seminary when school closed on July 31. The Superintendent planned to visit his family in Ohio and then to go to Washington, D. C., and New York City on Seminary business. He hoped David would not be too unhappy at the school, and promised to remember his "sacrifice" which allowed the others to go away on vacation.41 After he reached home, Sherman sent the lonely David a brief resume of campaign activity in the Buckeye state. Lincoln would certainly carry Ohio because of the divided opposition. Brother John Sherman was

41 William Sherman to David Boyd, August 5, 1860, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
politicicking in northern Ohio, where anti-slavery sentiment was most violent; even "moderate conservatives" were dubbed "Doughfaces" there. Therefore John's utterances were radical. Sherman expected to see Brother John but had no hope of influencing him. He ended on a note of resignation. "Political majority has passed to the North and they are determined to have it. Let us hope they will not abuse it." 42

From Washington, D. C., in mid-August, Sherman reported to David that no one in the capital really expected secession if Lincoln were elected. He saw some chance that Bell or even Douglas might win if fusion efforts by their partisans succeeded in New York. That would give the nation four years of peace and allow time for "ugly feeling" to subside. 43 Back in Ohio by mid-September, Sherman was convinced that the Republicans would win. He personally preferred Bell but even if Lincoln succeeded he did not expect violence. As for his brother John, Sherman despaired of "modifying" his views. When he urged him to publicly challenge William Seward's "irrepressible conflict" ideas, he would not do so directly. John Sherman laughed at William's warning

42 William Sherman to David Boyd, August 13, 1860, ibid.
43 William Sherman to David Boyd, August 19, 1860, ibid.
that "extremists" would take control of the Republican party. "He says Republicans are only Old Whigs, revived solely by the \textit{unwise} repeal of the Mo. Compromise."\textsuperscript{44}

From his lonely post at the Seminary David tried to describe Southern political sentiment. He thought Bell would carry every Southern state but South Carolina. Even Douglas was running well. David decried the breakup of the Democratic party at Charleston in April and at Baltimore in June. He was sorry the question of slavery in the territories had ever been introduced. But since it was "thrust upon us," and since he thought Breckenridge's position was right, he intended to vote for him. Failure to support Breckenridge, he argued, would constitute a denial of the South's right to equal enjoyment of all property everywhere in the Union.

David did fear what might happen if Lincoln won the election. He did not think any state would actually secede, but disunion might he brought about in other ways:

\begin{quote}
In many places in the South, whoever accepts or holds office under Lincoln will be lynched. He (Lincoln) will of course attempt to enforce the laws; that attempt will be resisted; and once the strife is begun, God only knows where it will stop. What is the use of that Republican Party? As you say, slavery will always
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{44}William Sherman to David Boyd, September 16, 1860, \textit{Ibid.}
go where it pays, in spite of Sewardism; and it will never go where it does not pay in spite of Yanceism /Sic/. Let the law of nature say you shall not take your slave here or there, but let not a clause of the constitution, or an enactment of the Congress say it. It then becomes a threat hurled by one section at the other; and threats ill become the people of a Union.45

Sherman thought David was unduly concerned. Although the older man preferred Bell, he considered Lincoln to be a man of "nerve and moderation." Besides, he pointed out, Lincoln was connected by marriage to the slaveholding Prestons of Kentucky and Virginia. To a practical man like Sherman, the whole fight over expanding slavery in the territories was foolish. It had already reached its limits, he argued. The only place where the institution might be extended profitably was Texas and that was all slave territory by treaty: "If we go to civil war for a mere theory, we deserve a monarch, and that would be the final result . . ."46

Again, on September 30, Sherman insisted that noone with any sense would go to territories like Utah, Arizona or New Mexico, and "the desert aint worth quarreling over." All the "clamor" about rights in the territories was "theoretical."

45 David Boyd to Wm. Sherman, August 30, 1860, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters, 1858-88, Box 4.

46 Wm. Sherman to David Boyd, September 16, 1860, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
But, as David said, because it involved a principle, men would fight over it. The superintendent was sick of the prejudice on both sides. In Ohio everyone thought planters had nothing else to do but hang abolitionists and hold "lynch courts." Meanwhile, Southerners thought everyone in Ohio did nothing but aid and abet runaway slaves. Sherman thought if both sides would mind their own business, the country would be better off.  

In Virginia David's family also reflected the political divisiveness of the nation. An uncle, William H. French of Mercer County, was solidly for Breckenridge but feared the Bell party would carry that state. He lamented the Unionist sentiment which seemed to be so prevalent. "It is so strong that in my opinion ... half our slave holders would give them up to save the Union ... . Your Uncle Napoleon ... declared to me the other day that he would be found against the southern states in case of secession, and would back Lincoln in his effort to bring them back to subjection and submission--Enough of this for the very thought is sickening," he concluded. 

47 William Sherman to David Boyd, September 30, 1860, ibid.

48 William H. French (uncle) to D. F. Boyd, October 19, 1860, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5. Uncle William
David's father, Thomas Jefferson Boyd, also supported Breckenridge, but his wife urged David to win him over to Bell. "I don't care who is president," she wrote, "I like Abe Lincoln as well as any. Will [David's brother] says he is for Abe--it is a nice time for us for the Nigs to be free Will thinks." 49

By election day William Sherman was back in Louisiana. He did not vote in spite of his eligibility. Rapides Parish went for Breckenridge and so did the state by a small margin. Sherman noted that sentiment for disunion was growing in the parish. He wrote his wife that he would leave Louisiana if it seceded. Meanwhile, discipline at the school suffered immensely because of the "uncertain events." Cadets broke crockery, fired off pistols in mess hall, and generally violated rules. 50

Secession was soon a reality. South Carolina withdrew from the union on December 20, 1860. By February 1, 1861, lived in Mercer County which subsequently became a part of West Virginia.

49 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, October 9, 1860, ibid. Will Boyd probably meant that emancipation could take little away from an already ruined estate.

50 William Sherman to his wife, November 10, 23, 29, 1860, in Howe (ed.), Home Letters of General Sherman, 180-185; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 95.
1861, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Texas had followed her example. Sherman resigned his post as superintendent even before Louisiana seceded. On January 10, 1861, Governor Thomas O. Moore ordered the seizure of Federal property in the state. Sherman, because he had to receive some of it for safekeeping, immediately submitted his resignation. He could not condone such defiance of the Federal government. Washington's failure to coerce South Carolina at Fort Sumter "disgusted" him; such temporizing, he wrote his wife, would only encourage efforts to prevent Lincoln's inauguration. \(^{51}\)

Sherman did not exaggerate. A friend of David Boyd's in Virginia informed him that interference with the inaugural was indeed being planned: "It will be done, mark what I tell you. The idea is becoming popular even in the mountains of W. Va. [western Virginia]. Vol\(^\text{t}\) companies and minutemen are being raised every week. All hope for compromise is banished . . . And sir when Va. speaks her voice will be heard and it shall be obeyed.\(^ {52}\) The friend disdained the several

\(^{51}\)Fleming, Louisiana State University, 98-100; William Sherman to his wife, January 5, 8, 13, 1861, in Howe (ed.), Home Letters of General Sherman, 189-91.

\(^{52}\)James T. Gleaves to D. F. Boyd, January 11, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
compromise proposals then being discussed. Only Crittendon's plan to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific had any merit. As for forming several confederacies as some proposed, the idea was impractical. David's friend hoped that God would avert the awful dangers confronting them. But he was proud to hear David say that if Virginia were invaded he would come to her aid. "May it be my fortune, should the worst come, to have you at my side as a companion in arms fighting for those principles instilled into us by our fathers." 53

On February 4, 1861, the seven seceded states of the lower South met at Montgomery, Alabama, and formed the Confederate States of America. A month later Abraham Lincoln announced at his inaugural that he had no plans to interfere with slavery in any of the states. But he also made it clear that secession was unlawful and would not be tolerated. Within six weeks Fort Sumter surrendered to Confederate forces, whereupon President Lincoln called for 75,000 troops to put down the "insurrection." The nation was at war. Virginia reacted immediately. On April 17, 1861, she left the Union, taking with her some of the best talent of the United States Army. When Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston "went

53 Ibid.
with their State," they set an example followed by thousands of lesser men. Among them was David Boyd, already pledged to defend Virginia against invasion.

The breakup of the Seminary began in February, 1861, when Sherman, his resignation accepted with regret, left Louisiana for the North. Just before his departure, he wrote his wife with some bitterness that those who "were most pro-Union last July are now loudest for secession." It was almost enough to make him a monarchist. He wondered whether the self-interest of one man were not a "safer criterion" to use in determining public policy than "the wild opinions of ignorant men."54 But if the public utterances of the politicians disillusioned him, they did not chill the warmth of his personal feelings for his Louisiana friends. On his way home Sherman took time to assure David that he would always welcome him to his roof: "If present politicians break up our Country, let us resolve to reestablish it, for the ties 'inter-partes' ought not to be severed. Goodbye."55 Again, after he joined the United States Army in May of 1861,


55Wm. Sherman to David Boyd, February 23, 1861, in Typescript of Sherman-Boyd Letters in possession of Professor T. Harry Williams, Louisiana State University.
Sherman wrote David Boyd that they were now enemies but he could not believe it. "No matter what happens," he promised, "I will ever consider you my personal friend, and you shall ever be welcome to my roof." 56

Other members of the academic staff at the Seminary soon followed Sherman's example. Francis Smith and Powhatan Clarke resigned on May 14, 1861, and left immediately for Virginia. David resigned the same day, but the Board of Supervisors prevailed upon him to reconsider in order that the school might finish the term (July 31). He then requested a leave of absence to be effective June 1. By then, he thought, there would be so few cadets on hand that Professors Vallas and St. Ange could carry on alone. 57 David faced something of a personal dilemma. He wished to do his duty, but he was not sure where it lay. On the one hand he promised the Supervisors to remain until they could find a replacement for him. On the other, he wanted to join a company then preparing to leave Rapides to "repel the invasion

56 Wm. Sherman to David Boyd, May 13, 1861, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.

57 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 104; David F. Boyd to the Board of Supervisors, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 4; David F. Boyd to the Board of Supervisors, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
of his country."\(^{58}\) Letters from his family only complicated the problem. His father did not want him to give up his professorship: "But country first with all true hearts in existing emergencies."\(^{59}\) Three weeks later, Thomas Boyd told his son that he would be more useful to Louisiana by remaining at the Seminary. David's mother agreed. Both William and Charles, David's younger brothers, were already in the service. So were all David's uncles and a "dozen cousins." They would all be in the first battle; no one could accuse the family of cowardice. As for David, his duty was to the Seminary, at least till the end of the term. He could serve his country better as a professor than as a private.\(^{60}\)

While David was trying to resolve his problems, the somewhat fragile relationship between him and his father received another blow. Minerva Boyd, always much closer to David, inadvertently widened the breach between father and son. When David's letters seemed so unhappy early in 1860, Minerva urged him to confide in her and to send anything

\(^{58}\) David Boyd to the Board of Supervisors, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.

\(^{59}\) Thos. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 20, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

\(^{60}\) T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, May 10, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1; Minerva F. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, May 16, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
"private" through a third person. Thomas Boyd discovered this correspondence almost a year later and was terribly hurt. To make matters worse, some of David's letters were harshly critical of his father. On May 1, 1861, Minerva rather belatedly scolded David for some of his remarks. She conceded that Thomas Boyd was not very successful in business. But he was a hard worker and honorable in his dealings. As for his manner, which David thought stern and lacking in affection, Minerva assured her son that Thomas Boyd was proud of him and loved him very much. 61 Two weeks later she wrote again, urging David to send his father a "kind letter." David had returned one of Thomas Boyd's letters unread and Minerva begged him to apologize. He seems to have gone half way. A few weeks later Thomas Boyd wrote his son:

It seems by your letter to your mother, that you will wait to receive a letter from me, to enable you to decide whether you will be a welcome visitor to your father & mother's roof. Now do pray discard all such notions & come along. Be assured that the foolishness that has been passing in our correspondence is no indication on my part of want of the utmost affection & good feeling in every way for you. 62

61 Minerva Boyd to D. F. Boyd, May 1, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

62 Minerva Boyd to D. F. Boyd, May 16, 1861, ibid.; T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, May 24, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.
While David was settling his family problems, many of his students and colleagues left the Seminary for war. Dr. Powhatan Clarke was a lieutenant in the Provisional Army of Virginia. Francis Smith, the ex-professor of chemistry, became a military secretary for General Robert E. Lee. "I have the advantage of being thrown quite intimately with all the bugs /important persons/, Davis, Genl Cooper . . .," Smith wrote David. Both Clarke and Smith advised David to go to Virginia and enlist there rather than to join a Louisiana outfit. Of the ex-cadets, some were already in Virginia. Others waited in Louisiana camps until their units could be filled. "There are very few military men on the ground from Brigadier General Tracy down to the privates," one of the latter reported to David. "I believe that as far as regards tactics I am as well posted as any of them." The same youth was appalled at the people he met in camp. He told his ex-professor that men up to the rank of captain who had never drunk or played cards were doing both. But his own company and officers, he was happy to say, had not "fallen to this vice."!

---

63Powhatan Clarke to David Boyd, June 7, 1861; Francis W. Smith to David Boyd, June 4, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.

64Sgt. R. S. Jackson to David Boyd, June 7, 1861, ibid., Jackson later became a Baptist minister.
A cadet writing from Virginia found other aspects of camp life distasteful. Soldiers, he discovered, had to wash their own clothes and cook their own food.65

David did not take Clarke's and Smith's advice. On June 11, 1861, he offered his services by mail to ex-Governor Henry Wise of Virginia, then forming a brigade in that state. But he did not wait for a reply. Instead, he enrolled as a private in Captain L. A. Stafford's volunteer company, then training at Camp Moore, Louisiana, across Lake Pontchartrain from New Orleans.66

General G. Mason Graham expressed great regret when he learned of David's enlistment. Referring to it as "patriotic folly," Mason chastized David for throwing away his life. "In the ranks, your mind, your talent, your capacities, of so much value to our state in your present position will be of no more avail than that of the lousiest ragamuffin that may be alongside you, while his greater ability to endure

65F. H. Perkins to David Boyd, June 8, 1861, ibid.

66David Boyd to Brigadier General H. A. Wise, June 11, 1861, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6. The length of David's original enlistment is not clear. Walter L. Fleming states that David enlisted as a private purposely, in order that he might be free to return to the Seminary if needed. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 109.
fatigue and exposure, and to handle a musket will make him really more valuable than you. Once 'mustered in' for the war, as you must necessarily be, there is no power to release you, except on a surgeon's certificate of disability."67

David spent July 4, 1861 at Tyrone Plantation with General Graham. A few days later he went to New Orleans to join his unit, the Stafford Guards, and by mid-July he was on his way to Virginia. The "event of war," remarked Minerva Boyd, accomplished what none of her letters could: David was coming home.68


68 G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, July 5, 1861, ibid., Dr. G. M. G. Stafford, General Leroy Augustus Stafford, His Forebears and Descendants (New Orleans, 1943), 34-35; Minerva Boyd to D. F. Boyd, June 17, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
CHAPTER IV

THE WAR YEARS

David Boyd enlisted in the Stafford Guards in late June of 1861. But he did not join the unit at Camp Moore until July 10 because he promised the Seminary Board of Supervisors to remain at the school as long as there were enough cadets present to require his services. By July 10 the Stafford Guards had become Company B of the Ninth Louisiana Infantry Regiment, Provisional Army of the Confederate States of America, and Richard Taylor of St. Charles Parish had been named its colonel by Governor Thomas O. Moore. Taylor, a son of President Zachary Taylor and a brother-in-law of Jefferson Davis, had served in Louisiana's state senate and her secession convention before assuming his command. When notified of his appointment as colonel of the Ninth Louisiana, Taylor was visiting his friend, General Braxton Bragg, at Pensacola, Florida. He hurried to Camp Moore, inspected his men, and at once despatched them to Richmond. After a quick trip to New Orleans to settle family affairs and to procure ammunition, he followed his regiment to Virginia. Richmond was
alive with rumors about an impending battle at Manassas, six hours by train from the capital. Taylor went immediately to the War Office to arrange rail transport for his troops. But a delay in departure and repeated mechanical failures en-route kept the Louisianians from reaching Manassas Junction until the battle was over. The men went into camp and for the remainder of the year the Confederate government attempted to bring some order out of the confusion following the action at Manassas.¹

David's name appeared on the first roll of the Stafford Guards as a private. But on reaching Camp Moore he learned that he had been named quartermaster sergeant for the Ninth Louisiana by its lieutenant colonel, E. G. Randolph.² David had no particular qualifications for the

¹Stafford, General LeRoy Augustus Stafford, 33-36; Richard Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction (London, 1879), 6-12; John D. Winters, The Civil War in Louisiana (Baton Rouge, 1963), 22. Stafford locates Camp Moore in St. Tammany Parish but Winters describes it as "near the town of Tangipahoa" which in 1861 was in St. Helena Parish. Since then a separate parish, Tangipahoa, has been created. Hammond's Complete World Atlas (New York, 1950), 185.

²Stafford, General LeRoy Augustus Stafford, 34; Andrew B. Booth (comp.), Records of Louisiana Confederate Soldiers and Louisiana Confederate Commands (New Orleans, 1920), II, 73; Order of Lt. Col. E. G. Randolph, Ninth Louisiana, July 10, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1854, 1860-65, Box 2, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
post; neither did he have much time to learn his duties. Between July 10 and July 21, 1861, he spent most of his time aboard a train headed for Virginia. After First Manassas, however, the lull in military activity in the East allowed time for more orderly drilling and organization. David's regiment, the Ninth Louisiana, together with the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Louisiana, was organized into the Eighth Brigade as a part of General P. G. T. Beauregard's command. Richard Taylor, in spite of his junior status, received promotion to brigadier general and command of the Eighth Brigade. David's rank also rose. He became a captain and assistant commissary of the Ninth Louisiana Regiment on September 2, 1861.

David obviously had misgivings about the post of assistant commissary even before he accepted his commission.

---


4L. R. Walker, Secretary of War, to Captain D. F. Boyd, September 2, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1. David was not unaware of his impending promotion. He wrote his parents on August 5, 1861, from Centreville, Virginia, informing them of his whereabouts and well-being. In his reply Thomas J. Boyd told him to seek an influential friend's help "if you do not get the place you expect." T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, August 15, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
Certainly there was nothing glamorous about that branch of the service as compared to, say, the cavalry or the artillery. Even the corps of engineers, in which his brother Charlie was a second lieutenant, commanded more respect. David wrote to Charlie about joining the engineers and his younger brother urged him to do so: "I hope you . . . will give up your servile employment although you are now captain or rather boss in the business." Letters from his parents were equally discouraging if somewhat ambivalent. In December of 1861 Thomas Boyd advised David to stay in the commissary service. But six months later Minerva Boyd referred to David's position as "that miserable place," and Thomas Boyd regretted that his son could not get "a more acceptable position." By August, 1862, both parents wanted David to resign if he could not get "a more honorable" post. The last parental comment on the subject must have devastated David. Minerva wrote that she was glad he was "in the Commissary" because "it's safer." She would rather "get him home safe" a corporal than have him win high honors.\(^5\) The only

---

\(^5\) Charles R. Boyd to David F. Boyd, September 13, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

\(^6\) T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, December 1, 1861, May 26, 1862; Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, n.d. \(\text{May, 1862?}\), in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1; Minerva Boyd to D. F.
consolation, and that was slight, came from David's friend and ex-colleague, Francis W. Smith, who by late 1861 was stationed at Hampton Roads, Virginia. Smith advised David, then considering resignation, to hold on a little longer to his "Beef Captaincy." Inasmuch as a "Beef Captain can fight, while a Captain of men . . . may not feed," Smith saw nothing dishonorable in the former title.  

Another factor contributed to David Boyd's desire to resign his commission. The second session of the Louisiana Boyd, August 16, 1862, October 13, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

Historians have contributed to the rather unfortunate public attitude concerning the supply services. In Rebel Brass, Frank Vandiver notes that most military histories and biographies practically ignore the important subject of supply. "There simply is no comparison, from the standpoint of interest, between the battles of Jackson's campaign in the Shenandoah Valley and the problems encountered by his Chief Quartermaster during the same campaign. But a strong case may be made for asserting that the activities of Jackson's quartermaster were a key to the general's success. . . ." Frank Vandiver, Rebel Brass (Baton Rouge, La., 1956), 83.

On the other hand, the low opinion David's family had of the supply services was not completely undeserved. John Winters notes that the quality of goods obtained by the Quartermaster's Department was often shocking and that the contractors who supplied it were notoriously corrupt. "Even more disgraceful," he adds, "was the unprincipled conduct of some of the commissary officers . . . It has been estimated that corrupt commissary officers appropriated nearly one third of every ration requisition, sold it, and pocketed the proceeds. Few men who served as commissary officers for a regiment remained completely free of this organized graft." Winters, Civil War in Louisiana, 25.

F. W. Smith to David Boyd, December 18, 1861, in
State Seminary ended June 30, 1861. Whether it would reopen in the fall was left to the Board of Supervisors, among whom there was a difference of opinion. The prevailing faction of the Board opposed lowering academic standards and the age of admittance simply to attract a sufficient number of professors and cadets. There was also serious doubt that the people and the legislature would support an educational institution while the state was at war. By late October, 1861, the Board of Supervisors decided not to reopen the school without specific legislative approval. David, who left the Seminary for the army on a leave of absence, therefore had no job to which he might return. Unless the Board changed its position or he could get a transfer to some other service, he was doomed to remain a "beef captain."8

During the winter of 1861-1862 David tried to secure another post. He wrote his parents that he had been offered a place in the engineers. It would mean a raise in rank and a chance to serve in Louisiana or the "southwest," building and repairing railroads. He would, at the close of the war, Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.

8A. Vallas to David F. Boyd, July 26, August 19, September 19, September 28, November 11, 1861, ibid.; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 108-111.
be near the Seminary, to which he planned to return. Thomas Boyd approved, but he wondered if his son had enough "practical knowledge" to build railroads. He suggested that David go to Richmond and find a "good assistant." 9

The post in the engineers corps did not materialize, but David's efforts to resign continued well into the spring of 1862. 10 Events in Louisiana were partly responsible. The legislature authorized the Board of Supervisors to reopen the Seminary. When the Board met in December, 1861, it set April 1, 1862, as opening day. It also asked David and Francis Smith to return as professors. David wrote to Smith for advice as to the "right" course to pursue. He was concerned about the propriety of leaving the service while the war continued. Because of the recent Mason-Slidell affair, Smith thought there was a strong possibility of war between the United States and Britain. If that occurred, pressure on

9 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, January 7, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1. David apparently employed a "good assistant" even as a commissary officer. When he left the service in the spring of 1863, he signed a promise to pay his "civilian clerk," S. B. Robinson, six hundred dollars for "faithful services rendered," Note dated May 18, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1854, 1860-65, Box 2.

10 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, May 1862; T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, May 26, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.
the South would be greatly reduced and some men might "honorably" leave the army. But Smith felt he could not resign until he was sure his services were no longer needed. He advised David to wait. The South might have to make a strong show of force to bring an early peace. In any case, he thought the Seminary Board would hold David's job open.11

The school opened April 1, 1862, as scheduled, with William Seay as professor of ancient languages, "pro-tem." Seay, a lawyer, was a former editor of the New Orleans Delta, a paper which General Benjamin Butler suppressed when the Federals occupied the Crescent City. By June of 1862, Seay hoped to receive a permanent appointment to the chair of ancient languages. When the Executive Committee of the Board met, it ordered that David be notified he must return for the fourth session (November 1, 1862) or forfeit his job. He had until mid-October to decide. It is not clear whether Richmond's refusal to release him from the service or his own sense of duty to the Confederacy determined his course. But sometime before the deadline he submitted his resignation as professor of ancient languages to the Seminary's Board of

11F. W. Smith to David Boyd, December 18, 1861, ibid.; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 112.
Meanwhile, David was promoted to Brigade Commissary Major in the spring of 1862. This did not end his efforts to win a transfer to some more "honorable" branch of the service. He applied to the Secretary of War for assignment in the infantry or the cavalry, but his immediate superiors would not endorse his request. In March of 1863 he asked for a post in the newly organized Corps of Engineers Troops. He even sent "testimonials" from prominent persons like Judah P. Benjamin and Jubal Early but all to no avail. Earlier efforts to transfer to Richard Taylor's staff in Louisiana also came to nothing. Taylor left the 8th Brigade and returned to Louisiana in mid-1862, taking with him only a handful of his Virginia staff. When David urged one of them to have Taylor request his services as well, the friend replied that General Taylor thought the "old Brigade" could not do without David.  

12 A. Vallas to David Boyd, August 21, November 29, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1; G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, September 3, 1862, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6.  

13 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, May 26, December 6, 1862; Geo. W. Randolph, Secretary of War, to David Boyd, June 25, 1862; David Boyd to James A. Seddon, Secretary of War, December 27, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1; G. F. Gilmer, Colonel of Engineers and Chief of Bureau, to D. F. Boyd, March 23, March 31, 1863; T. R. Heard to David Boyd, March 28, 1863, ibid., Box 2.
When David finally left the commissary service in May of 1863, it was largely due to the pressure brought to bear on the War Office by Louisiana politicians. The Seminary Board of Supervisors, planning to reorganize the institution during the summer of 1863, hoped to secure David's release from the army so that he could resume his old chair and serve as acting superintendent. They hoped to secure Francis Smith for the post of superintendent ultimately. David, well aware of their intentions, could not get his resignation accepted by Richmond. But Judge Thomas Manning, a member of the Board of Supervisors and on the staff of Governor Thomas O. Moore, appealed to Louisiana's representatives in the capital. They approached the Secretary of War, and within six weeks David was a civilian.  

During his service in Virginia, David's regiment, the Ninth Louisiana, saw action in eastern Virginia and in the Valley. The Ninth was part of Richard Taylor's Eighth

---

14 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 115-116; C. S. deElgee to David Boyd, March 30, 1863; certified copy of letter from Judge Th. C. Manning, Governor Thos. O. Moore, and C. S. deElgee to Hon. Henry Marshall, March 31, 1863; H. Marshall to David Boyd, April 29, 1863; Special Order No. 120, Adjutant and Inspector General's Office, Richmond, May 20, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2. David's resignation became effective on May 11, 1863.
Brigade which, in the spring of 1862, was sent to General Thomas J. Jackson in the Valley. There it took part in Jackson's spectacular feats at Front Royal, Winchester, Cross Keys, and Post Republic. 15

While the drive toward Winchester was in progress circumstances contrived to promote David. General Taylor's brigade commissary officer, Major Aaron Davis, "carried away by his ardour . . . gathered a score of mounted orderlies and couriers and pursued [a Federal regiment from Maryland] until a volley from the enemy's rear guard laid him low . . . shot through the head." 16 David assumed Major Davis's duties at once and a month later received formal notice of his promotion. 17 By that time Jackson's Corps was supporting Lee in the Battle of the Seven Days around Richmond. General Taylor was ill before the fighting began. When it was over he was

15 For a detailed discussion of the Eighth Brigade's activity in the first half of 1862, see Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 48-95.

16 Ibid., 61-62; Official Records, XII, Pt. 1, p. 800.

17 In his report of the Valley Campaign General Taylor notes that Major Davis was killed on May 23, 1862. David's promotion to Brigade Commissary Major became effective on May 24. He was formally notified a month later. Official Records, XII, Pt. 1, p. 800; Geo. W. Randolph, Secretary of War, to David Boyd, June 25, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.
partially paralyzed. Early in July, 1862, he was promoted to major general and shortly thereafter left his brigade in Virginia for service in Louisiana. He was replaced by Brigadier General Harry T. Hays, a New Orleans lawyer, who commanded the brigade until the last few months of the war.  

David was also sick when the Battle of the Seven Days ended. A physician endorsed his request for a two-week furlough, citing "acute diarrhoea" as grounds. On July 12, 1862, he left his unit, then camped near Richmond, for a visit to his family in Wytheville. This was his first furlough and his first visit home since September, 1861. At that time he obtained five days leave to go to Richmond on business connected with his duties as assistant commissary. Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana, then acting Secretary of War, authorized a five-day extension of David's leave, apparently enabling him to visit Wytheville. This first trip home in almost four years was very disappointing. Mrs. Nannie Stuart, a woman whom David considered his "particular friend,"

---

18 Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 76, 93; Official Records, XII, Pt. 3, pp. 917-18.

19 Application for sick leave by David Boyd, endorsed by Dr. J. C. Egan, Colonel LeRoy Stafford, 9th La., and Brig. Gen. Jas. Ewell, July 11, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1854, 1860-65, Box 2; Furlough Permit for D. F. Boyd by E. Griswold, Provost Marshal, July 12, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.
was out of town when he visited. But Minerva Boyd told her of David's harsh condemnation of Virginians as cold and unfeeling. Mrs. Stuart thought she knew why David was bitter:

I believe . . . that you long ago formed an attachment for one and cherished hopes that were never realized—that those hopes may have since revived and again disappointed—and finding that one unworthy of your affection you are too much inclined to class your other friends with her and condemn them all alike.20

David, thought Mrs. Stuart, ought "to quit grieving over spilt milk" and find someone else before he became a "crusty old bachelor."21

The lack of rapport between David and his father, Thomas Boyd, was another reason for David's disappointment when he visited Wytheville in September, 1861. He remarked to Mrs. Stuart that he felt more welcome in his "new home 'way down in Dixie" than he did in Wytheville, and he complained at length to his brother Charlie of Thomas Boyd's lack of affection. Charlie thought David was too sensitive. He admitted that he, too, used to think "that Pa had the same affection for his children that the viper had for its young" but he knew better now. David ought to allow for the harsh

20 Nannie Stuart to David F. Boyd, January 1, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1.

21 Ibid.
way in which Thomas Boyd had been raised; thrown out at fifteen, friendless and penniless, he had been compelled to make his own way in a "heartless world." Charlie begged David to discard any notions he might have about his father's lack of affection for him. He urged him to come home at Christmas and see for himself.  

But David did not go home for Christmas in 1861, thereby disappointing the whole family. Minerva Boyd was particularly unhappy. It was March before she could even write her son a note begging him to come home. Two months later, after failing to hear from him for weeks, she wrote, "I can't see the justice of keeping you always on duty. May I not write to Col. [General] Taylor & beg a furlough?"  

The truth seems to be that the hypersensitive David, estranged from his father and still suffering pangs of unrequited love, found little to attract him in Wytheville. Only

---

22 Ibid.; C. R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, December 16, 1861, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.  

23 C. R. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, March 7, 1862; Minerva Boyd to D. F. Boyd, March 7, 1862, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 1. This letter, although undated, refers to one written by David dated March 25, 1862, which did not reach Minerva until the last of April. Also, Minerva's undated letter was sent to Rockingham County in the Valley. Taylor's forces reached there about April 30, 1862. Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 48.
a debilitating illness made him return there in mid-July, 1862. When he rejoined his unit about August 1, Jackson's Army was about to take part in a series of major engagements. Cedar Mountain, Second Manassas, and Sharpsburg kept the Army of Northern Virginia busy until mid-September. Jackson's forces, by that time formally organized as the Second Corps of that army, then rested around Winchester. In late November, they moved southeastward to Fredericksburg, Virginia. Following the bloody battle which took place there in December, 1862, the men settled down in winter quarters along the Rappahannock.24

During the winter of 1862-63 General Jackson enjoyed very pleasant quarters. By that time his fame was so great that wherever he appeared he could expect to be deluged with gifts, delicacies, and invitations to enjoy the best the country could offer. It clearly embarrassed him to be the object of so much special consideration, particularly when his troops lacked even the bare necessities.25 Some units at Fredericksburg suffered more than others. In January of 1863, Brigadier General Harry Hays's adjutant general wrote


Louisiana Representative John Perkins about the pitiful conditions in camp. Almost no one had shoes or underclothing, and "an overcoat is an object of curiosity." Many slept in the open for lack of tents and rations were described as "petty." "Troops of other States are supplied . . . by . . . contributions from their homes. We from La. have gotten nothing since N. O. fell . . . with the exception . . . of a company in the 9th Regt." Even before the Battle of Fredricksburg, troops were on short rations and substitutes. In November of 1862 David Boyd received orders to purchase ten pounds of wheat for every hundred men as a substitute for coffee, and pork, rather than beef, was the meat ration "one day in every seven." David must have described the bad conditions in a letter to his family. Thomas Boyd answered, demanding to know, "What is the Quartermaster General doing that he don't furnish your soldiers with shoes? I am told that every Jew's shop in Richmond is filled with them to overflowing."
The miserable winter of 1862-63 at Fredricksburg was the last David would spend in Virginia for almost twenty years. His efforts to transfer out of or resign from the commissary service, begun late in 1861, finally succeeded in the spring of 1863. He obtained a thirty-day leave of absence beginning March 13, 1863 and spent part of it in Wytheville. About April 10 he returned to his unit, then preparing to take part in the Battle of Chancellorsville.  

Meanwhile, his Louisiana friends were pulling wires through their representatives at Richmond. By the middle of May they had succeeded. A series of special orders from the Confederate Assistant Adjutant General in the capital finally separated David from the service on May 11, 1863.  

Even before his resignation was accepted, David was busy with plans for the Seminary. He tried to hire Rene T. Beauregard, a son of General P. G. T. Beauregard and an ex-cadet at the school, to serve as commandant and professor.  

---

29 Special Order No. 67, March 8, 1863, granting Major D. F. Boyd leave of absence for thirty days; S. B. Robinson to David Boyd, March 26, April 4, 1863; Railroad ticket from Wytheville, Va., to Lynchburg, Va., April 10, 1863, ibid., Box 2.  

of French. He also corresponded with ex-professor Francis W. Smith, whom the Board of Supervisors hoped ultimately to appoint as superintendent of the Seminary. Neither Beauregard nor Smith was willing to leave the army but for different reasons. Beauregard declined David's offer because of the "uncertainty of holding an office in a state where . . . every inch of soil is within the enemy's grasp," and the unlikelihood of securing enough cadets to operate the school.  

But Smith, then serving under General Robert E. Lee's brother, Captain S. Lee, refused to leave the army for any reason until peace was declared or the need for men was over.  

Smith was, however, willing to consult with David about the reorganization of the Seminary. On May 13, 1863, he sent David a detailed plan dealing with curriculum, fees, personnel and management of the institution. A week later, "Citizen D. F. Boyd" traveled to Richmond and on to Drewry's Bluff where he talked with Major Smith about reorganizing the

31 Rene T. Beauregard to David F. Boyd, April 28, 1863, ibid.

32 F. W. Smith to David Boyd, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11. Smith was stationed at Drewry's Bluff, below Richmond, under the command of R. E. Lee's brother, whom he described as "an octogenarian imbecile" and the "poorest excuse for an officer I ever saw." The letter was sent to David at Fredricksburg, thus it may be dated sometime between December 1862 and May, 1863.

33 F. W. Smith to David Boyd, May 13, 1863, ibid.
school. They planned a strictly military institution with five professorships: (1) mathematics and natural philosophy; (2) chemistry, mineralogy and geology; (3) engineering and applied mechanics; (4) ancient languages and ancient history, and (5) English literature, belle-lettres and modern history. The first half of the four-year program would be required for all students. But third and fourth year cadets might specialize in literary or scientific studies. In 1910 a historical account of the Seminary's early days noted that the Boyd-Smith proposal drafted in 1863 "was essentially that now generally accepted as the proper organization of college work." 34

After meeting with Major Francis Smith, David went to Wytheville where he spent a week resting and concluding his affairs in Virginia. On June 1, 1863, he began the long and circuitous trip to Louisiana. His route, planned by a friend in the Ninth Louisiana Regiment, took him from Wytheville, Virginia, through Bristol and Knoxville, Tennessee, to

34 Pass signed by Brigadier General Harry Hays granting Citizen D. F. Boyd permission to travel to Richmond, May 16, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; copy of proposed reorganization of La. State Seminary and Military Academy by Major F. W. Smith, May 21, 1863, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1862-1865, Box 1; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 116.
Stevenson, Alabama. There he left the East Tennessee Railroad and traveled eastward to Dalton, Georgia. At Dalton he boarded the Western and Atlantic Railroad to Kingston and Rome, Georgia. From Rome it was necessary to travel to Jack-sonville, Alabama, by stage. There David joined the Alabama and Tennessee Railroad to Selma, Alabama. A newly constructed line carried him from Selma through Meridian, Mississippi, to the capital, Jackson, where he spent two or three days. Then he rode southward on the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern line until he reached Brookhaven, Mississippi. Natchez lay directly west of Brookhaven, but in 1863 no rail line connected the two towns. Whether David covered the distance by stage or horseback is not clear. But it was the most expensive part of his trip. At Natchez a ferry carried him across the Mississippi to Vidalia, Louisiana. Another stage took him to Trinity on the Black River and finally to Alexandria, Louisiana. The whole journey from Fredricksburg, Virginia, to Alexandria, Louisiana, consumed twenty-six days and about $275. Considering that both Vicksburg and Port Hudson were under siege, that Federal gunboats commanded the Mississippi, and that Union forces captured Jackson, Mississippi, in May of 1863, David's progress was surprisingly
Whether his job would still be available when he arrived in Louisiana was doubtful even before David left the army. The Louisiana congressman who secured his resignation pointed out on April 29, 1863, that Federal troops were threatening Alexandria. Actually, the school broke up six days earlier when, on the approach of General Nathaniel P. Banks's army, the acting superintendent dismissed the cadets to fight the enemy. Federal forces occupied the school building briefly but even after their withdrawal, the institution did not reopen during the war. On June 23, 1863, shortly after David's arrival in Alexandria, the Board of Supervisors formally closed the school, vacated the existing professorships and named the steward custodian of the building.  

As July, 1863, began, David Boyd found himself an unemployed civilian. Fortunately, he had friends at hand. Dr.  

---

35David's route, expenses, and mode of travel between May 19 and June 23, 1863, appear in a small manuscript volume, Item 12, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 22.  

36H. Marshall to David Boyd, April 29, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 114-115; Resolution of the Board of Supervisors, June 23, 1863, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1862-65, Box 1.
Powhatan Clarke, one of his former colleagues at the Seminary, was a captain of artillery stationed at Shreveport. But his marriage to Louise Boyce, daughter of the wealthy Judge Henry Boyce of Rapides Parish, made him a frequent visitor to Alexandria. It also allowed him to lend David four hundred dollars, which David planned to use for fare back to Virginia.\(^37\)

Before David could leave the state, a chance came to rejoin the army on the staff of Major General Richard Taylor, his first commander. Taylor, whose command included all of Louisiana west of the Mississippi, made his headquarters at Alexandria. Early in August David went to see him and by mid-September he held a captain's commission as chief of engineers on Taylor's staff.\(^38\)

In his new post David's principal assignment involved refitting Fort DeRussy on the Red River. Located about thirty miles below Alexandria, Fort DeRussy was still

\(^37\)Powhatan Clarke to D. F. Boyd, July 9, July 10, 1863, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2. On the back of the letter dated July 9, 1863, there is a note signed D. F. Boyd: "This was paid back in July 1876 by check of \(\frac{10000}{100}\) on Citizens Bank of N. O."

\(^38\)M. D. Berengier, A. D. O., to Major D. F. Boyd, August 3, 1863; General Order No. 54, Hdqr. Dist., Western La., September 16, 1863 introducing Captain D. F. Boyd to the district as Chief of Engineers on Major General Taylor's staff, ibid.
uncompleted when Federal gunboats under David D. Porter appeared before it in May of 1863. The Confederates managed to save their guns and supplies, but Porter leveled the fort's earthworks and destroyed a log-and-chain raft in the river before withdrawing to the Mississippi River.\(^{39}\)

After Vicksburg and Port Hudson fell in July, 1863, General Richard Taylor was sure the enemy would return. Therefore he assigned Chief Engineer David Boyd the task of rebuilding the ruined fort. Specifically, this meant mounting guns, digging earthworks, constructing a powder magazine, and, perhaps most important, driving huge pilings into the riverbed behind which an impassable raft of logs might accumulate. The work, begun late in 1863, did not go smoothly. In addition to shortages of labor and material, the project also suffered from strained relations between District Headquarters at Alexandria and Department Headquarters under Lieutenant General E. Kirby Smith at Shreveport. When Taylor asked Smith to send the "best engineering officer available" to assist his own crew at DeRussy, he did not expect that the engineer, Major H. T. "Fred" Douglas, would be reporting directly to Shreveport. Worse still, Taylor and Douglas disagreed about the kind of fort DeRussy ought to be.

Taylor thought "mere water batteries" were enough to combat enemy gunboats: forts like DeRussy should not attempt to withstand "serious land attacks." But Shreveport, inclined to more permanent defense works, including iron casemates and heavy guns, decided to construct what Taylor later called a "Red River Gibraltar."\(^{40}\)

When Major General J. G. Walker, after a visit of inspection on Taylor's behalf, condemned DeRussy as "inadequate for the defense of the river," Taylor must have felt somewhat vindicated. Specifically, Walker's report criticized the placement of guns inside the fort some two or three hundred yards from the river. "Where they now are not more than one shot out of ten would be accurately aimed . . . ," he remarked, even if the gunners could see the vessels. Boats could not be seen from the fort until the river rose twelve to fifteen feet. But they could sail past with only a three to four foot rise. The only thing Walker had any faith in was the log raft being built below the fort to obstruct the passage of boats. Even that, he thought, was

\(^{40}\text{Official Records, XXXIV, Pt. 2, pp. 890-92; Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 118-19, 136,153, 155. Taylor had other differences with Kirby Smith, especially dealing with the latter's penchant for organizing bureaus and maintaining an extensive staff. Smith's staff, commented Taylor, would have done credit to Von Moltke in the Franco-Prussian War.}
in the wrong place. Because it lay beyond the reach of Fort DeRussy's guns, enemy working parties might dismantle it in safety. However, if the piling proved strong enough to sustain the weight of accumulating timber, and if Captain Boyd could obtain four or five hundred Negro laborers and forty or fifty ox teams to throw trees into the river, thus filling the entire space from the piling to Fort DeRussy, the river might be made impassable to any boats and the raft impossible to dislodge. 41

Less than two months later, Taylor's and Walker's worst fears were realized. On March 14, 1864, a Yankee land force under Brigadier General J. A. Mower took Fort DeRussy from the rear. The Federals lost three killed and thirty-five wounded. They captured ten guns, took 260 prisoners, and killed five Confederates. The Federal gunboats, stalled for two hours by the "impassable" raft in the river, arrived too late to fire a shot. 42


Captain David Boyd managed to escape capture at Fort DeRussy only because he was already a prisoner of the Yankees. On February 3, 1864, about four in the afternoon, a band of "Jayhawkers" waylaid him some five miles from Alexandria. For several days General Taylor did not know whether his chief engineer was alive or dead. But on February 8 he received information that David, and perhaps two other officers, had been taken to Natchez, Mississippi, and "sold" to the Federals.\(^{43}\) "Jayhawkers" were a serious problem in many parts of Louisiana by 1864. After David's capture General Taylor wrote General Walker, then headquartered at Marksville near Fort DeRussy, that "no officer should be permitted to travel north of the Red river from here Alexandria to Marksville until we root out this band. At present they number only 15, but the whole population ..."

On March 19, 1864, Major General J. G. Walker reported the following to General Taylor:

"In accounting for the disaster at Fort DeRussy it is unnecessary to look to other causes then the overwhelming superiority of the enemy's force; but even with this advantage Fort DeRussy might have been held for some days, perhaps, without relief from the outside, but for the viscous system of engineering adopted and the wretched judgement displayed in the selection of the position."


\(^{43}\)Statement of David Boyd after his release, June 15, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; Official Records, XXXIV, Pt. 2, pp. 950-51.
sympathize with them." Taylor did not let popular sentiment stand in his way. He instructed Major R. E. Wyche to drive the outlaws into the swamps, take their horses, and starve them out. Any armed man of draft age who could not account for himself was to be shot on the spot.

When he was captured David was carrying some five thousand dollars. The money, destined for soldiers at Fort DeRussy, was not taken from him. According to an account written years afterward by Judge A. A. Gunby, David hid the money in his boot. But in 1904 David's wife corrected the Gunby version. As she remembered it, David and the "Jayhawkers" had to cross Black River enroute to Natchez. The boat capsized and, during the confusion, David supposedly destroyed the money by stamping it into the mud.

David reached Natchez on February 7, 1864. General William T. Sherman, commander of the Army of the Tennessee, was then a few miles north at Vicksburg. David wrote Sherman on February 13, asking to be transferred from his command

---


45Ibid., 944.

46Ibid., 977; Gunby, "Life and Services of David French Boyd," 7-8. Gunby's account of the "Jayhawking" incident appeared in May, 1904, in a speech delivered at ceremonies honoring D. F. Boyd. By that time, forty years after the event, the money in the bootleg had grown to thirteen thousand dollars. Gunby also said the "Jayhawkers" tried to
to the Department of the Gulf under General N.P. Banks.

Because General Banks and General Richard Taylor had an agreement regarding the exchange of prisoners west of the Mississippi, David's chances for release were much better in Banks's Department. Sherman agreed to David's request and even delivered him to New Orleans. "I never saw a man evince more gratitude," Sherman commented to his wife. "He clung to me till I came away." Before Sherman left New Orleans, he assured David of his personal regard for him in a hastily written note. If David ever needed a friend in New Orleans, wrote Sherman, he should show the note to either General C. P. Stone or General T. J. Reynolds.

Drown David and that he saved them when the boat capsized in the Black River. David's own account of his capture states that he did not know how to swim but saved himself by staying with the capsized boat. MS, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 14.

Mrs. Boyd's comment, an annotation to an unidentified newspaper clipping quoting the Gunby address, appears in a scrapbook among the David Boyd Papers, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.


W. T. Sherman to Mrs. Sherman, March 10, 1864, in Howe (ed.), Home Letters of General Sherman, 285. Sherman was enroute to New Orleans to confer with General N. P. Banks about the pending expedition up the Red River.

Prison life did not suit David. When confined at 21 Rampart Street on March 1, 1864, he did not even have a place to sleep. His request to have a mattress, blankets and a pillow sent in was immediately honored. But a petition on April 17, complaining about the noise, crowding, and lack of privacy in the prison, and asking for the freedom of the city upon signature of a parole seems not to have been successful. Three weeks later David sent an individual appeal to the Commandant of Prisons, Colonel C. W. Killborn. He was suffering greatly from diarrhea and although he hesitated to ask for privileges not enjoyed by all prisoners, he hoped to recover his health by spending a few hours outside the prison every day. Reminding the colonel that he had been transferred to the Department of the Gulf at his own request and through the good offices of General William T. Sherman, he also pointed out that in Natchez he had been allowed the "privilege of the city, day and night, simply on my word of honor . . ." Colonel Killborn returned his request with a note that permission to leave the prison had been denied by the "Comdg. Genl." If David needed special treatment, he

---

50 Petition to Col. C. W. Killborn, Commandant of Prisons, April 17, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2.
could go to the hospital.\textsuperscript{51}

By the end of May David's health was worse and so were his relations with the Federal Commandant of Prisons. Now Killborn agreed to allow his prisoners some freedoms if they signed what David labeled "the humbug parole of No. 21 Rampart Street." When David refused to sign, Killborn responded by denying him the right to have visitors. David protested bitterly:

Your unmanly and unofficerlike treatment of myself and two others have caused us to attempt to escape. . . . We shall probably fail . . . If so, we know what awaits us, but let our fate be all that cowardice, malice and revenge can command, we will meet it as becomes men and Confederate officers.

David closed by promising to "return good for evil" as an object lesson, should Killborn ever become his prisoner.\textsuperscript{52} Whether Colonel Killborn was impressed is not clear. In any case he was about to lose a colorful correspondent.

Following the Federal withdrawal from the Red River in late May of 1864, Generals Banks and Taylor proceeded to carry out their agreement to exchange prisoners. By June 1, Captain David Boyd and two other officers on Taylor's staff were back

\textsuperscript{51}David Boyd to Col. C. W. Killborn, May 8, 1864, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{52}David Boyd to Col. C. W. Killborn, May 27, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1854, 1860-65, Box 2.
in Alexandria. Their exchange was considered official when three Federal officers of comparable rank were returned by the Confederates.53

Because he was in Federal custody between February 7 and June 1, 1864, it might be assumed that David Boyd missed one of the most significant campaigns of the Civil War in Louisiana. As an active participant, he did. But as an observer he could not have been better placed. On April 14, 1864, David was on board a Federal transport, the Polar Star, at Grand Ecore, Louisiana. The Polar Star, being used as a prison ship, accompanied Porter's fleet from Grand Ecore toward Shreveport on April 7. As Porter worked his way slowly upstream on April 8, 9, and 10 to a point above Grand Bayou, General Richard Taylor managed to stop Banks's forces at Mansfield (April 8) and Pleasant Hill (April 9). Banks returned to Grand Ecore to regroup, and Porter, finding the water level dangerously low, rejoined him there by April 14. David, in the midst of Porter's fleet and Banks's army, saw a chance to be of service to General Taylor. In the margins of a newspaper he penciled a detailed account of the location and numbers of Federal gunboats, troops, and guns he had

53 Official Records, VII, 193. Though present in Alexandria from June 1, David's exchange was not official until July 25, 1864.
heard about or observed while aboard the Polar Star. A Confederate surgeon, allowed aboard the ship to treat sick prisoners, promised to deliver the paper personally to General Taylor. But he broke his promise, and Taylor did not receive the message until the night of April 19. The Confederate cause did not suffer from the surgeon's broken faith. While personally occupied with Banks at Mansfield and Pleasant Hill, Taylor kept abreast of Admiral Porter's movements through a specially detailed staff officer assigned to watch the river. Nevertheless, when he finally received David's smuggled communication, he ordered a copy sent to General E. Kirby Smith, then on his way to Arkansas.54

David was captured near Alexandria, Louisiana, on February 3, 1864; turned over to the Federals at Natchez, Mississippi, on February 7; delivered to New Orleans by General Sherman as of March 1; and was a prisoner on a Yankee transport at Grand Ecore by April 14. He was back in New Orleans addressing petitions and defiant letters to the Federal Commandant of Prisons during May, and not finally returned to Alexandria until June 1. To locate David between

54David Boyd to General R. Taylor, April 4, 1864, Copy, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 176-77.
February and June of 1864 is not difficult. But to explain his boat trip between April 4 and April 18 involves speculation. It is possible that the Federals, in accordance with Sherman's wishes, were trying to exchange him at the "first opportunity." But low water and General Taylor may have altered their plans, just as they affected the course of the entire Red River campaign. Whatever the explanation, David's experience as a Federal prisoner was relatively brief and comparatively interesting. Few captives on either side managed to escape the monotony of prison life by taking a riverboat excursion; fewer still found friends and champions like General William Tecumseh Sherman.

David rejoined General Taylor at Alexandria just days before General Kirby Smith named Major General John G. Walker to replace Taylor as commander of the District of West Louisiana. The change reflected formal recognition of the

55 General W. T. Sherman to Mrs. Sherman, March 10, 1864, in Howe (ed.), Home Letters of General Sherman, 285. That David was back in New Orleans from Grand Ecore by April 18 may be deduced from two individual petitions addressed to Colonel Killborn and dated May 8 and May 27, 1864. The second petition states that the first was written "after being here three weeks." This would indicate that David was back in New Orleans by April 17 or 18. David Boyd to Col. C. W. Killborn, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; David Boyd to Col. C. W. Killborn, May 27, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1854, 1860-65, Box 2.
longstanding bitterness between Taylor and Kirby Smith. Taylor ultimately received orders to cross the Mississippi and assume command of the Department of Mississippi and East Louisiana. Originally he was to take as many men with him as the Trans-Mississippi could spare. But continued bickering between Taylor and Smith and wholesale desertion on the part of the affected troops nullified the plan. Smith's refusal to allow Taylor to choose the staff officers who would accompany him made matters even worse. Finally, Taylor crossed the river alone in the latter part of August, 1864.56

Between June 1 and July 25, 1864, David waited at Alexandria for his formal exchange to be approved. He used the time to collect his personal effects which, after his capture, had been left with various friends.57 He also corresponded with a friend at Department Headquarters in Shreveport about General Taylor's removal from command. The friend, T. R. Heard, was clearly on Kirby Smith's side. Taylor, he thought, was "insubordinate" and "insolent" and the tool of various politicians who sought to have Kirby

56Winters, Civil War in Louisiana, 380-82; Taylor, Destruction and Reconstruction, 188-90, 196-97.
57J. B. Jarreau, Jr. to D. F. Boyd, June 17, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2.
Smith removed so that Taylor could take his place.\(^{58}\)

Apparently David was not convinced. Early in August he wrote Lieutenant Colonel H. T. Douglas, Chief of Engineers in the Trans-Mississippi Department for permission to follow Taylor. This would involve resigning his commission but, as David explained to Colonel Douglas: "He \(^{Taylor}\) was my first & is now the best friend I have in the army." Although Douglas respected David's feelings, he refused to release him until a suitable replacement could be found.\(^{59}\) David tried again on August 31. This time the request was denied until his replacement, Captain C. M. Randolph, could take over David's duties as chief engineer for the District of West Louisiana. By October 1, 1864, Randolph was ready to take charge. David was free to join Taylor if Taylor had a post for him and when Richmond approved his resignation.\(^{60}\)

The month of October passed and no word came from Taylor or Richmond. Meanwhile, Colonel Joseph L. Brent, formerly Chief of Ordinance and Artillery on Taylor's staff, made

\(^{58}\) T. R. Heard to D. F. Boyd, July 7, 1864, ibid.


\(^{60}\) D. F. Boyd to Lt. Col. I.N. Galliher, August 31, 1864; C. M. Randolph to D. F. Boyd, October 1, 1864, ibid.
David a tempting offer. Brent was about to be named commander of the First Louisiana Cavalry Brigade, District of West Louisiana. In his new post he would require an assistant adjutant general and Captain David Boyd was his choice for the position.61 David was in something of a dilemma, but Brent offered a simple, practical solution. David should write Taylor, who would see that the pending resignation was disallowed at Richmond. David could then be transferred locally to Brent's staff, and Brent would write Taylor that he wanted David's services. If Taylor objected, Brent would acquiesce and David could go to Taylor.62 For most men, Brent's proposal would have been perfectly satisfactory. But David, whose sense of "duty" and "loyalty" surpassed that of most men, had reservations. He expressed them in a letter written to Brent early in November. But when he arrived at Brent's headquarters later that month, he found that Brent never received his letter. Fearing that some "misunderstanding" existed between him and General Brent, David decided to

61 Colonel H. T. Douglas to Brigadier General J. L. Brent, October 22, 1864; Colonel H. T. Douglas to Captain D. F. Boyd, October 24, October 27, 1864, ibid.; Official Records, XLI, Pt. 4, pp. 1017, 1019, 1140.

62 General J. L. Brent to D. F. Boyd, November 6, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2.
review the entire course of their correspondence in another letter written on November 29. He began by summarizing the contents of the lost letter. In it David had thanked Brent for offering him such a high office, "but thinking and feeling it to be my duty to go to Genl. Taylor I determined to await his pleasure even if I shd sacrifice myself by such course." Because he was sure that Taylor would contact him soon, David had answered Brent that he would join his staff informally, without a commission of any sort. When he received no reply, he assumed that Brent agreed, and that meanwhile, Brent was looking for a permanent assistant adjutant general. In the November 29 letter of clarification, David still thought it would be better for him not to join Brent's staff "formally." But in order to make amends for all the confusion and delay, he was prepared to follow General Brent's proposal of November 6: to become Brent's assistant adjutant general formally, subject to General Taylor's call.63

It must have been a relief to all concerned when a few weeks later General Taylor released David from any obligation. Taylor wrote that he had no openings on his staff, that there were more officers than men in his command, and

63 David Boyd to General J. L. Brent, November 29, 1864, ibid.
that he did not expect to remain there long himself.\textsuperscript{64}

After the Red River campaign of 1864, military operations in the Trans-Mississippi Department were confined largely to small expeditions, raids and guerilla activities. Desertions increased tremendously and "Jayhawkers" became a serious threat as the war dragged on. In December of 1864 General Joseph Brent attempted to deal with conditions around Ville Platte and Opelousas. He and many of his staff moved to St. Landry Parish from their base at Camp LeRoy Stafford on the Seminary grounds near Pineville. But little was accomplished, and by mid-January, 1865, General Brent and most of his men were back at Camp Stafford.\textsuperscript{65}

If conditions were bad in Louisiana, they were even more discouraging in other theaters of operation. From Virginia Minerva Boyd wrote of Yankee raids on saltworks, lead mines, and railroad bridges in and near Wytheville. Georgia, she had heard, was "subjugated." "If Richmond falls I think the Confederacy is gone. Your father would smite me if he .

\textsuperscript{64}Lieutenant General Richard Taylor to Captain D. F. Boyd, December 16, 1864, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{65}General J. L. Brent to Judge C. H. Mouton, December 2, 1864, \textit{ibid.}; F. Seip to David Boyd, January 18, 1865, \textit{ibid.}, Box 3.
thought I had expressed such an opinion even to you."66

Minerva Boyd may not have been exaggerating. To David's remark that sentiment for reunion was growing in the West, Thomas Boyd responded, "I would rather die a thousand deaths myself & see every member of my family destroyed, than to unite with them again. Let us fight as long as we have a man to die . . . Let other states do what they may, I trust Virginia will never again go into Union with the Yankees."67 "Other states" were clearly ready for peace. Colonel H. T. Douglas, chief engineer on General Kirby Smith's staff, returned to Shreveport from Richmond in March of 1865. In a letter to David he described Alabama, South Carolina, and Georgia as "rocking and tottering" to ruin, shame and disgrace. Only the Virginians had any "nobility." Virginia, wrote Douglas, looked to Louisiana and the southwest to save the Confederacy. The Trans-Mississippi Department must overcome its "lethargy." It must not wait till the Yankees appeared; it must press the attack.68

66 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, December 29, 1864, ibid., Box 2.
67 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, December 27, 1864, ibid.
68 Col. H. T. Douglas to David Boyd, March 3, 1865, ibid., Box 3.
By April 19, 1865, word of Lee's surrender reached Louisiana. General Kirby Smith, hoping to continue the fight in the Trans-Mississippi Department, delivered a speech to his men on April 21. He urged them to "prove to the world that your hearts have not failed in the hour of disaster" and to "sustain the holy cause." Those who heard his appeal listened with mixed emotions. Others had long since deserted the cause as hopeless. Meanwhile, General John Pope, Federal Commander of the Division of the Missouri, offered Kirby Smith the same surrender terms presented to Lee at Appomattox. Smith rejected them as inconsistent with his sense of duty and honor. He also urged the governors of Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas and Missouri to meet in order to decide future policy in the department. After a conference in Marshall, Texas, on May 13, the governors instructed Smith to disband his troops provided the Federal authorities accepted certain conditions designed to protect Confederate citizens and preserve public order. While the negotiations continued, desertions increased and lawless acts multiplied. At Shreveport, Mansfield, Natchitoches and Alexandria there was extensive pillage of government stores by soldiers and

civilians. Those few troops who remained at their posts were especially apprehensive. Because the country was overrun with armed deserters, they feared for the safety of their families.

Learning that Confederate forces in Texas were deserting in large numbers, General Smith moved his headquarters to Houston, Texas, on May 18, 1865. There he hoped to rally the forces which remained and fight to the Rio Grande if necessary. General Simon Buckner, left in charge at Shreveport, prepared to move all troops from West Louisiana into the Lone Star state. He had already instructed his subordinates, Major General Harry Hays at Natchitoches, and Brigadier General Joseph L. Brent at Alexandria, to "make a show of resistance" against an expected Yankee attack along the Red River in order to cover his withdrawal. 70

But neither Hays at Natchitoches nor Brent, on the front lines at Alexandria, had much faith in their men. Replying to Brent's private letter of May 11, Hays wrote: "It is sad to see our cause going to the devil for the want of a

70 Ibid., 421-25; Major General Harry Hays to General J. L. Brent, May 8, May 11, 1865; copy of instructions from Lieutenant General S. B. Buckner to Major General Harry Hays, May 10, 1865; Colonel H. T. Douglas to General J. L. Brent, May 11, 1865, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 3.
little spirit on the part of our troops. If they would only fight with determination I would still be hopeful. More than hopeful—sanguine. But this I fear they will not do."²¹ A few days later Hays advised Brent, should the enemy advance on him in force, to discover what terms of surrender the Federals would accept. He authorized him to make any temporary convention he felt to be proper. Those officers still present in Brent's command made the same request. On May 18, in order "to save our State from further and unnecessary desolation," they urged General Brent to take immediate steps toward securing "honorable terms of capitulation."²²

Because he had received no official instructions from General Simon Buckner and Governor Henry W. Allan at Shreveport, General Hays was forced to act on his own authority. In a general order he directed General Brent and two others to meet with United States authorities and to arrange terms for the surrender of Confederate troops and public property in the District of West Louisiana. A letter accompanying his formal order urged Brent to treat with the

²¹Major General Harry Hays to General J. L. Brent, May 12, 1865, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 3.

²²Major General Harry Hays to General J. L. Brent, May 17, May 18, 1865; Officers' Petition to General J. L. Brent, May 18, 1865, ibid.
enemy before he had nothing left to surrender. His men, wrote Hays, were a "lawless mass." He hated to turn them loose on the roads with guns but he saw no other course. As assistant adjutant general, David was privy to all of General Brent's correspondence. He was also "a warm personal friend" of General Harry Hays, having served under him in Virginia. When Hays authorized Brent to surrender, David wrote his old commander a personal note of support. He assured him that to continue fighting was hopeless:

In Texas & La. the army and people are opposed to the action of Gen. Smith & Buckner, somehow they have been led to believe (erroneously I hope) that these officers are acting more for their own personal considerations than for the good of the soldiers & the citizens . . .

Pointing out that Texas did not want Louisiana troops on her soil, David expressed the fear that the Texans might retaliate by a "reinvasión of La." where people were already starving. "Do you know, General, that many families of this section [Alexandria] are forced to live on herbs & roots of the Earth?" he asked. "You are now called on to save us from our misguided friends."  

73 General Order No. 7 from General Harry Hays to General J. L. Brent, May 18, 1865; General Harry Hays to General J. L. Brent, May 18, 1865, ibid.

74 David Boyd to General Harry Hays, May 18, 1865, ibid.
Even the "misguided friends" soon saw the futility of continuing the struggle. On May 26, 1865, General Simon Buckner, acting for General E. Kirby Smith, surrendered the Trans-Mississippi Department to General E. R. S. Canby in New Orleans. Smith approved Buckner's act a few days later. Together with several Confederate civilian and military leaders, Buckner and Smith exiled themselves in Mexico. Several of David Boyd's acquaintances intended to follow their commanders, but he planned to remain in Louisiana. On June 5, he gave his parole and on July 19, 1865, he took the oath of allegiance to the government of the United States.\footnote{David Boyd to Col. H. T. Douglas, June 5, 1865; Parole of David F. Boyd, June 5, 1865; Oath of Allegiance of David F. Boyd, July 19, 1865, \textit{ibid}; Winters, \textit{Civil War in Louisiana}, 426.}
CHAPTER V

TAKing COMMAND

Even before the war ended officially in Louisiana, David Boyd was working diligently to reopen the Louisiana State Seminary. During the last week of June, 1865, he asked a friend, then on his way to Texas, to visit Governor J. Madison Wells in New Orleans. Wells, a native of Rapides Parish and a Unionist, became governor of occupied Louisiana in March, 1865. Following the surrender, President Andrew Johnson recognized his authority over the entire state. Through his emissary, David urged Governor Wells to reopen the Seminary; to name him (David) custodian of the Seminary buildings; to appoint a full Board of Supervisors; and to raise funds, and to hire a faculty. Governor Wells responded at once and positively. He appointed a Board composed largely of leading Rapides citizens. He named David acting superintendent, and he forwarded him a check for $1,738 to cover initial expenditures necessary to prepare the building for the
fall session.¹

David went to the Seminary on July 25, 1865. He found the grounds occupied by Federal troops and the buildings employed as a hospital. He applied to the local commander for immediate possession, but the Federals did not turn over the buildings to him until August 16. Two years of war and occupation had taken a heavy toll. Fences were gone; doors and windows were missing; floors were rotting, and the roof leaked. Even worse, the library, furniture and scientific apparatus had been destroyed or carried off.² David made an effort to salvage whatever he could. With the permission of the local Federal commander he published the following in a local paper:

NOTICE TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN!

Many persons in this vicinity are known to have taken from the State Seminary and to have now in their possession, furniture, books and other property belonging

¹The money represented over $4,800 owed by the state to the Seminary and deposited in the Bank of Louisiana. When converted into U. S. currency it amounted to $1,738 or about thirty-six cents on the dollar. David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, September 2, 1865, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4; Walter L. Fleming, "The Louisiana State Seminary, 1865-1869," Louisiana State University Alumnus, V (1909-1910), 167-68; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, July 26, August 23, 1865.

²David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, December 2, 1865, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
to the Institution. They are respectfully asked to return the same At Once, and those who have not the means of transportation will report the fact to me. Failing to do so within ten days, their names will be furnished to the military authorities, who will cause them to be arrested and tried for theft.

D. F. Boyd, Acting Supt.
Approved by Major Gen.
J. P. Hawkins

Whether David's published threat produced any results is not recorded. The notice is interesting, however, because it suggests that local residents participated in the pillage of the Seminary. That Federal troops did so is certain. But the Federals withdrew in May of 1864. If Seminary property was still in and around Alexandria when David printed his notice, the Yankees must have had help.

---

3 Alexandria (La.) Democrat, August 23, 1865.

4 Walter L. Fleming assigns full credit for the sacking of the Seminary to General "E. Kirby Smith." This is, of course, an error; the Smith to whom he refers was probably Brigadier General T. Kilby Smith, commander of the Federal 17th Corps in the Banks Expedition of 1864. T. Kilby Smith's superior was General A. J. Smith, U. S. 16th Corps. Both Smiths, T. Kilby and A. J., were active in and around Alexandria until the Banks expedition withdrew in May, 1864, and both Confederate and Federal accounts comment on the wanton destruction perpetrated by men under their command. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 117-21; Winters, Civil War in Louisiana, 328-29, 373-74.

5 Winters notes that "Jayhawkers" and even Confederate troops engaged in extensive pillage and arson during the withdrawal of Federal forces from the Red River. The poor may have been venting their aggressions against the rich planters in the area. In the case of Unionists like J. Madison Wells,
On September 2, 1865, the Seminary Board of Supervisors met at Alexandria, Louisiana. David, whose acting superintendency ended that day, was unanimously elected to fill the position permanently. He was also designated treasurer and professor of English, and ancient languages and literature. The Board created and filled four additional professorships: Richard M. Venable, engineering, drawing, and architecture; John A. A. West, mathematics, and natural and experimental philosophy; Edward Cunningham, chemistry, minerology, and geology; and J. P. Bellier, modern languages and literature. It was decided to begin classes on October 2, 1865. In the meanwhile, based on David's minimum estimates, the Board urged Governor Wells to negotiate a loan to finance essential repairs to the building and to purchase books and equipment.\(^6\)

The Board also considered several reforms suggested

whose plantation was severely vandalized and plundered, the motive was clearly political revenge. Winters, *Civil War in Louisiana*, 373.

---

\(^{6}\)Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy, September 2, September 4, 1865, in President's office, Louisiana State University, hereinafter cited as Minutes of the Board of Supervisors; Report of the Board of Supervisors of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy (New Orleans, 1866), 4-7, hereinafter cited as Report of the Board of Supervisors.
by David in a paper entitled "Memoranda of Facts and Ideas for the Louisiana State Seminary." He proposed the creation of a preparatory department so that fourteen-year-olds might be admitted to sub-college classes in the fall of 1865. Then, in 1866-67, "we can raise our standard of admittance to the Collegiate Classes--now shamefully so low, a little knowledge of arithmetic only being requisite." The course of study also required revision. David described it as "bunglingly arranged" and suggested that a subcommittee of the Board work with the faculty to change it. Other suggestions concerned the school calendar, the fees and regulations, and possible sources of revenue. But the most striking of David's recommendations called for eliminating the Seminary's military feature entirely and converting the institution into the "Collegiate Dept. of the University of La." At its September meeting the Board accepted most of David's proposals but it would not discontinue the military system of discipline or endorse the merger of the Seminary with the University of Louisiana.\footnote{Memoranda of Facts and Ideas for the Louisiana State Seminary, July 1, 1865, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1862-65, Box 1. The University of Louisiana, located at New Orleans, was actually composed of a school of law and a school of medicine. In 1865 it was not operating. Fleming, \textit{Louisiana State University}, 131.}
When school began on October 2, 1865, only four students and three professors were on hand. A fourth faculty member arrived two weeks later, but the fifth, Edward Cunningham, did not appear until 1870. Meanwhile, students trickled in. By the end of January, 1866, fifty-five were enrolled and more were expected. Conditions must have been spartan. An exhaustive inventory of everything on hand on opening day lists only two chamber pots. However, relief was forthcoming. Governor Wells managed to raise $15,000 in New Orleans, using as collateral the accrued interest of $32,000 owed by the state on the Seminary's endowment fund for the years 1862-1866. But even David's "characteristic energy and zeal" and his "judicious disbursements" could not offset the school's pressing needs. In its first postwar Report to the General Assembly in January, 1866, the Board requested $10,000 for "absolutely necessary" repairs and another $10,000 for chemical apparatus, engineering instruments, and volumes for the library. This was over and above the $32,800 interest owed by the state on the endowment fund and already pledged to secure the loan obtained by Governor Wells. The Report concluded with an urgent reminder:

8 Report of the Board of Supervisors, 1866, pp. 4-30; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 132-33.
The Board beg the members of the General Assembly not to lose sight of the fact that income is in a badly depreciated currency and that the whole country is run wild in prices of labor, materials, provisions, freights and everything else. 9

Because the future of the Seminary, like that of all state supported institutions, was so inextricably bound up with political developments, it would be helpful at this point to summarize the beginnings of Reconstruction in Louisiana. The presidential phase of Reconstruction was already in progress when David became superintendent of the Seminary in 1865. As early as December, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln put forward his "ten per cent" plan for reconstructing seceded states. The proposition offered Federal recognition for any government set up in a seceded state by one-tenth or more of the number of persons voting in the election of 1860. General Nathaniel P. Banks, Federal commander of the Department of the Gulf, ordered an election of state officers in February, 1864. Michael Hahn, Bavarian-born but a long-time resident of Louisiana, became governor and J. Madison Wells, a Unionist from Rapides Parish who went behind Federal lines in 1862, was elected lieutenant governor. A second election in March chose delegates to revise the state constitution

9Report of the Board of Supervisors, 1866, quoted in Fleming, Louisiana State University, 143.
and representatives to serve in the legislature to be set up under the altered document. By October, 1864, Louisiana's first "free-state" legislature was ready to begin deliberations. Its political character, like that of the convention, was decidedly Unionist.\(^{10}\)

Following President Lincoln's assassination in April, 1865, President Andrew Johnson proclaimed a general amnesty for all those who took an oath of allegiance to support the United States. As a consequence, the South in general and Louisiana in particular were provided with a predominantly conservative or ex-Confederate electorate in 1865-1866. Meanwhile, Governor Hahn, the first "free-state" governor, resigned to become a United States senator and his lieutenant, J. Madison Wells, took office. In accordance with the Johnson amnesty plan, Governor Wells ordered a registration of voters in preparation for an election of state officials to be held on November 6, 1865. In the interest of harmony, the dominant faction of Democrats renominated the Unionist Wells

\(^{10}\) Germaine Memelo, "The Development of State Laws concerning the Negro in Louisiana, 1864-1900" (unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1956), 1-6. For detailed accounts of Reconstruction in Louisiana see John Rose Ficklen, History of Reconstruction in Louisiana Through 1868 (Baltimore, 1910); Ella Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868 (New York, 1918), and William E. Highsmith, "Louisiana During Reconstruction" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1953).
to head the ticket. The result was a strongly Democratic state government. Meanwhile, chaotic labor conditions and certain operations of the Freedmen's Bureau outraged many Louisiana planters. As a result they brought strong pressure on the legislature to adopt restrictive measures regarding ex-slaves. In his annual message Governor Wells advised caution, but the lawmakers ignored his counsel. They enacted a series of statutes designed, from their point of view, to restore economic and social stability to the state. But to many northern newspapers and congressional critics, Louisiana's Black Code and the even harsher codes of other Southern states, represented nothing more than an attempt to reverse the results of the war.\textsuperscript{11}

While the Louisiana legislature met in the winter of 1865-66, President Andrew Johnson and the Radicals in Congress engaged in a duel which would soon take the issue of the emancipated Negro out of the hands of conservative state legislatures. In January, 1866, Congress passed the second Freedmen's Bureau bill. Section seven extended military authority to all cases involving freedmen whose rights were denied by local law, custom or prejudice. President Johnson

\textsuperscript{11}Memelo, "State Laws Concerning the Negro in Louisiana," 15-27.
vetoed it in February. The Radicals responded with a much more far-reaching measure, the Civil Rights bill of 1866. It conferred citizenship on the freedmen, gave United States courts jurisdiction over cases involving violation of any citizen's civil rights, outlawed discriminatory local legislation, and authorized the president to enforce the act with military and naval power. Unlike the Freedmen's Bureau bill, this would affect the Northern as well as ex-slave states.

On March 27, President Johnson vetoed it as an unlawful attempt by Congress to control matters reserved by the constitution to the states. Congress overrode the veto and shortly thereafter, on April 30, 1866, entertained resolutions proposing the Fourteenth Amendment. Section one essentially restated the Civil Rights Act of 1866. However, as Thaddeus Stevens candidly remarked, it placed that law beyond the power of a later Congress to repeal. By June of 1866 the Fourteenth Amendment was submitted to the states. Louisiana's legislature, already adjourned, did not convene in regular session until January, 1867. Governor Wells, by that time thoroughly at odds with the legislative branch, considered the proposed amendment "just and proper" and advised speedy ratification. In response, the conservative General Assembly voted unanimously against it. Many of the
legislators had been prominent in the Confederate army or
government. Section three of the proposed amendment would
bar them from voting or holding office unless pardoned by a
two-thirds vote of each house of Congress. More odious
still, from their point of view, the Fourteenth Amendment
appeared to bestow the suffrage on the ex-slave.12

Louisiana provided the Radicals in Congress with one
more argument for military reconstruction: a race riot. In
the summer of 1866 a faction of Louisiana Republicans sought
to reconvene the 1864 constitutional convention in New Or­
leans in order to secure the ballot for freedmen and to as­
sure themselves of state offices. Federal troops occupied
the city but had no orders to act in case of trouble. City
officials, known to be hostile to the gathering, were ex­
pected to maintain order. A procession of Negroes marched
toward the convention site, setting off a series of con­
frontations with the white citizenry and city police. When
the shooting stopped, thirty-seven Negroes and three whites
lay dead; 119 Negroes and seventeen whites suffered wounds.
The police lost one killed and ten injured.13

12Ibid., 27-36.

13Ficklen, History of Reconstruction, 169; J. G.
Randall and David Donald, The Civil War and Reconstruction
(Boston, 1961), 587-88.
The New Orleans riot, the election of ex-Confederates, the enactment of Black Codes, and the rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment convinced the Radicals in Congress that Southern blacks were not safe in the hands of Southern whites. The Military Reconstruction Acts of 1867 were the result. Collectively, these measures returned the South to military rule; required the states to frame new constitutions providing for Negro suffrage but disqualifying ex-Confederate leaders from voting or holding office; required ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment before a state could be represented in Congress; empowered the military commanders in each district to begin a registration of voters including Negroes, so that suitable constitutions could be adopted without delay, and vested the power of appointment and removal in the military commanders of each district whereas before it had been the president's prerogative.\(^\text{14}\)

The Military Reconstruction Acts grouped the ex-Confederate states into five districts. General Philip H. Sheridan commanded the Fifth District comprised of Louisiana and Texas. Because of his arbitrary policies concerning voter registration and the removal of civil officials (among

\(^{14}\)Randall and Donald, *Civil War and Reconstruction*, 595-600; Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana*, 4-5.
them Governor Wells), Sheridan was soon replaced by General Winfield Scott Hancock. By September, 1867, Louisiana voters, black and white, went to the polls to select delegates to a constitutional convention. The members, half of whom were black, met in New Orleans in November and spent the next three and one-half months framing the new organic law. In April, 1868, Louisiana voters ratified it and chose state officials. Henry Clay Warmoth and Oscar J. Dunn, a Negro, became governor and lieutenant-governor respectively. Meanwhile, Congress passed a law readmitting Louisiana and five other ex-Confederate States to the Union subject to their ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment. By the end of July, 1868, Congress seated Louisiana's representatives, the newly-elected state officers were installed, and the military commander turned the machinery of state government over to civil authorities.\(^\text{15}\)

It was against this background of political, economic and social upheaval that David Boyd sought to reopen and re-vitalize the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning. As already indicated in the Report submitted by the Board to the

General Assembly in January, 1866, the Seminary's first and most pressing need was money. To secure it, David went to New Orleans immediately after Christmas, 1865, to plead with the lawmakers. There he embarked on a second career, lobbying, which lasted as long as his association with the school. Indeed, lobbying often absorbed more of his time and effort than his official duties as superintendent and professor. Successful in his first venture among the politicians, David proclaimed on his return to the piney woods in March, 1866, that "the existence & complete success of the Seminary shd now be considered a final fact."  

David was unduly optimistic. By 1867 the political picture was cloudier than ever. Louisiana's conservative legislators, uncertain as to what lay ahead but fearing the worst, made two-year appropriations for all state institutions, thus insuring the Seminary some income until 1869.  

But well before then the Radical press in New Orleans began to attack the school as a hotbed of unregenerate rebels. In August, 1867, the New Orleans Republican printed a series of

---

16 David Boyd to the Students and Faculty of the Louisiana State Seminary, March 15, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1.

17 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 142-43.
letters signed "Loyalist" which labeled the Seminary "an enclave of the Confederacy." Instead of reflecting "the new order of ideas--one common country, and freedom and equality to all," the institution was a "stronghold of rebel spite and resistance." Secessionists served on the Board; ex-rebel soldiers or their sons comprised the student body; and four ex-Confederate majors made up the academic staff. And, "as if the spite was not stinging enough, the pirate Raphael Semmes was added . . . in derision of all decency, as professor of moral philosophy."18 "Loyalist" followed up his first letter with a second on August 11, 1867. This one outlined the history of the Seminary, charging that fire-eating politicians, "maddened by the venom of secession," distorted congressional intent and acted treacherously when they established a combination seminary of learning and military academy. "Well might the supervisors place with their left hand the often quoted inscription: "By the Liberality of the General Government, the Union, Esto perpetua' over the portal of the seminary while their right hand displayed the dagger that was to murder the Union." "Loyalist"

---

18Letter to the editor signed "Loyalist," New Orleans Republican, August 10, 1867. "Loyalist" sometimes signed himself "Loyalty." The first term is used here throughout.
ended by praising Ex-professor Anthony Vallas for having been an obstacle in the path of the rebel elements at the Seminary during 1860-61.\textsuperscript{19} Finally, a third letter from "Loyalist" accused the Seminary's founders of establishing the school in Rapides Parish in order to protect their sons from contact with humble mechanics, tradesmen, and abolitionist sentiment. Logically, argued "Loyalist," the funds to set up the school should have been used to create a collegiate department of the University of Louisiana in New Orleans. But the "lords of the soil, the lords of cotton and sugar," preferred to locate it in the "fire-eating regions of the Red River . . . in the parish of Rapides, the chief seat of gambling, drunkenness and chivalrous rowdism." The site chosen was too close to Alexandria for the "morals of the place." "Loyalist" concluded by suggesting that the Seminary was some sort of pastoral brothel:

\begin{quote}
We have heard of caravans of ladies invading the seminary, assisting to the drill, importuning the faculty for frequent hops, and even of their spending nights within the sacred precincts of this temple of science. We have heard officers charging one another with keeping a disorderly house, and female neighbors fighting for the privilege of being regarded as the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{19} Letter to the editor signed "Loyalist," New Orleans Republican, August 11, 1867.
favorites of the place.  

The attacks of "Loyalist" did not go unchallenged. The Louisiana Democrat, an Alexandria paper, remembered, sarcastically, that the pre-war "aiders and abettors of Treason" at the Seminary consisted of men like Generals William T. Sherman and G. Mason Graham, the latter the "most uncompromising Union man in the South till hostilities had actually begun." As for Dr. Vallas, the Democrat recalled that "said loyal Doctor used to preach secession in his class-room and altogether blew the loudest 'secesh' horn in these parts till his treachery to and sudden desertion from the Southern cause in 1861." "Loyalist," the paper concluded, must be counted "a fool or a knave, or perhaps both." The charges of immoral conduct at the Seminary, were probably not taken seriously by even the most ardent Radicals. But "Loyalist's" attacks on the school and its management for its

---

20 Letter to the editor signed "Loyalist," New Orleans Republican, August 24, 1867. If the womenfolk of Rapides, singly or in caravans, spent many nights within the "sacred precincts" of the Seminary, they must have been a hardy lot. The cadets slept on the floor until 1886. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 458-9.

21 Alexandrie (La.) Democrat, August 21, 1867. Following "Loyalist's" attack on Seminary morals and Rapides women, the outraged editor of the Democrat branded "Loyalist" a "liar and a defamer . . . there is but one code of honor applicable--a good stout cowhide well applied to his back." Ibid., September 11, 1867.
frankly Confederate character were certainly well-founded. David's first academic board was indeed composed of "four rebel majors"—himself, Venable, West, and Cunningham. They were soon outranked, as "Loyalist" noted, when Admiral Semmes joined the faculty in January, 1867. What "Loyalist" did not know was that David also tried unsuccess fully to hire General Joseph Wheeler and the naval officer, Matthew F. Maury in the fall of 1866.

Members of the Seminary Board were just as "unreconstructed" as the faculty. At least one supervisor, Bartholomew Egan, emphatically drew the line at what "Loyalist" called "the new order of ideas--one common country, and freedom and equality to all." Speaking at commencement exercises in June, 1866, Dr. Egan declared that slavery was dead and he would not restore it if he could. But, he cried, "God has never designed for them, and we can never concede to

---

22 Professor Venable, a Virginian, was certainly unrepentent. In July, 1866, he wrote David from their home state of the joy he felt at finding Virginia so "united and dignified" in misfortune. "The Federal government," he confided, "is rotten and powerless. Virginia with the eye of an eagle and power of a lion stands ready to spring on her the moment her foreign complications may justify a hope of success. It is as true now as it ever was--the first gun fired at Fort Sumter destroyed the Union." R. M. Venable to David Boyd, July 7, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12. The "foreign complication" involved France and Maximilian in Mexico.

23 D. F. Boyd to S. B. Robinson, November 13, 1866, in
them, political or social equality. Never! Never!" Two years later, in August, 1863, board member G. Mason Graham was equally adamant. In his reply to a prospective professor he wrote: "We of the school are frankly a white man's party, and negrophilists [sic], or those in sympathy with them, can find no favor in our eyes." Describing himself as the Negro's friend, Graham wrote that he would uphold the black man in "all civil rights, but never in Political and Social Equality . . . and this . . . is the general feeling of the gentlemen here." 

One feature which rendered the Seminary potentially very vulnerable to political pressure was the beneficiary system. "Beneficiaries" were cadets who received a Seminary

Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, November 28, 1866; Bartholomew Egan to David Boyd, November 20, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha file, Box 8. Semmes joined the faculty in January, 1867, and left a few weeks later to become editor of the Memphis Bulletin. E. Merton Coulter states that Semmes was "forced out" of the Seminary by political pressure, but Elizabeth C. Bott attributes his short stay to the disparity in age between Semmes and the other professors. Coulter, South During Reconstruction, 196; Elizabeth C. Bott, "Admiral Semmes, C. W. N.," Louisiana State University Bulletin, II (1911), 8, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1910-13, Box 21.

24 Commencement Address by Dr. Bartholomew Egan, Louisiana State Seminary and Military Academy, June 29, 1866, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, 1860-69, Printed pamphlets, Box 20.

education at state expense. When the school began operation, the state supported only sixteen beneficiary cadets. The rest paid tuition and board. But very shortly the legislature increased the number of beneficiaries to fifty-eight. By 1867, just before military reconstruction began in Louisiana, the lawmakers raised the number to ninety-eight and agreed to appropriate $400 each for their support. Because state-supported cadets comprised so much of the Seminary student body (and brought in such a large part of its revenue), and because parish police juries or, in New Orleans, the district school board, designated state cadets, some feared that black youth would be sent to the Seminary if Negroes won control of local government. R. M. Lusher, a former state Superintendent of Education, a member of the Seminary Board and director of the Peabody fund in Louisiana, was convinced that Radical politicians meant to win control of the Seminary and integrate its student body. He informed David in August, 1867, of a Radical political meeting at which ex-professor Anthony Vallas urged the new "mixed" school board of New Orleans to set aside the list of beneficiaries named by their predecessors. "You can readily infer,  

26 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 27-28, 140, 152.
therefore, to what the 'Prof.' aspires--the Superintendence of Negro Cadets! Cannot your friend Sherman crush him?"

Lusher advised David to have his accounts in order in case the "vandals" seized the school. 27

Lusher's pessimism concerning Radical intentions was shared by many friends and creditors of the Seminary. Stationer James A. Gresham of New Orleans wrote David of his fears while the Radical constitutional convention was in session in the Crescent City. But David thought Gresham took the convention's threats too seriously. The delegates were "merely making bloody laws; what about the carrying out?"

In any case, David doubted that the Federal government would support extremism in the states. Congress, he predicted, "will show weakness in the knees" and "the Republican Party cannot carry the north at the next Presidential election if it holds to the Military bill for Southern reconstruction." 28

Another New Orleans firm, Swarbrick and Company, manifested its uneasiness about the future by shutting off the Seminary's credit in the fall of 1867. Even worse, it

27 R. M. Lusher to David Boyd, August 30, 1867, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10.

28 David Boyd to James A. Graham, November 24, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, Vol. I, 1865-68, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
published the fact in various newspapers around the state. Because Swarbrick was the school's oldest and largest supplier, its action must have disturbed David considerably. Nevertheless, he responded calmly by delivering Swarbrick's manager, J. D. Kenton, a mild lecture on the firm's bad business judgement. By denying the school credit and publishing the fact locally, he argued, Swarbrick merely advertised its own financial instability and pessimism about the future. If the Seminary were liquidated, Swarbrick, as the largest creditor, would be the first to get its money. But, David concluded, the longer the school operated, the better chance Swarbrick and everybody else would have to recover the full amount due them. Meanwhile, the school would cheerfully pay cash.29

Privately, David was more disturbed about the Seminary's future than his letters to Swarbrick and Gresham indicated. Late in November, 1867, he wrote to Major W. A. Freret, a New Orleans engineer and member of the Board of Supervisors, asking for as much information about political developments as the major could supply. David doubted that the school would be interfered with "except by due process

29 David Boyd to J. D. Kenton of Swarbrick and Company, November 25, 1867, ibid.
of law growing out of the new constitution." Meanwhile, he hoped that General Winfield S. Hancock, administrator of the Fifth Military District, would act "conservatively." The Seminary, he told Freret, had "enough trouble getting along without Radical interference." 30

The "trouble" to which David referred was financial. As already indicated, the bulk of the Seminary's income came from state appropriations, state support of the beneficiary cadets, and the annual interest on the school's endowment fund. All were paid in the form of state warrants, not cash. Because political and economic conditions were so unstable in 1867-68, the warrants almost never brought more than two-thirds of their face value when converted to currency. Of $100,000 appropriated for 1867-68, the Seminary realized only $68,179. 31 Even that amount required herculean efforts by David in his extracurricular roles as lobbyist and broker. In less than a year he made three trips to New Orleans from Alexandria to secure and cash state warrants for the Seminary. One trip, made shortly after military authorities suspended civil government in the state, was especially frustrating.

30 David Boyd to Major W. H. Freret, November 27, 1867, ibid.

31 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 142-45.
David wrote a New Orleans creditor in November, 1867, that he hated to return to the city "to continue my drudgery of last summer: the honoring of the State's warrants." But in December another $8,000 would be due. "Oh, if they cld be cashed in greenbacks, what a happy man I'd be."  

The December, 1867, trip was not entirely "drudgery." In addition to cashing warrants for sixty-five cents on the dollar, David managed to do some personal shopping and to attend the theater.  

Three months later, in March, 1868, he was back in the Crescent City. This time, with the help of James Gresham, the school's stationer, and a New Orleans Board member, W. C. Black, David cashed warrants for seventy cents on the dollar. He also managed to secure the school's annuity for 1867 but did not cash it because he could not get favorable terms. On his return to the Seminary in April, 1868, he told the vice-president of the Board of Supervisors, W. L. Sanford, that he thought the school could "hobble along" financially until the end of the term in June. Meanwhile, the Radical constitutional convention, in session

32 David Boyd to James A. Gresham, November 24, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.

33 Memorandum Book for 1867-68, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Manuscript Volumes, Box 22.
since November, 1867, completed its work. Louisiana voters went to the polls to ratify it and to select state officers on April 16 and 17. David was glad to see how hard Rapides citizens were working for the election of non-Radicals. But he doubted that Robert M. Lusher, a Seminary Board member and a conservative candidate for state Superintendent of Public Education, could defeat his Radical opponent, Reverend T. W. Conway. "However," he wrote Board member Sanford on election day, "I have a presentiment that the Seminary will not be interfered with, if we have anything of fair legislation."34

David's optimism was not shared. On May 16, 1868, the Board of Supervisors met in New Orleans and adopted the following resolution:

As the Board of Supervisors of the Lou^a State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy . . . is about to adjourn, it may be to meet no more, We the assembled thereof are not willing to do so without leaving on record some token of our sense of what is due to Colonel D. F. Boyd by this Board, and by the people of the State of Louisiana, for the clear manner in which he has acquitted himself in the discharge of all the various and arduous duties of his different and combined positions of Superintendent, Treasurer and Professor.

The Board ended its resolution by thanking David for his

34David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, April 16, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.
"earnest, zealous, untiring, faithful and self-sacrificing devotion" and sent him a copy of their action.\(^{35}\)

The Board of Supervisors was too quick to despair. It was true that carpetbaggers, scalawags and blacks would soon control the state. It was also true that Louisiana was about to begin a period of political and economic turmoil from which she would not emerge for many years. But for four and one-half of those years, or until 1873, the Seminary did not fare too badly. In many ways, it enjoyed more generous state support and less political interference than it had before the war and than it would after a more parsimonious and more "business oriented" state government resumed control in 1877. The reasons are many. For one thing, the Seminary was too far out of the mainstream, New Orleans, to interest the politicians. David realized this as early as November, 1867, when he informed a New Orleans friend that one reason he stayed away from the city was to avoid attracting Radical attention to the institution.\(^{36}\) For another, the Seminary had effective defenders in the legislature even after Radicals won control of the state government in 1868. One of

\(^{35}\)Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, May 16, 1868.

\(^{36}\)David Boyd to James A. Gresham, November 24, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.
these, Dr. J. C. Egan, represented the Twentieth Senatorial District. A friend of David's and a son of Board member Dr. Bartholomew Egan, Dr. J. C. Egan wrote an account thirty-five years later in which he described the legislative horse-trading by which conservatives, Radicals and Negroes managed to subvert the intent of the constitution of 1868. The Radical constitution of 1868 did not mention the Seminary by name, but two articles relative to state supported institutions of learning were certainly applicable. Article 135 outlawed discrimination in any institution of learning established by the state and prohibited the creation of any school for the sole use of one race. Article 142 authorized state establishment of a university in New Orleans provided it did not discriminate among its students on any grounds other than ability. The trick was to observe the letter if not the spirit of the constitution. Dr. Egan recalled that "all the true people" of Louisiana wanted to provide schools for both races "without bringing upon us the untoward consequences which would follow an attempt at mixed schools." Only the most doctrinaire, like state Superintendent of Public Education T. W. Conway, insisted upon integration. In

37Fleming, Louisiana State University, 153; Constitution of Louisiana, 1868, pp. 26-27.
the legislative session of 1868 Superintendent Conway submitted a bill which would place all state-established and incorporated institutions under state control, require integration in all public schools, and make attendance compulsory. The bill was defeated. The next year a similar Conway-sponsored bill passed, but its administrative features made it unworkable. Governor Warmoth asked the legislature to frame a new law. In March of 1870, a public education bill was finally enacted. Egan described it as a compromise because, he claimed, it provided that "one or more public schools shall be taught in each district," with the distinct understanding that one would be set up for whites and one for blacks. Furthermore, the law left the Seminary under the control of its own Board of Supervisors by not granting control over it to the superintendent of public education. Another act passed in 1870 appropriated $35,000 to Straight University, which was exclusively black. In Egan's words, "By assisting the colored people in all their enterprises presented for support, we finally secured their cooperation in voting on all measures for our own race without conflict or clash."

38J. C. Egan, Appendix to Gunby, "Life and Services of David French Boyd," 31-33; Fleming, Louisiana State
Finally, the Seminary managed to escape political interference during the first years of Reconstruction precisely because it played politics so well. In the summer of 1868 David Boyd made two trips to New Orleans in order to discover what effect the state's Radical administration might have on the Seminary. He came away convinced that Governor Warmoth and Superintendent of Education T. W. Conway had no plans to interfere with the operation of the school. Governor Warmoth particularly impressed him as being very favorably disposed toward it. But David was practical enough to realize that some gesture of political accommodation might provide the Seminary with additional insurance against future interference. While in New Orleans he met and talked with Dr. Francis V. Hopkins, a native of New England and a Republican. Hopkins had been teaching for years in the New Orleans high school, but because the legislature was considering Superintendent Conway's "mixed school" bill, he was afraid he would soon be out of a job. Having

154-56. Egan commented that David was a principle architect of the legislative compromise and hence, "perhaps to him, more than any other Southern man, is due the credit of inaugurating the free school system, which allowed one or more schools in each district, which had in view the purpose of keeping whites and blacks separate, and which eliminated from the control of the Superintendent of Public Education any control over the State Seminary."
heard that a vacancy existed at the Seminary, he applied for the position by letter, included his credentials, and mentioned several prominent Radical politicians as references. His letter also inquired about the Board members in great detail and seemed to suggest that if Governor Warmoth named a new Board, he (Hopkins) might be considered for the post of superintendent. David, to whom Hopkins sent the letter, understood perfectly. He submitted the application to the Board for its consideration and, in a covering letter to Vice-President W. L. Sanford, he advised that Hopkins be appointed. It might be "prudent," he wrote, to elect Hopkins professor of chemistry as the "cheapest way" to placate the Radicals. Meanwhile, General G. Mason Graham wrote to Hopkins stating the Seminary's position flatly. The Seminary administrators had always sought to keep politics out of the school. But their "head is in the lion's mouth." They might have to exercise a little "policy." If the Board could secure some "qualified gentleman of conservative and liberal views" on the faculty, or on the Board, and if the gentleman were a Republican, it might be the

---

39 David Boyd to F. V. Hopkins, August 3, 1868; David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, August 6, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.
"right thing to do." Hopkins responded that he shared Graham's sentiments and, a few days later, his appointment was announced in an Alexandria newspaper.

Throughout his administration Governor Warmoth manifested in numerous ways the good will he had for the state Seminary. When vacancies occurred on the Board of Supervisors, he filled them with people suggested by Seminary officials. When the legislature considered Seminary appropriations, he urged that they be generous. When Radicals attempted to send black cadets to the Seminary, he dissuaded them lest they break up the school. Finally, when he reported to the legislature on the conduct of the school, he praised the academic board for its "zeal, energy and fidelity" and the superintendent for his carefully and competently...

40 G. Mason Graham to F. V. Hopkins, August 4, 1868, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6. By 1869 it apparently was necessary to make another concession to "policy." Harry Lott was added to the Board of Supervisors as one of the three members from Rapides Parish. (The others were General G. Mason Graham and W. L. Sanford). In 1868 Lott represented Rapides in the first Warmoth legislature. A Negro Republican, he introduced a bill to repeal Article 95 of the Louisiana Civil Code which prevented marriages between Negroes and whites. Louisiana House Journal, 1868, p. 89.

41 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 152; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, August 12, 1868.
prepared reports. David appreciated the governor's interest. Governor Warmoth wrote him in December, 1868, for information about the Seminary so that he might mention the school in his annual message. David responded with thanks. This was the first time a chief executive of Louisiana had called upon the superintendent of the Seminary in order to present its needs to the legislature. Shortly after his first meeting with Governor Warmoth, David made a comment which aptly summarized relations between the State House and the Seminary until 1873: "So far as my self-respect would admit, I have been conciliatory and courteous to the Radical leaders which may possibly have something to do with their conciliatory course towards us. A little politeness does not cost much, and often brings a rich return."

---

42 Fleming, *Louisiana State University*, 158-59; Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1868, p. 8; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, January 13, 1869.

43 David Boyd to Governor H. C. Warmoth, December 15, 1868, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1.

44 David Boyd to Dr. S. O. Scruggs, member of the Board of Supervisors, August 23, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68. In 1941 Leroy Boyd's estate donated a copy of Governor Warmoth's book, *War, Politics and Reconstruction: Stormy Days in Louisiana* (New York, 1930), to the Boyd Special Collection in the Louisiana Room of the Louisiana State University Library. On page 270 Leroy scrawled in pencil: "My father Col. David French Boyd, a Southerner and a Democrat, said many times that Gov. Warmoth was the best
The good will of Governor Warmoth and the relatively liberal appropriations by the Radical legislature certainly made David's task as superintendent more pleasant. But the institution's perennial problem, lack of income, continued to be his major concern. In his annual Report for 1866, David suggested at least two methods by which the Seminary might balance its books. First, the legislature could increase the number of beneficiary cadets and the amount appropriated for their support. Second, the state could apply for the grant provided under the Morrill Act of July, 1862. The Morrill Act made the proceeds from the sale of Federally-owned public lands available to the states for the purpose of establishing agricultural and mechanical colleges. If the Morrill funds were added to the Seminary endowment, and the Seminary became the nucleus for the proposed agricultural and mechanical college, the institution would be considerably less dependent on "the uncertainty of annual Legislative aid."45

During the legislative session of 1867, the solons governor Louisiana ever had."

45 Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1866, pp. 11, 14. W. L. Sanford, vice-president of the Board of Supervisors, prepared a separate report, dated March 1, 1867, which concurred with David's regarding the beneficiary cadets and the Morrill Act grant. It was printed with the Report of 1866.
approved both of David's proposals, at least in part. They increased the number and support of beneficiary cadets and they applied for funds under the terms of the Morrill Act of 1862. But the session adjourned before a bill to confer the agricultural and mechanical funds on the Seminary could achieve final passage. David was undismayed. In his Report for 1867, submitted in January, 1868, he argued strongly for the fund on the grounds that it would be foolish to duplicate educational facilities. The Seminary already had buildings, professors, laboratory equipment, and a library. Besides, he pointed out, all the Northern and Western states with few exceptions, had bestowed the Morrill grant on existing institutions. David's plea, although supported by Governor Warmoth, did not convince the lawmakers. Ten years passed before the Seminary obtained the Morrill grant funds.

Meanwhile, David cast about for other possible sources of income. In 1867 an American-born English banker, George Peabody, set up a fund of $3,000,000 for the purpose of promoting education in the South. The philanthropist appointed a Board of Trustees who in turn selected Barnas Sears, President of Brown University, to administer the fund.

---

46 Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1867, p. 6, 12.
David made several efforts to obtain Peabody money for the Seminary in 1867 but letters from Dr. Sears seemed to indicate that the school was not eligible for a grant. Because Peabody funds were available to teacher training or "normal" schools, David thought the Seminary did qualify. Beneficiary cadets, he pointed out, were required by law to teach for two years following graduation. He appealed to the Peabody Board of Trustees but again his request was denied.47

In April, 1868, David tried a new approach. In a letter to Dr. Sears he requested a loan from the Peabody fund. For collateral he offered Seminary annuity warrants. All of their previous correspondence, wrote David, convinced him that the Seminary could not hope for a grant. It would do no good to put forward the same arguments, however excellent they might be. But the school needed money at once. Could it not obtain a loan until political conditions settled down and its warrants could be cashed more advantageously? Then, in a characteristic burst of frankness which probably did little to advance his case, David pointed out to Sears that the Peabody fund and the Seminary sought the same

ends: the education of indigent youth to be teachers.

You have a preference for "Normal Schools." We are as much a Normal School in every respect but the name (which I don't like, and hope we will never bear) as you can possibly build up in the South-west. Not one young man out of any five, educated at your Normal Schools will teach longer than three years in this country; nor can you expect them to remain teachers, when other callings are so much more lucrative.

As to "Normal Methods" of teaching, I beg leave most respectfully, to say that it is best to leave every educated man of good sense and discretion to adopt his own method. Too many men, in my humble judgement, are allowed to teach school who have no common sense; for them only is a "method" needed in, as well as out, of a school room.48

David did not expect much success but a month later, in May, 1868, Robert M. Lusher became the sub agent of the Peabody fund in Louisiana. After discussions with Sears, Lusher was authorized to award $1000 to the Seminary if the school would create a "Normal Department." When apprised of the conditions David responded bitterly. It took six pages for him to tell Lusher what he thought of "the useless & objectionable conditions" proposed by Dr. Sears. "What earthly good," demanded David scornfully, "could come of a lecture once a week or once a month on the subject of school teaching?" He was glad that the Seminary did not indulge in such "superficial talk." David submitted the Sears proposal to the Seminary

48 David Boyd to Barnas Sears, April 17, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.
Board but with a recommendation that it be rejected. 49

David Boyd became superintendent of the Seminary in 1865. He would serve, with the exception of four years, until 1886. But by 1869, when fire destroyed the building and forced the school to move to Baton Rouge, the broad outlines of David's administrative style were already emerging. First, he was totally immersed in his many-faceted job. At the Seminary he was officially professor, treasurer, and superintendent. Less formally he was clerk, chief disciplinary officer, and sometimes even steward. When the legislature met he went to New Orleans. There, besides acting as the Seminary's purchasing agent, he also served as its lobbyist and broker for its securities. It is not surprising that very early in his tenure he asked the Board of Supervisors to relieve him of the treasurership and part of his professorial responsibilities. But two years later, in 1868, he was still "teaching 4 hours a day--such classes as Calculus, Analytical Geometry, Advanced Algebra & Virgil, together with my duties as Sup't et c." It was, he wrote to a friend, "too

49 Robert M. Lusher to David Boyd, May 7, 1868, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha file, Box 10; David Boyd to the Board of Supervisors, April 18, 1868; David Boyd to Robert M. Lusher, June 1, 1868 in Boyd (David F.) Letters-books, 1865-68.
Another characteristic which appeared early in David's administrative career was his tendency to draft very ambitious programs for the expansion of the institution. The Seminary ended its first postwar session with five professors and 108 cadets. But even before summer recess the Board named four additional professors for the coming academic year. Commenting on the appointments and the Seminary's prospects, a local paper boasted:

The Academic Board . . . is not excelled in ability by any other Faculty of the same size on the continent. With such an institution holding forth such inducements, we cannot see why parents should send their children abroad for Education. We shall therefore expect to see the Institution crowded to its utmost capacity the coming season. Its friends have no reason to complain of its success during the past session. There were 108 matriculates . . . one half as many as at the University of Virginia, the leading institution in the South.\

In November the same paper reported 150 students enrolled and more expected. The editor called for the appointment of

---

50 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1866, p. 9; David Boyd to Robert M. Lusher, June 1, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68. David's salary for the year was $3,000 plus quarters in 1867.

51 Alexandria (La.) Democrat, June 20, 1866. The optimism and the prose style are so familiar that one suspects David added part time journalism to all his other duties.
additional faculty and promised the construction of more facilities if that proved necessary.52

As 1866 drew to a close David was optimistic. He expected the Seminary to become "the University of the Southwest." With that in mind he persuaded the Board of Supervisors to appoint Admiral Raphael Semmes and General Joseph Wheeler to the academic board.53 The local editor was ecstatic when Semmes accepted.

A thrill of satisfaction must naturally follow the announcement of this valuable acquisition to the faculty . . . As Washington College may now boast of its Lee, the pride and admiration of the Confederate Army, so may the Louisiana State Seminary now boast of its Semmes, the subject of eulogy wherever daring deeds and mighty achievements upon ocean's treacherous flood are made the theme of either song or story."54

In his Report for the year 1866, David noted with pride that the Seminary began the year with only five professors and a balance of $1,798.42. But as of January 1, 1867, it boasted ten professors and one assistant professor "being the largest and among the ablest academic faculties in the South." In addition, as 1867 began, there were 164 cadets enrolled and

52 Ibid., November 14, November 28, 1866.

53 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Supervisors, October 24, October 28, 1866; David Boyd to S. B. Robinson, November 13, 1866, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

54 Alexandria (La.) Democrat, December 19, 1866.
a balance in the treasury above all indebtedness of almost $6,000. Unfortunately, by March of 1867, when the 1866 Report went to the printer, the situation had begun to deteriorate. Due to deaths (two), dismissals (eleven) and resignations, mainly for lack of funds (21), only 130 cadets remained. David estimated that at the "present rate of maintenance cost per cadet," the Seminary would finish the term $3,500 in the red. The only way it could break even was to secure 200 cadets by July, 1867, and that seemed unlikely. Therefore, if the legislature, then in session, did not "liberally" aid the Seminary, David feared it would be necessary to cut costs by reducing the staff. He left it to the Board to decide whether this could be done "without injustice" before the close of the term. But, he concluded, "it is not the less my duty to report that the number of cadets should reach two hundred to justify the present number of professors."

The 1866 Report illustrates some of David's major qualities as an educational administrator. At the same time it points up some shortcomings. He was ambitious, far-seeing, and intent upon securing the best faculty and facilities

---

55 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1866, pp. 6-10.
possible for the Seminary. But he also tried to accomplish too much too soon. He was too impatient of the financial limitations of the state, often in his Reports and correspondence sneering at the general disinterest of the public in supporting what he called "a college of the first grade."

Besides an overlarge academic board, the Report for 1866 lists expenditures of over $3,000 for the library and the laboratory and another $4,200 for "contingencies." The school certainly needed books and professors but whether it needed as many, especially at the risk of running a deficit, was questioned by at least one Board member. Dr. Bartholomew Egan asked David to excuse him for volunteering advice, but he was a "warm personal friend" of David's and the school. He asked whether David, in his "earnest zeal" had forgotten the old Latin Maxim: Festina Lente or, go ahead slowly. The legislature and the people, he cautioned, would support the Seminary only up to a certain point. Egan saw no necessity to remake the Seminary into either a full-scale university or military school "at present."

It may well have the discipline of the latter and the literary advantages of the former without assuming the character of either exclusively. It seems to me . . . you have professors enough for three hundred students.

56Ibid., 7.
... My only fear is that in your great zeal you may run too far ahead of public opinion. I have written this reluctantly but from my great regard for you and my entire confidence in the purity of your purpose. I feel that I owe you the counsel of a friend. 57

Circumstances, such as the uncertainty surrounding the beginnings of Radical Reconstruction, forced the Seminary to retrench. In his Report of 1867 David explained that the school had gone through a "year of trial." It had been threatened with destruction from political turmoil, bankruptcy, and epidemic. But it was still alive; it still had six professors, one assistant professor, and one instructor. David looked forward to the day when it could again support a large academic board. "Someday, full of years and usefulness ... its halls filled with hundreds of students, it too will be called one of the great schools of America." 58

Meanwhile, David pointed out "many deficiencies" in the course of study. The Seminary did not teach astronomy, mineralogy, geology, botany, physiology, history, or constitutional law. There should "very soon" be a "distinct professorship" of English language and literature and, if money

57 Bartholomew Egan to David Boyd, November 20, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8.

58 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1867, pp. 5-10.
became available, of music.\textsuperscript{59}

The Seminary's financial resources may have been limited; David's plans for its future were not. A few months later he confided his ambitions to his cousin, James Boyd:

I intend to advance and spread the scientific departments of the Seminary till there is nothing like them in the South, not even at the Va. Mil. Institute, which I believe to be much in advance, scientifically, of any school in Va. The University has been very slow, too slow, in increasing her no. of chairs . . . of study. She is today but little in advance of where Mr. Jefferson left her in 1826.\textsuperscript{60}

Apparently, Dr. Bartholomew Egan's maxim, \textit{Festina Lente}, was not one of Latin Professor Boyd's favorites.

Finally, very early in his administrative career, David developed such an extreme devotion to the Seminary's well-being that he could not understand the lesser interest of other people. In 1865, G. Mason Graham commented on David's "singleness of purpose."\textsuperscript{61} Twenty years later he pleaded with him to "divest yourself of that . . . diffidence and self-sacrificing disposition which has so long

\textsuperscript{59}\textit{Ibid.}, 10.

\textsuperscript{60}David Boyd to James Boyd, August 22, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.

\textsuperscript{61}G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, November 13, 1865, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letter, 1854-85, Box 6. Graham was chastizing David, who in his zeal to build the school was "trenching on the authority of the Board."
influenced you in your absorbing devotion, for now a quarter of a century, to the maintenance and welfare of this school, to the most serious and ruinous prejudice of the interests of your family and yourself." David also had a tendency to equate support for the Seminary with patriotism and loyalty to the state. When wealthy merchants and planters sent their sons out of state to another college, David chastized them in local newspapers. He admitted it was worth $500 a year just to gaze upon Robert E. Lee at Washington University. But that did not absolve citizens of their duty to Louisiana.

When four professors prepared to resign in 1867 because of the Seminary's uncertain finances, David saw no need to close the school. To one Board member he wrote: "All that is necessary is for the whole staff to make up its mind to save the school, be willing to work with promise of pay if no money is available." Nor could David understand why the faculty chose to leave the Seminary during summer vacations. To build support for the school they should be willing to

62G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, undated, quoted in Fleming, Louisiana State University, 353.

63Alexandria (La.) Democrat, August 14, 1867.

64David Boyd to G. Mason Graham, May 28, 1867, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-83, Box 4.
"travel through the State and work for the good and glory of our school as hard in July and August as in February and March." But the professors, for the most part young, single, and from Virginia, found the Seminary, outside the classroom, "intolerably dull." There was nothing to do, one of them recalled, but take walks in the woods or to Alexandria which he described as "not inspiring." Because they had few ties to Louisiana, the young men "naturally gravitated" back to Virginia. But David did not give up. To William Sanford he declared: "All I have to say is money or no money, for God's sake don't stop the school nor give up the State cadets who are the great pillars of our support. . . . I am sure there is no need for stopping it. . . . and upon my opinion I am willing to stake my all in life."

The broad outlines of David Boyd's educational theories also began to emerge in the years immediately following the Civil War. David himself was a product of private, preparatory schools and an aristocratic university education.

---

65 Ibid.


Yet in his first postwar Reports he championed public, tax-supported education, at all levels, and promoted it in particular for "indigent" youths. His own training consisted of "classical" studies like Latin and mathematics, yet he repeatedly expressed the desire to make the Seminary "the leading scientific institution of the south." His educational background was completely lacking in military training, yet he became an ardent advocate of "the military system" as the best method of instilling discipline and responsibility in Louisiana youth. He did not renounce the older, traditional programs of university education; rather, he sought to keep the best of the old and add to it studies which would meet the needs of a more "practical" age. What he hoped to provide for Louisiana was a state-supported institution which would train young men "mentally, morally, and physically," to assume their responsibilities to themselves and their state.

By 1868 he thought the Louisiana Seminary

---

68Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1866, p. 11; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1867, p. 10.

69David Boyd to James Boyd, August 22, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.

70Fleming, Louisiana State University, 349-50.

David's vision of what a university ought to be was aptly expressed in his Report for 1869. Quoting the "noble Ezra Cornell," he urged, "Let us have an institution where any person can find instruction in any study!" Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1869, p. 21.
was performing that task. The school offered bachelors degrees in both "literary" and "scientific" subjects. It also provided a degree in civil engineering and, for those who chose to enroll for only one year, there was a commercial school which taught bookkeeping, commercial arithmetic, and penmanship. The state supported ninety-eight cadets and, upon graduation, these young men pledged to teach school in Louisiana for two years. This, thought David, was "the handsomest feature of the institution." To those like Barnes Sears, administrator of the Peabody Fund, who considered the school deficient in teacher training because it did not provide "methods courses," David responded heatedly: "I contend that for the subjects taught this is today the best and most thorough school in America." He admitted that was a large claim but predicted that others would agree when the beneficiary cadets went out to teach and were compared with graduates of

Mr. Sears Normal schools--trained in his most approved 'methods' and fed upon the latest Yankee texts . . .

Our methods will make men of the boyd of La. I do not believe his will. Our training is natural . . .; his is artificial, cramps the intellect and fails to

---

71Prospectus of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy, July 1, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1859-69, Box 19.
expand the soul. Our system is West Point and Va.; his is New England.  

David also thought a young man's education took place outside as well as inside the school room. To that end he expended relatively large amounts of the Seminary's meager income on books, paintings, prints, zoological and geological exhibits. When the school reopened in 1865, nothing remained from prewar days but the bare walls. David proceeded to rebuild the library and refit the chemistry and "natural philosophy" departments. In 1866 he spent over $8,000 on books and "scientific equipment." For the next year he asked the legislature to appropriate an additional $10,000. The library claimed 2,000 volumes in January, 1867. By the following year the total rose to 3,660. Much of the increase, David noted, was due to the generosity of Senator John Sherman and General William T. Sherman who had copies of all significant government publications sent to the school.  

David Boyd to Robert M. Lusher, May 13, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68. David's animus for Sears can be traced to the latter's refusal to grant the seminary $1,000 in Peabody funds unless it instituted a "Normal" department.  

Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1866, pp. 7, 13; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1867, pp. 5, 11.
continued to purchase expensive reference works for the library. Early in 1869 a joint committee of the legislature visited the school and inspected its facilities. The Committee thought the library and "philosophical" apparatus were adequate for the number of students enrolled. But David disagreed. In his annual request for Seminary appropriations he budgeted a minimum of $5,000 for books and equipment. 74 Meanwhile, he appealed to the general public for mineral, geological and fossil specimens. He solicited gifts for the library and commissioned portraits of G. Mason Graham and General William T. Sherman for the ballroom. 75 Finally, because David thought the cadets could acquire something from the "company of ladies" not available in books, the Seminary scheduled dances on appropriate occasions. In his Prospectus for 1867 David noted, "The 'Hop' has worked like a charm during the past two sessions in polishing the manners and refining the feelings of the cadets. 75

74 Report of the Joint Committee of the Legislature to Investigate Charitable Institutions, January, 1869, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1860-69, Box 20.

75 Prospectus, July 1, 1867, ibid., Printed Items, 1859-69, Box 19; Alexandria (La.) Democrat, July 1, August 12, 1868.

76 Prospectus, July 1, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1859-69, Box 19.
In matters of discipline David Boyd's ideas were obviously influenced by those of his famous predecessor, W. T. Sherman. Sherman believed firmly in strict adherence to duty, stern rules and regulations, and full authority, subject only to approval of the Board, for the superintendent to govern the institution. However, the Board revised the regulations in the summer of 1860. Thereafter, the superintendent and the academic board shared powers in determining such matters as expulsion from the Seminary. The same rules applied when David became superintendent after the Civil War. If a cadet earned enough demerits and the academic board recommended it, the superintendent could dismiss him from the institution. As a last resort, the cadet could appeal to the Board of Supervisors. Sherman objected to procedure on the ground that it made the superintendent a pawn, subject to pressure from both professors and supervisors. He thought it would encourage student disrespect for the superintendent. By 1866, David had come to the same conclusion. A rebellious cadet, Stockton, repeatedly reported by the commandant, J. A. A. West, was dismissed on

77 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 92-93.

78 Ibid.
recommendation of the academic board. One hundred and eleven cadets signed a petition objecting to Stockton's expulsion and demanding that the conduct of the commandant be investigated. The petition was given to Stockton to use as he saw fit. The commandant then submitted his resignation, not wishing to injure the school. But David refused to accept it. He did relieve West of his duties as commandant, but not until he met with the cadets, pointing out to them the illegality of their action in presenting the petition to Stockton rather than to the superintendent. He gave them until the next day to reconsider and to try to "annul the bad effects of the certificate." He also cited the regulations which allowed Stockton to appeal directly to the Board if he thought he had been wronged. If, by the next day, the cadets still thought Stockton had been treated unjustly, David would review the entire case, and, as the regulations required, submit the dispute to the Board of Supervisors. The following day all but eleven of the original petitioners signed a second one which admitted their error in the use made of the first. David accepted it. The recalcitrants submitted a petition of their own which did not meet David's specifications. "Their conduct was mutiny, and the
penalty was summary dismissal."

Sherman's prediction proved correct. A few days later David received a letter from a friend in the community, William Seay. Seay was a lawyer, politician, and, for a brief period during the Civil War, had served as superintendent of the Seminary. He begged David to reconsider the expulsion of the eleven cadets. David's authority had been vindicated and the boys had been sufficiently humiliated. The plea succeeded. On January 4, 1867, David issued a general order reinstating five of the eleven dismissed cadets. They promised to obey the rules and admitted the error of their ways. David's order also offered pardon and reinstatement to the others if they made similar reparation. Throughout the Stockton affair David made his support for and belief in Commandant West's correct conduct extremely clear to cadets and the Board as well. Nevertheless, Professor West was not restored to the post of commandant. He subsequently resigned his professorship, explaining that he could not remain at the Seminary if he could not resume his old position. Months later he thanked David for his support.

79 David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, December 21, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1.

80 W. E. Seay to David Boyd, December 21, 1866, ibid., Alpha File, Box 11; General Order of the Superintendent,
"The consciousness that you appreciated me is the highest recollection of my life."\textsuperscript{31} David's attitude concerning the Stockton affair was best expressed when he forwarded the case to the Board. "I have made this report to the Board of Supervisors," he write, "only because it is made my duty by the regulations in such cases."\textsuperscript{32} Years later, when he drafted the bill which provided for the merger of the Louisiana State University and the Agricultural and Mechanical College, he carefully included clauses which required the Board to delegate to the President "sufficient authority to enable him to maintain proper discipline and good order" and declared that in "all matters of discipline and relating to the conduct and behavior of students or cadets the president alone, and not the faculty or any professor, shall decide and act."\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31}David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, December 21, 1866, \textit{ibid.}, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1; J. A. A. West to D. F. Boyd, January 15, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11; John A. A. West to David Boyd, August 24, 1867, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12.

\textsuperscript{32}David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, December 21, 1866, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1.

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Acts} of Louisiana, 1877, No. 145, Section 22.
The Stockton case was not the only instance of insubordination and infraction of the rules which David had to face while the Seminary was located in Rapides. It was the most serious. But other challenges to his authority reflect more accurately his willingness to temper justice with mercy. Cadet Henry Brown was dismissed in October, 1866, in spite of a petition by twenty-eight friends that he be allowed to stay. However, David had already given the headstrong Brown a second chance. Regretfully, David denied the petition as "justice would be outraged" and "clemency misused" if Brown were reinstated. Another cadet was luckier. Professor J. P. Bellier, assistant professor of Latin, gave Cadet J. S. Lanaux a zero and sent him to study hall because he came to class unprepared. Cadet Lanaux appealed to David, claiming the grade was unjust. Bellier insisted that Lanaux "did not know a word" of his lesson. "He says he did: I say he did not. Who is going to be the judge? He or I?" Bellier refused to change the grade unless David ordered him to do so. Six weeks later the scene was repeated. The dramatis personae were the same but this time the subject was French. Again David was called upon to settle the dispute. Several months later
Cadet Lanaux notified David that "after mature deliberation," he had decided not to devote his time any longer to the study of Latin. Latin was a required subject and Lanaux was a beneficiary cadet. David waited four days for Cadet Lanaux to cease his defiance. Then he expelled him with an explanation to the Board. If Cadet Lanaux's behavior were tolerated, the beneficiary cadet law would become "a farce and a gross injustice to the taxpayers." The school might better close and the building be used as an asylum for orphaned children. He regretted that Cadet Lanaux had not learned "the first lesson of a cadet, obedience to authority." 

Somehow Cadet Lanaux avoided the expulsion order and resumed his student career. But by May, 1869, he was in trouble again. This time eight cadets petitioned the superintendent to "reconsider the action taken" and "look with all possible leniency on his youth." David replied that "in deference to the sympathy of his fellow

---

84 Petition by cadets to Superintendent D. F. Boyd, October 8, 1866, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11; J. S. Lanaux to Col. David Boyd, March 2, 1868; J. P. Bellier to Col. D. F. Boyd, undated; J. S. Lanaux to Col. David Boyd, April 17, 1868; J. P. Bellier to D. F. Boyd, undated, ibid., Box 5; J. S. Lanaux to Col. David Boyd, January 25, 1869; Col. Boyd to Board of Supervisors, January 29, 1869, ibid., Box 11.
cadets and because of the good standing heretofore" of Cadet Lanaux, he would revoke his latest dismissal order. But Lanaux must give a written promise that he would never again employ a "deadly weapon in an affray." David seems to have been in an especially forgiving mood. Just the day before he granted a petition begging him to reinstate two cadets accused of theft. One of the thirty-nine signatures must have stood out. It belonged to Thomas Duckett Boyd, David's youngest brother, then a cadet at the Seminary.

In spite of David's absorption with his public duties as superintendent of the Seminary, he did not completely forego a private life. In the late summer of 1865, he informed Dr. Powhatan Clarke, a former colleague and a close friend, that he planned to marry. Clarke labeled the news "astounding." He accepted David's invitation to attend the ceremony and promised to bring with him Father Bellier, the Catholic priest at Alexandria, and General G. Mason Graham. Clarke's own carriage was "smashed," so they

85Petition to Superintendent David Boyd, May 29, 1869; David Boyd in reply to Petition, May 29, 1869, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1.

86Petition to Superintendent D. F. Boyd, May 28, 1869, ibid.
would make the trip in his father-in-law's coach, "with four spanking horses." "I want Mrs. B. and yourself to say that your wedding was attended by a grandee (keeping a grocery at Cotile!) in a coach and four!!" 87

"Mrs. B.," the former Esther Gertrude Wright of Cheneyville, Louisiana, was twenty-one when she married David on October 5, 1865. He celebrated his thirty-first birthday the same day. Esther, or Ettie, was the youngest of the five living children of Dr. Jesse Durastus Wright and Sara Robert Grimbball Wright. Born in Connecticut and educated at Yale, Jesse Wright migrated to Woodville, Mississippi. There he met the Grimbball and Robert families, en-route westward from their homes in South Carolina. Wright traveled with them, settling finally near Cheneyville, Louisiana, in 1820. The next year he married Sara Robert Grimbball, then about sixteen. Like many prominent men of the region, Jesse Wright combined medicine with planting and mercantile interests. He was also interested in education and the Baptist Church. The Wrights acquired a large

87 Dr. Powhatan Clarke to David Boyd, September 8, 1865, ibid., Alpha File, Box 7. Clarke, a Virginian, served as professor at the Seminary before the war. He married Louise Boyce, daughter of the wealthy Judge Henry Boyce, of Rapides Parish, in 1861.
plantation, North Bend, about one mile from Cheneyville, and it was there that Ettie Wright was born in 1844. Six years later, in 1850, Jesse Wright died. Sara Wright sold North Bend and purchased Greenwood Plantation, west of Cheneyville, from one of her sons-in-law, Leroy Augustus Stafford. Stafford was in financial difficulty and North Bend was sold to his creditor. By the outbreak of the Civil war Stafford's circumstances had improved. He had acquired Edgefield Plantation adjoining Greenwood. But his debt to his mother-in-law was still unpaid. In the spring of 1861, he formed a volunteer company, the Stafford Guards. Among the enlisted men was David F. Boyd. Stafford served on the Virginia front until his death from wounds suffered at the Battle of the Wilderness in May, 1864. By that time, David had returned to Louisiana and rejoined the army near Alexandria. Because he was considered "a friend of the family," David promised to visit the bereaved Wright and Stafford families near Cheneyville in June, 1864.

88 Stafford, General Leroy Augustus Stafford, 293-308.
89 Ibid., 30-34.
90 Ibid., 39-44; MCW [Mary Cornelia Wright] to D. F. Boyd, June 22, 1864, in Boyd (David F.) Civil War Papers, Box 2; D. F. Boyd to Miss M. C. Wright, June 29, 1864, in
Whether David already knew Ettie Wright in 1864 is not clear. As a young child she was educated at home by a Connecticut "school marm" employed by her father. Later she attended boarding schools near Cheneyville and Mansfield, Louisiana. In 1857 she went to Kentucky with her mother to visit her only brother, who died before they arrived, and Ettie, about thirteen at the time, was left at a school in Georgetown, Kentucky. She was so miserable that her mother allowed her to come home. The next year she enrolled at Minden Female College from which she graduated as valedictorian in July, 1861, about the time David left for Virginia. During the war she lived at Greenwood Plantation where she occupied the time by teaching the younger children of her absent brother-in-law, Leroy Stafford. Therefore, if Ettie Wright met David Boyd before 1864, it must have been during a holiday from school or on a visit to the

Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5. Mary Cornelia Wright was Ettie Wright's elder sister. Another sister, Sara Catherine Wright was Leroy Augustus Stafford's widow and the eldest living child of Jesse and Sara Grimball Robert Wright. When Stafford died in 1864 he left several children one of whom, Sally, married David's brother, Charles Rufus Boyd, in 1868. Stafford, General Leroy Augustus Stafford, 96.

91 Recollections of Esther Gertrude Wright Boyd, 1906, in Wright (Jesse D.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
Seminary in 1860-61 where her nephew, Leroy Stafford's son, George, was enrolled as a cadet.92

News of David's impending marriage surprised his family even more than it did his friend, Powhatan Clarke. They learned about it through one of David's friends who visited them in Wytheville. After chiding David for not telling them earlier, they urged him to "come home with his wife" during the next summer. Meanwhile, David's brother Charlie was on his way to Louisiana because there were no business opportunities available for young men in Wytheville, Charles would convey all the news of the Wytheville Boyds to the Louisiana Boyds.93

---

92 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 105.
93 Minerva F. Boyd, October 4, 1865, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5. Charles Boyd tried several things to make a living after he arrived in Louisiana. In March, 1866, he and R. W. Bringhurst advertised themselves as "Land Surveyors and civil Engineers," in Alexandria, but by April of 1867, the business was failing and Charles wanted to go to Texas. Thomas J. Boyd opposed the move unless some definite offer existed. Meanwhile, in 1866, Charles did some surveying work for Mrs. Sara Grimbail Wright at Cheneyville. He may have met her granddaughter, Sally Stafford, at that time. Sally was the eldest daughter of Leroy and Catherine Wright Stafford. She was therefore Ettie and David Boyd's niece. Charles Boyd and Sally Stafford were married on April 3, 1868. Charles was twenty-seven; it was Sally's twenty-second birthday. By the next year he was farming around Cheneyville, without much success. Alexandria (La.) Democrat, March 7, 1866; T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 29, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Minerva Boyd to
The first months of Ettie and David's married life must have been hectic. The school had just reopened, the whole state was poverty-stricken and the Seminary, sacked and occupied by opposing armies during the war, was in great need of repair. It is not surprising that Ettie chose to spend Christmas, 1865, with her family at Cheneyville, thirty miles away. David remained at the almost deserted Seminary ministering to fourteen cadets who could not go home for the holidays. "Even my wife has deserted me," he wrote a friend in New Orleans. He thought the cadets were having "a dull Christmas" although he was "feeding and eggnogging them well."94

David and Ettie lived in what one of the professors described as "a wooden structure . . . retired in the woods" from the Seminary building. But the unmarried faculty members must have been frequent guests. One of them, recalling the monotony and isolation of Seminary life, remarked that "the presence at table of Colonel Boyd's charming wife

David F. Boyd, February 16, 1869, ibid., Box 5; Receipt for thirty dollars paid to Charles R. Boyd by Sara G. Wright, May 21, 1866, in Wright (Jesse D.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 1; Stafford, General Leroy Augustus Stafford, 96.

94 David Boyd to R. M. Venable, December 25, 1865, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.
prevented some of us from losing all sense of the social life.\textsuperscript{95} David probably did not notice the near absence of "social life." He had never enjoyed it as a single professor. Now that he was married and superintendent, he had little or no time for it. In a class book he kept for 1866 he scrawled the following daily schedule:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
5 rise & 1 seminary \\
6 breakfast & 4 home \\
7 seminary & 5 seminary \\
8-9 & 6 home and supper \\
10 home & 7 seminary \\
11 seminary & 10 home\textsuperscript{96} \\
12 home and dinner & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

For Ettie, who came from a large and relatively wealthy family, the Seminary's isolation and a professor's limited income must have required considerable adjustment. Very soon after the ceremony the newlyweds were short of money and in November, 1865, David asked his father for a loan. But Thomas Jefferson Boyd was in worse financial condition than his son. Although he had retired over $200,000 of his prewar debt, he still owed $25,000 in 1865. As for the lots David once owned in Wytheville, T. J. Boyd had to sell them.

\textsuperscript{95}Garnett, "Reminiscences of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning in 1867," 20.

\textsuperscript{96}Class Book for 1865-66, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Manuscript Volumes, Box 23.
during the war in order to support his family. He still owned half interest in some mountain land which might interest "Yankee capitalists," but at the moment he had no funds. "As soon as I can," he promised, "I will send you some help." 97 Instead, the assistance came from David. In March, 1866, T. J. Boyd asked David, "if your institution needs another instructor, . . . could you not interest your Board of Trustees in favor of your cousin, Jas. M. Boyd? You know he is a very thorough and accomplished scholar. James told me he had written to you on the subject." 98

James M. Boyd was a graduate of the University of Virginia. David secured his appointment as professor of natural philosophy for the 1866-67 session, but ill health kept him from returning the next fall. He resigned, but David urged the Board to keep his place open until the following year. 99 James Boyd suffered from "consumption," which the Louisiana climate seemed to aggravate. Hoping to improve his health, he spent the 1867-68 term at the University of Virginia, expecting to return to the Seminary in the fall of 1868. During the summer he married a young woman,

97 T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, November 25, 1865, ibid., Box 5.
98 T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, March 24, 1866, ibid.
99 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1867, p. 9.
Betty Lawson, and went to Baltimore for medical treatment.

But Thomas J. Boyd wrote David in July, 1868, that James was no better and "can hardly go to La." By August he reported that James seemed "more feeble." However, Minerva Boyd urged David not to release James Boyd from his contract. The "hope of being independent," she told David, helped to keep James alive. Apparently David accepted his mother's advice. He wrote James a cheering letter telling him that he relied heavily on him and his "chair of chemical engineering" to give the school "a good name; it is practical."
The James Boyds did return to Louisiana, but by February 15, 1869, James Boyd was dead. 100

David sent Betty Lawson Boyd and James Boyd's remains back to Wytheville, largely at his expense. In her grief, Betty wrote David on March 16, 1869, "God will bless you, for your goodness to him --You were not a cousin

100 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, September 26, 1867, July 28, August 18, 1868; Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, September 6, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; D. F. Boyd to T. J. Boyd, February 18, 1869, ibid., Box 11; David Boyd to James M. Boyd, August 22, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68. Relations between James Boyd and David were obviously strained when James left the Seminary in June, 1867. Thomas Boyd commented on the rift in September but the cause for the trouble is not clear. Nevertheless David wanted him to return. James M. Boyd to David Boyd, July 19, 1867; T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, August 29, September 26, 1867, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
but a brother to us both, in our great necessity." A month later she asked David to let her know what bills she and "Jimmie" had left so that she could settle them. But it appears she never did.101

In October, 1868, David assumed responsibility for still another Virginia Boyd. Thomas Duckett Boyd, the ninth of Minerva and Thomas Jefferson Boyd's ten children, followed his two brothers and his cousin to Louisiana. Tom was just fourteen in January, 1868, when David first offered to "educate and maintain" him at the Seminary. He was not sent until the fall because the family thought a summer away from school would be good for his health. "He is a remarkably bright boy," a brother-in-law explained to David, "& needs a little growth of stature more than of mind just now."102 The description was accurate. By December, 1868, David reported to his parents that Tom was "doing well" in all of his studies, but outside the classroom older cadets teased him about his size. Ignore the "wild La. boys" and "stay moral," the father advised young Tom. He sent him a

101David Boyd to T. J. Boyd, February 18, 1869, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11; Betty Boyd to David Boyd, March 16, April 14, 1869; T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, May 9, 1869, ibid., Box 15.

102T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, January 28, 1868; Charles Motz (brother-in-law) to David F. Boyd, March 14, 1868, ibid., Box 5.
few jars of applesauce. 103

In April, 1869, David's family responsibilities increased again. Ettie Boyd gave birth to twin sons. When he announced the news to his parents, David asked his mother what she would give to see the babies. Minerva replied, "I have nothing left of all I once possessed but a handsome silver pitcher. That I would gladly give." 104 David wanted to name one son after William Sherman, but his mother advised against it. Although she understood David's motives for wanting to honor the general, she was afraid others would not. There would be plenty of time later to name a son after Sherman "when time has softened the feelings of Southerners toward their enemies." 105 In the meanwhile, the boys were called Reb and Jack. A former professor, R. M. Venable, congratulated David. "Perhaps the addition of responsibilities by the pair may awaken you to the fact that the Seminary is not your only care." He sent Ettie his regards, but warned that "so great a structure as my respect for her,

103 Thomas J. Boyd to David Boyd, December 14, 1868, in Boyd (Thos. J.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 5.

104 Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, May 23, 1869, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

105 Ibid.
will certainly melt into the air, if she permits you to
call her children 'Reb' and 'Jack' the whilom names,
forsooth, of two 'purps' of low degree."

By 1869 it was already very clear to David's friends
and parents that he was too generous and too self-sacrificing
for his own good and that of his family. One friend wrote,
"There is a person ... whom I never could induce you suf-
"ficiently to admire and labor for--that is self." Besides opening his house and pocketbook to his relatives, Da-
vid offered to take in an unemployed former colleague, E.
Berte St. Ange. After the war St. Ange tried to operate a
school in New Orleans, but by October, 1867, he was insol-
vent. He wanted to go back to France but I could not raise
the fare. "I am not walking but running in the streets,
when I am going to eat fearing to be recognized by those who
knew me some years ago." He had no shoes or winter clothes

---

106 R. M. Venable to David F. Boyd, August 2, 1869, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12. The twins were ultimately named Thomas J. and Edward J. Boyd. The "J" stood for no name in either case but Thomas later took the name of Jackson. Edward J. died in October, 1871, at Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Geneological Scrapbook.

107 R. M. Venable to David Boyd, August 2, 1869, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12.
when he appealed to David for help. David offered him a home and sent him some money. Eight years later St. Ange was still poor and still promising to reimburse David when he could.\textsuperscript{108}

David was too poor to leave the Seminary during summer vacations even if his extreme dedication to "duty" had permitted it. Plans to visit the Boyds in Wytheville were repeatedly set aside.\textsuperscript{109} His disappointed parents urged him to consider himself and his family as well as "the public." Thomas Boyd feared for David's health "to say nothing of the pecuniary distress you subject yourself & wife to by postponing your claims for service till after everybody else is paid." Minerva agreed. "You have always worked for others. Give that up, I beseech you," she wrote her dedicated son. "I have lived long enough to know that you will get no thanks for your pains."\textsuperscript{110}

The year 1869 proved to be one of triumph and tragedy for David and the Seminary. It began on a cautious but

\textsuperscript{108}E. Berte St. Ange to David Boyd, September 7, October 22, 1867, September 27, 1875, \textit{ibid.}, Box 10.

\textsuperscript{109}T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, March 24, 1866, January 2, August 29, 1867; Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, May 21, 1866, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; T. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, April 29, 1867, \textit{ibid.}, Box 15.

\textsuperscript{110}Thos. J. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, January 28, 1868; Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, February 16, 1869, \textit{ibid.}, Box 5.
hopeful note. David reported to the Board that during 1868, despite depreciation of thirty-two cents on the dollar, the Seminary managed to meet most of its current expenses. Furthermore, its creditors agreed to "continue their trust" in the coming year. Then, almost casually, he suggested that "the buildings should be better protected against fire." He proposed the installation of two large tanks, a force pump and a hose on the roof of the main building. He also thought the Board should consider insuring the structure.111

Routine concerns like depreciated warrants and inadequate fire protection probably assumed lesser importance as David, the Seminary, and the cadet corps prepared to hold the first commencement exercises in the school's brief history. David began planning at least a year in advance. In June, 1868, he wrote General William T. Sherman that Colonel Samuel H. Lockett, commandant and professor of engineering, had completed Sherman's portrait, to be hung in the Seminary's main hall. David invited Sherman to come and see it. He thought June, 1869, would be an ideal time. The school would be honoring its first graduates and it would be "very appropriate" for the first superintendent, Sherman, to give

111Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1868, pp. 10-11, 16.
out the diplomas.¹¹² Sherman answered at once that if he were free the following spring he would come "with the greatest of pleasure."¹¹³

Because he had business in New Orleans, General Sherman decided to visit the Seminary well before commencement. On January 27, 1869, he wrote David to expect him, his daughter, and a Colonel Dayton and lady about February 10. His note expressed a desire to see General G. Mason Graham during his visit, but "he may have some feeling against me." Apparently David planned an escort for Sherman's party. He sent S. B. Robinson, his clerk-secretary, to New Orleans with instructions to charge all the Sherman party

¹¹² David Boyd to William T. Sherman, June 11, 1868, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68.

¹¹³ W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, June 23, 1868, in Typescript of the Sherman-Boyd Letters, in possession of T. Harry Williams, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. David and Sherman exchanged letters frequently during the first years after the war. As General of the United States Army, brother of Senator John Sherman, and an old acquaintance of President U. S. Grant, Sherman was obviously in a position to help the Seminary. On David's request he asked the Smithsonian Institution to send fossil collections to the Seminary. He also sent copies of all government publications appropriate for its library. He interceded with the local military authorities so that the Seminary could resume full military exercises and drill. Finally, he offered to defend David and the school to Governor Warmoth if that became necessary. The Seminary Board responded formally by unanimously voting a resolution of thanks to Sherman: "For the great interest he has manifested... during the past three years and for
expenses to David's account. If Robinson saw General
Richard Taylor, "a great friend of Sherman's," and if Robi-
son thought Taylor "wd take it well," he should invite Tay-
lor to accompany the party to the Seminary. "Also Long-
street," David added.114

The local newspaper announced Sherman's impending
arrival, commenting that while they "may not forget the
bloody scenes of the war, [they] are willing to 'let the
dead past bury its dead,' to treat him with respect and
kindness ... We are sure the General's visit will not fail
to be a pleasant one in every respect."115 The prediction
proved accurate. When Sherman arrived home he wrote his
brother John a long account of his "Southern trip."

the material assistance he has rendered." David Boyd to
William T. Sherman, May 1, 1866, in Rachel Sherman Thorndike
(ed.), The Sherman Letters (New York, 1894), 273-74; David
Boyd to General W. T. Sherman, January 16, July 27, 1868, in
Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1865-68; William T. Sherman to
D. F. Boyd, August 9, 1868, in Sherman (W. T.) Letters,
David F. Boyd Family Papers, 1864-91, Department of Archives,
Louisiana State University; W. T. Sherman to D. F. Boyd,
August 17, 1868, in Typescript of the Sherman-Boyd Letters;
Copy of resolution of Board of Supervisors, /June 24, 1868/,
in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook, 1855-1913.

114William Sherman to D. F. Boyd, January 27, 1869,
in Typescript of Sherman-Boyd Letters; David Boyd to S. B.
R. Robinson, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection,
Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1860-61, Box 1.
David's memo to Robinson also instructed him to "tell Kenton
that my note at Pike's for $6,000 must be extended."

115Alexandria (La.) Democrat, February 10, 1869.
My old friends in Alexandria did all they could to make us welcome, and I was not allowed to pay a cent on steamboat, at the hotel, or anywhere. . . . Boyd was perfectly grateful for the books you sent him, which were in the library and marked with your name. I found my own portrait, in full uniform, in the main hall, and in the library many books on our side of the war. . . . Of course they have their old prejudices, and labor to prevent their cause from sinking into one of pure malignity,--but . . . he [Boyd] promised me to teach his pupils to love and honor the whole country. . . . The marble tablet . . . over the main door on which was cut the inscription "By the liberality of the general government. The Union—esto perpetua," was taken out and was found broken in pieces. . . . Boyd has ordered an iron casting of same size and same inscription and promised me to place it over the door in lieu of the marble, too much broken up to be replaced.\(^{116}\)

In the midst of the gala Sherman visit, David's cousin, the ailing James Boyd, died on February 15, 1869. David, already intending to go with the Sherman party to New Orleans, now had another reason for the trip. He had to help Betty Lawson Boyd arrange her sad journey back to Virginia. S. B. Robinson, the Seminary clerk and librarian, traveled with Betty to Virginia. David may have spent some time in New Orleans before returning to the Seminary because the legislature was in extra session. Besides the Seminary appropriations bill, he may have been interested in the controversial "mixed" public school bill then being

debated. By March 19, 1869, David was certainly back at
the school. S. B. Robinson, then in New Orleans, wrote to
David at the Seminary of his return to Louisiana.

In late April David's twin sons were born, and at the
end of June the Seminary awarded diplomas to its first grad-
uating class. David delivered an address in which he re-
viewed the difficulties endured by the school since its re-
opening in 1865. He predicted that in the future the gradu-
ates would come to the school's rescue when all others de-
serted it. Knowledge was not necessarily wisdom, he advised.
Therefore, if their learning conflicted with common sense,
they must not hesitate to "toss it out. . . . The mechanic &
the merchant, the farmer & the laborer in these days of
material progress, are as much use to the world and just as
important members of society as the lawyer, the physician &
the professor." Finally, he warned them to leave politics

117 W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, February 22, 1869,
in Typescript of the Sherman-Boyd Letters; Mary B. Clopton
(James Boyd's Sister) to David Boyd, February 22, 1869, in
Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; David Boyd to T. J. Boyd,
telegram, February 18, 1869, ibid., Box 11; Edwin H. Fay,
History of Education in Louisiana (Washington, 1898), 83;
Memelo, "State Laws Concerning the Negro in Louisiana,"
63-64.

118 S. B. Robinson to D. F. Boyd, March 19, 1869, in
Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11.
alone. "Avoid politics & politicians as you would the plague or a pestilence. It is a filthy pool, in which no gentleman can dabble, without getting befouled." 119

The Louisiana Democrat was charmed. David's address was labeled one of the most able, touching and appropriate of its kind. "If we had not already seen the Colonel do so many other difficult things, in the course of his arduous labors, we should have been astonished at seeing him appear in his new capacity of orator and finished writer." 120

G. Mason Graham presented the nine graduates with their diplomas. A band imported from New Orleans played for the occasion and a "Hop," which lasted till dawn, completed the activities. "The Seminary," declared the Democrat, "has passed through its most trying season, and may now be considered established on a permanent basis." 121

Less than four months later the Seminary burned to the ground. Early on the morning of October 15, 1869, fire was discovered in the commissary under the kitchen in the main Seminary building. At four a.m. a wall collapsed.

119 Address to the graduating class, by D. F. Boyd, June 30, 1869, ibid., Box 15.

120 Alexandria (La.) Democrat, July 7, 1869.

121 Ibid.; Address to the graduating class by D. F. Boyd, June 30, 1869, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.
"The scene, lighting up the dark primeval forest, in which the building was located, is described by an eye-witness as awfully grand and sublime." Three hours later little or nothing remained.\textsuperscript{122} Because there was no way to fight the fire, cadets and professors concentrated on saving the library, scientific equipment and school furniture. Personal possessions of the cadets, pictures, maps, commissary stores and dining room furniture were destroyed. David, in his Report of the Superintendent for 1869, castigated himself for not having insisted "more strongly" on precautions against fire. It was a "heartrending spectacle" to see the "labor of years destroyed" in a few hours. "But that was no time for tears or despondency. The Seminary had to be saved and 143 young men had to be fed and sheltered."\textsuperscript{123}

The Ice House Hotel in Alexandria housed the cadets until they could go home. Meanwhile David started to search for a new building. By October 17, 1869, he was in New Orleans, having stopped on the way at Baton Rouge. There he inspected the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind as a possible temporary home for the Seminary. He applied informally to the president of the Asylum Board, John O'Conner,

\textsuperscript{122}\textit{Alexandria (La.) Democrat}, October 20, 1869. The Democrat printed an "extra" to report the fire on October 15. They reprinted part of it in their regular edition on October 20, 1869.

\textsuperscript{123}\textit{Report} to the Board of Supervisors for 1869, pp. 8-9.
for permission to share the building. But the Board refused. A few days later when the Seminary Board convened in New Orleans, David reported his investigations in Baton Rouge. He was sure that with "proper care" by the superintendents of both groups, the Asylum building could be used as a temporary home for the Seminary. The Board asked Governor Warmoth to write a letter to the Asylum Board asking it to reconsider. Governor Warmoth was more than willing to oblige. He urged the Asylum Board to grant the Seminary's request, even if they had to move. Yielding to the governor and local public opinion, the Asylum Board granted the Seminary temporary quarters in the north half of the building, subject to the approval of the legislature.

The cause of the Seminary fire was never definitely established, but from the first some suspected arson. The Louisiana Democrat reported in its special edition on the blaze that "the conflagration is generally believed to be the work of an incendiary." David, in his Report for 1869,

124 "Extra" for October 15, 1869, reprinted in Alexandria (La.) Democrat, October 20, 1869; New Orleans Daily Picayune, October 19, 1869; Minutes of Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors, October 21, 1869.

125 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 21, October 23, 1869; Annual Report of the Board of Administrators and Superintendent of the Louisiana Institution for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind, in Legislative Documents of Louisiana, 1870. The legislature did approve the Asylum Board's action. It
carefully avoided speculation: "Now as then the origin of
the fire is unknown." But David's *Report* for 1869 was di-
rected to a Radical legislature whom he was asking for extra
funds to rebuild the school. In his diary, on the fifth
anniversary of the fire, he recalled:

> What a scene—as grand as it was awful. And what a
> misfortune to our institution & to La! And how much
trouble & misfortune it has given *me!* It has taken
years from my life. It was burnt no doubt by the
negroes in revenge for the killing of the negro Isaac
Whiting by Cadet Simmons.126

Almost sixty years after the fire an Alexandrian, Mr. Jonas
Rosenthal, also attributed the fire to arson. According to
his account, a cadet shot a Negro youth on Front Street in Al-
exandria because he thought the Negro "lacked respect." The
student was jailed, but during the night other students broke
into the jail and allowed him to escape. He was never recap-
tured. Rosenthal believed the Negroes retaliated by burn-
ing the Seminary. However, Senator R. G. Thornton, a student
at the Seminary in 1869, disputed the Rosenthal account. "It
was ever his opinion that the building was not intention-
ally fired by the negroes, but through the carelessness

---

126 David Boyd Diary, October 15, 1874, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.
of employees. 127

Whatever the origin of the fire, there is no question about the killing of the Negro. On September 20, 1869, David issued an official order that in the future no cadet could visit either Alexandria or Pineville except for the most urgent business and with special permission from the superintendent. Any cadet known to visit either town or even to pass through it without permission would be dismissed. "This order, so severe, is decreed absolutely necessary for the protection of the cadets themselves." To leave the Seminary grounds at all a cadet had to take an oath that while absent he would not drink, or carry, or use a "pistol, knife, or other dangerous and deadly weapon." Those cadets who had such weapons were required to give them to the superintendent at once, on pain of dismissal. Only "fowling pieces" could be retained. 128


128 General Order No. 6, September 20, 1869, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1866-69, Box 1. In his Report for 1869, David mentioned "an affray in the town" in which a cadet killed a citizen. "Without intending to pass opinion... of his guilt or innocence in the eyes of the law, the regulations of the Seminary demanded his dismissal. Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1869, p. 15.
How long the Seminary would be domiciled in Baton Rouge depended upon several factors. The most important considerations were financial but local pride was also involved. Only days after the fire, W. B. Gill, secretary of the Board of Trustees of Homer College, offered David the presidency of that institution. Mr. Gill had heard rumors that the Seminary would not be rebuilt in Rapides. "If the authorities intend to locate elsewhere and might come to Homer, then no doubt the Homer College bldgs. would be tendered to the state." Baton Rouge manifested her interest in obtaining the Seminary by bringing pressure to bear on the Asylum Board to share its facilities with the homeless school. 129

Intelligence of this interest must have reached Alexandria very quickly. On October 27, 1869, the editor of the Louisiana Democrat urged his readers to act at once if they wished to keep the Seminary in their parish. He recalled that when the institution was first proposed, many parishes "vied for it." He now was sure the competition would begin again. Rapides had an advantage. The Seminary owned

129 W. B. Gill to David Boyd, October 25, 1869 in Boyd (Thomas J.) Papers David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 5; Report of the Board of Administrators of Louisiana Institution for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind, 1870, in Boyd (David F.) Printed Pamphlet, 1870-75, Box 20.
land there and at least thirty-thousand dollars of improved property in the form of professors' homes and other buildings. It was a healthy location. He saved his best argument for the end. "It has been demonstrated that such an institution is a source of revenue to the community in which it is situated. And it is destined to be the occasion of a still greater revenue, when the prosperity of the country causes the assembling of a larger number of students." The editor challenged local businessmen to come forward to "Subscribe Something Toward Rebuilding," before other parishes did. "Colonel Boyd, the superintendent, is willing to head the list with his salary for two years (8000) which he will give to retain the seminary in this parish . . . Who will imitate his example?"130 A week later the same paper reported the reopening of the Seminary in its temporary quarters at Baton Rouge. The tone was considerably subdued. Noting that the governor would recommend appropriations for a new Seminary building in his annual message, the paper commented; "There exists no good reason why the institution should not be again in operation in Rapides in a year."131

130 Alexandria (La.) Democrat, October 27, 1869. The challenge was issued in boldface type.

131 Ibid., November 3, 1869.
In October David pledged two years' salary to rebuild the Seminary in Rapides. When he composed his Report for 1869, he still thought the old location best "for reasons of health and auld lang syne," even if it were not very accessible. But he also suggested ways to make the "temporary" accommodations at Baton Rouge larger and more comfortable. Obviously he did not think a return to Rapides was imminent. Privately, David had speculated on other sites for the school long before the fire. In November, 1869, he received a letter from James Garnett, ex-professor of Greek at the Seminary in 1867. Garnett hoped the authorities would "take advantage of the occurrence" and rebuild either in New Orleans or Baton Rouge, as they "used to talk about." He suggested that refitting the state capital building in Baton Rouge, damaged during the war, might be the cheapest way to get a new building and "the location is far superior."

On November 1, 1869, the Seminary reopened in its new location. The cadets sent home on October 15, with instructions to report for duty when notified, responded quickly. By December 31, 1869, there were 138 in attendance and more

---

132 Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1869, pp. 10-13; James M. Garnett to David Boyd, November 17, 1869, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8.
were expected. All of the professors moved to Baton Rouge except one, who was soon replaced. The Seminary appeared ready to meet whatever challenge the future had in store. Since 1865 it had withstood financial crises and political assaults. It had found friends and protectors even among the Radical "enemy," and it literally survived an ordeal by fire. There were also minor triumphs. It celebrated a reunion with its first superintendent and it sent forth its first graduating class. If all this gave David Boyd a sense of pride in past accomplishment, he can certainly be excused. Considering what lay ahead it is fortunate that he did not have second sight.

133Alexandria (La.) Democrat, November 3, 1869; Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1869, pp. 8, 20.
CHAPTER VI

INTO THE MAINSTREAM

Early in January, 1869, a legislative committee charged with investigating the charitable institutions of Louisiana paid a visit to the State Asylum for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind. It found a "magnificent building" going to ruin and housing only fifteen inmates. The committee thought the structure as good as any of its type in the United States. But no repairs had been made since 1861. In many places falling plaster exposed the timbers to decay, floors were rotting and rust corroded the tin-roofed galleries. The furniture, once "magnificent," was now "a perfect wreck." The committee, believing $10,000 might cover the cost of repairs, urged the legislature to act at once or send the inmates elsewhere.¹ The lawmakers responded positively and during 1869 the Asylum building underwent considerable renovation. But more funds were needed to paint the

¹Report of the Committee to Investigate Charitable Institutions of the State of Louisiana, January, 1869, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1860-69, Box 20.
exterior and to erect stables and fences. In January, 1870, Governor Warmoth appointed a new board to control the institution. J. A. McWhorter became superintendent and Dr. J. W. Dupree of Baton Rouge assumed the post of attending physician. There were still only thirty-seven inmates because according to Superintendent McWhorter, most people thought the Asylum was an orphanage for indigents, not a school.\(^2\)

The emptiness and the solitude at the Asylum came to an end when the Seminary established operations in the north half of the building. A Baton Rouge paper was delighted to welcome the cadets.

We hope at the next session of the Legislature the Seminary will be permanently located in this city. The Asylum buildings are too large for the poor unfortunate mutes and blinds \(\text{sic}\). . . By turning over the Asylum buildings to the Seminary, the State would save fully three fourths of the amount necessary to rebuild . . . near Alexandria.\(^3\)

To secure legislative approval for the Seminary to occupy even part of the Asylum building, David went to New Orleans twice during January and February, 1870. Things did not go


\(^3\)Baton Rouge Tri-Weekly Advocate, December 10, 1869.
smoothly. He was sure that Superintendent McWhorter and part of the Asylum Board were "misrepresenting" him before the appropriate committees, "especially the colored members." Although he thought the lawmakers would ultimately grant the Seminary's request, they first insisted on sending a committee to Baton Rouge to inspect the jointly-occupied building.

Some of the "august members," David believed, expected to be bribed before issuing a favorable report. But he informed one that he "wld see . . . \(\text{the Seminary}\) and the State sunk so deep that plummet cld never reach," before he, David, would spend one dollar to influence a vote. David felt "degraded" at having to deal with such "scoundrels," but he advised Colonel S. H. Lockett, in charge during his absence, to have the "infernal dirty kitchen and stove" cleaned up for the committee's visit. Meanwhile, Superintendent McWhorter continued to protest that the building was not large enough to house both Asylum inmates and Seminary cadets. David retorted that McWhorter and his "retainers" occupied too much space. If the schools combined their kitchens, dining rooms and staffs, they could save money, time and room. David wanted Lockett to show McWhorter his letters, but Lockett refrained. He thought David must have been very "irritated" when he wrote them. If "we" were written to in such a way, Lockett
remarked, "we" would be "quite bitter." 4

The legislature finally acted. It granted the Seminary temporary use of part of the Asylum building and authorized the Asylum Board to rent other buildings if necessary. The next year, 1871, the legislature gave the Deaf, Dumb and Blind permission to move out entirely, leaving their old home to the Seminary. To David, these laws proved the legislature's intent; to award the whole building to the Seminary. But others were not so sure. Governor Warmoth wrote David he was sorry that "satisfactory arrangement" could not be made. Although willing to endorse anything the Asylum Board might do to accommodate the Seminary, he thought he had said all he was authorized to say on the subject. 5 The controversy continued for years. Ironically, when the Seminary finally moved out of the Asylum building, it again occupied "temporary" quarters: the United States Arsenal and Barracks at Baton Rouge.


5 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 184-85; D. F. Boyd to Governor W. P. Kellogg, August 9, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Governor H. C. Warmoth to David Boyd, October 7, 1872, ibid., Scrapbook.
The same legislature which granted the Seminary part of the Asylum building authorized Governor Warmoth to ask the Secretary of War for temporary use of the United States Arsenal. In the spring of 1870, David asked General Sherman what chance Louisiana had to acquire the site. Personally, Sherman replied, he was against giving up the post, even for the school. He thought a regiment should be kept in Baton Rouge "to reinforce Texas, Arkansas, Mobile or Florida should a necessity arise." However, if Governor Warmoth made a "strong case," he promised not to oppose it. Apparently the Federal government was not ready to relinquish the Arsenal either. Not until 1886 did the University occupy the property.\(^6\)

In spite of difficulties with Superintendent McWhorter, cramped quarters, a debt approaching $20,000 and continued difficulty in cashing the state warrants, the Seminary (renamed the Louisiana State University in 1870) enjoyed an excellent first year in Baton Rouge. Everything lost in the fire was replaced and added to; eight students graduated in the class of 1870; the enrollment figures were the highest in

\(^6\)Baton Rouge Tri-Weekly Advocate, February 9, 1870; William T. Sherman to David Boyd, April 24, 1870, in Typescript of Sherman-Boyd Letters; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 434.
the school's history, and the faculty was one of the largest in the South. In his Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, David labeled the University "one of the best schools in the South." He saw no reason why it should not be "the best" soon, if the legislature would only award it the Agricultural and Mechanical college funds. If it did not prosper then, only management could be blamed.7

Beginning in 1869, with the first graduating class, David used his Commencement addresses not only to inspire the graduates, but to discuss the condition of the school, to express his educational ideas, and to comment generally on politics and society. The Anniversary addresses delivered for the first time in January, 1870, to celebrate the University's tenth birthday, served the same purpose. Like his Reports to the Board, David's speeches were usually cogent detailed and candid enough to offend at least a part of his listeners. This is not surprising considering that as many as five hundred guests attended some of the "public exercises." Present in the audience might be such disparate personalities as General G. Mason Graham and Governor Henry Clay Warmoth. If David had had his way, the contrast would have been even more striking. As guest speakers for Commencement and Birthday

7Acts of Louisiana, 1870, Extra Session, No. 47; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, pp. 7-9.
exercises in 1869, 1870 and 1873, he invited William T. Sherman, Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis, respectively. Sherman did visit the school in 1869 but too early to participate in Commencement. Lee, occupied with his own duties as president of Washington College, had to decline, and Davis, invited to deliver the Anniversary Address for 1873, refused because he thought it prudent to "avoid public notice." He was glad, however, that "a faithful Confederate" headed Louisiana State University. 8

In his Commencement address for 1870 David urged the graduates to do what their parents could not: "make a new La. and a new South." The older generation was too wedded to old custom, too prejudiced, too full of bitter memories of the recent war to participate meaningfully in Reconstruction. "Not so much political reconstruction," David hastened to add, "for politics, be it democratic or Republican, is all a lie, a swindle & a cheat; and I would implore you, if you value your honor & peace, never to be politicians--but I mean reconstruction--moral, social, material!" He urged the young men, now that America had faced her "great challenge,"

---

8 R. E. Lee to D. F. Boyd, copy, June 24, 1870, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Jefferson Davis to David Boyd, July 8, 1872, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8.
to go forward with the whole nation. He attacked the "misguided ideals" which led Louisiana to produce crops of "2nd rate Drs., lawyers /etc./ when she needs hardworking laborers and farmers, not elegant planters & drones." What, David asked his listeners, had such types ever done for Louisiana? New Orleans still had no railroad to Texas. Chicago was linked to both coasts. Baton Rouge was older than St. Louis, but had only 8,000 inhabitants and not enough businesses to support 500. Baton Rouge certainly possessed intelligence, refinement, Christian spirit and orderly conduct in large degree. That was its trouble: "it is all elegance & leisure, and no work!" What it needed was "laborers, mechanics and the steam engine." The war, David thought, awakened the whole South to the fact that it had to exert itself, overcome its hatred of outsiders and distrust of aliens. Otherwise it would never attract wealth, intelligence, and workers from other regions. He reminded the audience that Louisiana arrested Audubon as a vagabond and that Richmond, Virginia, so alienated Francis Cabot Lowell that he established his textile factories in Massachusetts. The South's failure in the war could be explained many ways, but David thought it was due to her love for politics and her contempt for the "mechanical arts." Finally, he appealed to the graduates to follow the examples of Lee and Grant and Jackson and Sherman
"who knew when to stop fighting." Only "extremists, fanatics and politicians" wanted to continue the strife. Personal gain motivated the politicians, whom he labeled a "dangerous class . . . who grow fat on corruption and like a dead car-cass best." The extremists were simply fools, not satisfied with the war's outcome and ready to "make our country's wounds bleed afresh." Moved by David's comments General G. Mason Graham reportedly rose in the audience and proposed three cheers for the superintendent. Others were more restrained. A local paper commented:

We did not hear the address of Superintendent Boyd, but learn that it was characterized with vigor of thought and seasonable advice to the graduates. His views on the political situation are not, however, receiving general commendation. The positions assumed were correct enough in principle—the illustrations inappropriate and humiliating to Southern sentiment.

David's remarks to the graduates of 1871 dealt with another volatile subject: religion. He was equally critical of "hellfire sermons" and "stylized Christianity" which operated only at 11 A.M. on Sundays. He showed no patience with what he called "pious stupidity," that brand of religion which denied man's appetites and passions. God gave these to man to

---

9David Boyd, Commencement Address to the graduating class of 1870, June 29, 1870, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 247; Baton Rouge Tri-Weekly Advocate, July 1, 1870.
enjoy in moderation. As for "the metaphysical approach,"
David considered it just as worthless as "sheer ignorance" in
the pulpit. What did matter was the "simple substance" of
Christianity. He cautioned his young listerners not to re-
nounce religion and Christ simply because He was sometimes
invoked by fools and frauds. David's remarks probably of-
fended some of his fundamentalist listeners. The fact that
he attended no church, professed no particular creed, and tol-
erated dancing at the University did call forth some critic-
ism. But he was not irreligious; he simply opposed "narrow
dogmas . . . ignorance and prejudice."11

One other sensitive topic usually received attention
in David's speeches: race. In his Commencement address for
1873, David advised his audience to accept reality. "True
republicanism," of the Jeffersonian variety, was as dead as
African slavery. Now that universal suffrage was a fact, St.
Charles Street, "evil, idle, corrupt and vile," epitomized
American life. There drunken politicians gathered, "not to
talk about business (they have none)," but about "politics and

10 David Boyd, Commencement Address to the graduating
class, June 28, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13.

11 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 246; Anniversary
Address, January 2, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers,
1873-75, Box 2; Annual Address to the graduates, June 26, in
Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, Box 20.
the everlasting nigger." The only thing that might counteract the ruinous effect of universal suffrage was universal education. David urged his young audience to rise above their prejudice and to actively seek teaching positions in black schools. On Sundays, he reminded them, their mothers and sisters taught Negro Sunday Schools. How, then, would it degrade them to do the same during the week? He knew he was not putting forth a popular idea, but universal suffrage demanded universal education and David preferred that it be provided by "Southern whites, not adventurers who are often themselves ignorant." Then, in case there was any doubt, David made it clear that he opposed integrated education. "You know I think it best to have separate schools for the different races... Whom God hath put asunder, let no man join together," was a principle, he remarked drily, not always practiced outside the schools. 12

David's Anniversary Address for 1873 also expressed his opposition to "mixed schools." He considered them "wrong in principle, and still worse in practice." But, he pointed out, the constitution of 1868 practically required "mingling, or 'mixing,' of the races in any public, or incorporated school."

12D. F. Boyd, Commencement Address to the Graduates, June 25, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13.
Therefore, the legal possibility for black cadets to enter the University had existed for several years. None had ever applied and David did not think they would. But the mere possibility, he thought, frightened prospective white patronage away.

It is just these imaginary (political or social) questions --like your imaginary quantities in Mathematics, that frighten you most. How many have got scared, and been run clear out of the Algebra by the minus quantity, with the big radical sign over it! And don't you let any such bugbear as a minus white boy,—negro,—in tow of a big white Radical politician, run you away from your State University.13

David thought the better element of both races would ultimately drive out the politicians and settle the problems of the state. He had faith that the rest of the country would help.

I cannot believe that the American people of the North--the great Anglo-Saxon stock of our common country--will let Louisiana become Africanized, or even be long misruled by a miserable set of mongrel politicians, whose chief qualifications are impudence, ignorance, villany, and vice. They will be just to the white man by giving him the supremacy; they will be just to the negro by teaching him that an inferior race must occupy a subordinate place; and they will be just to the office-seekers . . . by putting them down altogether.14

In January, 1875 David again prepared an Anniversary Address dealing with the subject of race. This time, however,

13David Boyd, Anniversary Address, January 2, 1873, ibid.

14Ibid.
he decided with Shakespeare that the better part of valor was discretion. He delivered instead an innocuous message on the famous advice Polonius gave Laertes, "To thine own self be true." The unpresented paper, entitled "Some Ideas on Ed., The True Solution of the Question of 'color' in our schools, Colleges and Universities et c." reflected some changes in David's thinking regarding segregated schools. He still insisted that prejudice, even instinct, required separation of the races in elementary and secondary schools. But at the college level, it was an "axiom to concentrate your means."
The state was obligated to provide two sets of public schools with equally good facilities, but to scatter its limited means among several "weak" colleges would be to defeat the educational purpose of a university. Then what must Louisiana, short of money as always, do when "natural causes and social prejudices would seem to demand two colleges?" The solution was simple: reorganize the University. The "true university," David argued, left the student free to study what he pleased, with whom he pleased. He could live and eat wherever he chose. There could be no "social intercourse whatever" unless the individuals, formally introduced, mutually agreed to it. This was what Thomas Jefferson planned at the University of Virginia; this was how Louisiana could solve her problem. How could
anyone possibly be "morally contaminated" or "socially degraded" by the mere presence of a Negro in the same class? Besides, David declared, a university which denied admittance to anyone was a contradiction in terms. He could not conceive of Paris, Berlin or Oxford refusing "an Indian or Chinee or African," or threatening to throw up its charter if they were admitted. "How absurd! We of the South must discard the very idea . . . I would no more deny access, on account of race, or color from the temple of learning, then I would exclude one, on account of race, or color, from the temple of faith." Considering the embattled condition of Louisiana in January, 1875, it is just as well that David did not deliver the address. The state, again faced with the prospect of two legislative bodies, was in turmoil. Under the circumstances, David's appeal to "do away with our prejudices" and exercise "a little common sense," had little chance of being heeded. Its public expression might have made a bad situation worse.

15D. F. Boyd, "Some Ideas on Edγ, the True Solution of the Question of 'Color' in our Schools, Colleges and Universities," 1875, Typescript in Louisiana Room, Louisiana State University Library. This also appears in manuscript in the Boyd Collection, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University; David Boyd Diary, January 2, 1875; MS for Anniversary Address, 1875, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
During 1870 and 1871 David had to deal with several problems. Some were public, directly concerned with the conduct of the University. Others were personal, involving relations with students and tax collectors. The imbroglios with students occurred at commencement time in 1870 and 1871. Both reflect, in different degree, the extreme sensiveness, devotion to duty, pride of self, and sense of personal honor so often associated with gentlemen of the nineteenth century. The less serious incident happened in June, 1871. Just before the end of the term, David invited A. A. Gunby, a graduating senior, to a social function. Gunby declined in writing, describing himself as "equally pained and surprised" at the invitation. He was surprised because of the "little notice or regard" which David had theretofore displayed for his personal feelings. He was pained because he had to refuse the invitation. David replied to Gunby's note, calling it a boyish whim." He asked Gunby to explain the alleged injustice, but Gunby preferred to wait until graduation when he was no longer a cadet. On June 28, he sent a letter to David with a copy to Commandant Edward Cunningham, in which he described an incident wherein he had been insulted by a black waiter in the mess hall. Gunby refrained from "punishing the insult personally" because he did not want to hurt the school. Instead,
he complained to Commandant Cunningham who insinuated that Gunby, not the waiter, was at fault.

Gunby charged that for the next three months Cunningham "abused his power" and that he, Gunby, quietly endured the abuse. If the commandant derived any pleasure from his "cowardly tyranny," he was welcome to it. David replied to Gunby, obviously managing to assuage his injured feelings. A few weeks later the ex-student thanked him for his letter which he considered "magnanimous" and "dispassionate." He thought it reflected David's "moral courage" and begged David's pardon for any offense he had caused David "by word and deed." For his part, Gunby preferred to forget the past and "live in the future." Gunby was as good as his word. Thirty-three years later, when the University began construction of a building to honor David's memory, ex-cadet A. A. Gunby delivered a glowing tribute to his friend and former teacher, David Boyd. 16

16 A. A. Gunby to David Boyd, June 3, June 28, July 15, 1871, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8; Gunby, "Life and Services of David French Boyd." Gunby entered the Seminary as a beneficiary cadet and, unlike many of the state-supported students, he really was poor. In his memorial speech, he praised David especially for promoting and expanding the beneficiary system. "From the very jaws of hell [the Radical legislature] he snatched a subsidy to educate hundreds of young men." But he heartily disliked the military
The second involvement with a cadet, much more serious than the Gunby incident, occurred in the summer of 1870. On June 30, Cadet Samuel H. Lewis graduated with honors. He immediately issued a formal challenge to David through Professor S. H. Lockett. According to Lewis, David "affronted" him four years earlier; now he was "demanding satisfaction."

David answered at once. He thought he remembered the incident but "considering the relationship between them of student and Sup.†," that Lewis was violating one of the well-known rules in David's presence and under circumstances "calculated to excite" him, David did not think then, nor did he in 1870, that he had done anything "officially" to Lewis that he should not have done. But, finding that Lewis was so "personally mortified," he regrettcd his punishment of four years before.  

David and Lewis exchanged notes again on June 30, just before Lewis left for New Orleans. Lewis was not satisfied;  

---

17 Unfortunately, the correspondence omits completely whatever it was that Lewis did and how David responded.
he thought he had been "basely humiliated" by the superintendent. David answered that he was sorry Lewis was still "aggrieved." But in the interest of the school, he would have to sever his relationship with the University before they could meet. He submitted his resignation to the Board, but it was refused. Instead the Board expressed its complete confidence in David's ability and integrity and "heartily sustained" his course as superintendent. On July 4, through his second, Lewis demanded that a date be set to settle the affair. David replied on July 7. He tried to reason with Lewis, suggesting that he and Colonel Lockett go to New Orleans and discuss the matter "amicably." David thought no good could come from a duel. It would wreck the school and "Sam" would regret it later. David still considered himself Lewis's friend, and even if they met, he insisted, "no act of mine will prevent your enjoying a long and happy life."

Lewis answered on July 10 that he could not meet David under such circumstances. Apparently he also impugned David's courage. David replied the next day, July 11, with a long explanatory note. He was sorry that the tone of Lewis's letter was so "ungenerous" and unforgiving. He would gladly give up his own life rather than run any risk of Lewis losing his.
"I would almost as soon fire at poor little Jack or Reb."

From the beginning, David insisted, he never intended to appear on the field with a loaded weapon. Lockett could verify this. He meant to give Lewis satisfaction by going through the form of a meeting, thereby providing him with a defense before the law. But, he pointed out, Lewis would have found out later and would never have forgiven David, Lockett or himself. Then David appealed in the name of the University. Considering the political condition of the state, David was doing the school a great injustice simply by agreeing to meet Lewis. If he met him without first telling a few persons he was going not to harm Lewis, but only to let him appease his wrath, the effect on the school would be worse. He concluded by asking if, under the circumstances, the insinuation (questioning David's courage) in Lewis's letter withdrawing the challenge were not unjust. He also praised Lewis for his determination and highly developed sense of honor, suggesting that they might better be tempered with reason and moderation.

A month later, August 9, 1870, David wrote Lewis again, reproaching him for remaining so "obdurate" and reminding him that he (David) had gone for more than half way to "smooth over" the difficulty. Any further effort would have to be made by Lewis. David had done as much as "my self-respect will
allow." David also suggested that Lewis open a preparatory school in New Orleans. He promised to do all that he could to help him. On August 22, 1870, Lewis replied that he had taken David's advice. He and a friend planned to open a private school to prepare boys for the University. They needed money and they thought David might help them. Lewis wrote David again on August 30. He had rented rooms and bought furniture for his school, but he needed blackboards. He remembered several lying idle at the University. It would save him and his partner money if David shipped them to New Orleans. They also needed funds for advertising, circulars, and incidentals. "We would wish you to favor us with a check for seventy-five or $100, as soon as convenient," he concluded. The letter was brief and the tone was abrupt. Whether Lewis was naturally or intentionally brusque it is difficult to say, but his letter smacks somewhat of "bush-league" blackmail. Whether David ever sent the money is also unclear. Years later David's son, Leroy Boyd, scrawled across one of Samuel Lewis's letters the comment: "I never knew a man named Sam who wasn't a big bluff and a coward."18

18 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 29, 1870; Sam Lewis to David Boyd, June 30, July 10, August 22, August 30, 1870, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File,
The Federal revenue service also challenged David during 1870 and 1871. On June 21, 1870 he was notified of his failure to pay taxes on his income for 1866. As a penalty he was ordered to pay five per cent a month on everything earned since September, 1867. If he did not comply in ten days, the collector was authorized to seize and sell his property to satisfy the debt. The following year he was in trouble with the tax collector again. A federal law of 1870 required everyone over twenty-one whose gross income from all sources in 1870, exceeded $2,000, to file a return with the assistant assessor of the district in which he resided. The deadline for the return was March 1. The tax form itself stipulated that the party filing it must verify it under oath. Apparently David neither filed his return on time nor did he personally verify it to the assistant assessor. On April 25, 1871, "F.D. Boyde" of East Baton Rouge Parish was notified to appear on May 2, 1871, at 10:00 A.M. to "show cause why the penalties prescribed by law should not be assessed agst. him for

Box 9; David Boyd to Samuel H. Lewis, June 30, July 7, July 11, August 9, 1870, in ibid., David F. Boyd Letters and Papers, 1858-88, Box 4. Because the Lewis-Boyd notes did not begin until June 30, 1870, David must have discovered informally that Lewis intended to challenge him and submitted his resignation in anticipation the previous day.
neglect to make or render a true and correct return of his gains, profits and income for the year 1870." David considered the regulation requiring personal verification of the tax form particularly offensive. Sometime during the controversy he scrawled across the return that his clerk's statement as to the return's authenticity had always been accepted in the past. "If Mr. Van Pelt [his clerk] cannot answer for me, then this paper may go unanswered, for I will not attend to it further. D.F.B." Whether David or the assistant assessor ultimately capitulated is not clear. But David's general attitude about income taxes and tax form questions is certainly obvious. To the query "Have you included in this return the income of your wife, and . . . wages of minor children?" he answered flippantly, "Yes, if nothing can be counted!"¹⁹

¹⁹ Notice of failure to pay taxes, June 21, 1870 in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University official Papers, 1870-72, Box 2; Income tax form, undated 1871, ibid., Box 1. Summons issued to "T.D.Boyde" to appear before Assessor; April 25, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1866-72, Box 2. Ironically, during the same time that David was doing battle with the Baton Rouge tax collector, he was trying to have his unemployed brother Charlie, appointed to that post in Rapides. On March 8, 1871, Charlie wrote his brother that if David could "use his influence," he would gladly take the job. Charlie declined to visit Baton Rouge in his own behalf because he did not know enough of "the influential" to do him any good. He thought he would ruin his chances if he appeared to be "begging." Ex-professor and Seminary Superintendent William Seay of Alexandria thought Charlie's appointment depended upon Negro Republican Harry
David's personal difficulties with students and tax collectors paled into insignificance by comparison with the problems he faced as president of the University. After the school located in Baton Rouge, it could no longer escape public notice and political pressure as it had in Rapides. Almost at once crises whose magnitude ranged all the way from graffiti on the privy walls to legislative resolutions to investigate his administration occupied David's time and attention. His first problem grew immediately out of the fact that the University shared quarters with another state institution. The conflict between him and Superintendent McWhorter lasted throughout the latter's tenure. A Radical appointee, McWhorter had sufficient power in the legislature to forestall all of David's efforts to acquire the entire Asylum building. Nevertheless, David kept trying. Besides securing legislation authorizing the Deaf to occupy other quarters, he used his influence with Baton Rouge politicos to get McWhorter out. But nothing succeeded. Not until 1878, did the University secure the entire building.

Lott, then representing Rapides in the legislature. Charles Boyd to David Boyd, March 8, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

20 Acts of Louisiana, 1870, No. 29, p. 53; Resolution of Baton Rouge City Council, February 23, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Selected Papers, 1866-72, Box 2; D. Boyd to Col. J. A.
An important part of David's job consisted of lobbying before potentially hostile legislatures. He heartily disliked the task because it was time-consuming, but even more because it involved dealing with people whom he held in contempt. To Colonel Samuel Lockett, professor of engineering, he described his appearances before the legislators in 1870 as personally degrading. Later the same year, when the Board's vice-president urged him to go to New Orleans in the school's behalf, he protested that he would if he had to, but he did not like "to stand around in lobbies." He also doubted that it did the school any good. Apparently, what he really objected to was the adverse comment his trips to New Orleans seemed to stir up among the "old citizens." Their remarks "mortified him." "God only knows," he wrote Vice-President William Sanford of the Board, "my only object is to advance the Seminary [University]. I do not wish to go about the

Fuqua, August 29, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; David Boyd Diary, August 14, 1874; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 185, 263-4, 429. In his diary, David commented on "how meanly" Superintendent McWhorter had behaved. In spite of all David's efforts to get the old state capitol at Baton Rouge repaired for the use of the deaf, McWhorter declined to leave the Asylum building. In his letter to Colonel Fuqua, a leading citizen of Baton Rouge, David urged the citizens of Baton Rouge to "settle" the building problem soon or he would ask the legislature to move the University to New Orleans.
Legislature or the Radical Authorities any more than I can help."\(^{21}\) Nevertheless, he went. He spent a good part of February, 1871, lobbying to secure passage of the law which would authorize the Deaf and Dumb to move to other quarters. He also had to dispose of University warrants in order to secure enough cash to operate the school. Conditions were so bad in 1871 that he had to sell them on the street for whatever he could get. At one point the state warrants brought only fifty per cent of their face value. To avoid further loss he pledged some $81,413 worth of 1870 and 1871 warrants as collateral for a loan of $39,000.\(^{22}\) All this took a great deal of time and kept him away from Baton Rouge for long periods. In his 1870 Report he noted that he had had "little chance to act as professor this session." Each year the duties of the superintendent seemed to increase so much that he could not be an "efficient professor." Therefore he asked to resign. "I am convinced that no one can be superintendent here and professor too," he said, "and as I am only a teacher and

\(^{21}\)David Boyd to Colonel Samuel Lockett, January 20, 1870, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4; David F. Boyd to William Sanford, December 20, 1870, January 31, 1871, ibid., Box 5.

\(^{22}\)Telegram of D. F. Boyd to Col. Edward Cunningham, February 16, 17, 20, 21, 1871, ibid., Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1870-72, Box 1; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1871, pp. 4-5.
wish to be nothing more, with no taste and less fitness for business and finance, I respectfully ask the Board to relieve me as early as practicable of the Superintendency and permit me to be simply professor of mathematics."\(^{23}\)

David remained as superintendent and he continued to lobby. He also continued to offend some of the "old citizens." In December, 1871, he confided to Vice-President Sanford that he had made several enemies in his confrontations with the Radicals. He thought some of them might try to oust him. But he was determined to let the "Radical scoundrels" know exactly where he stood; he had already informed Speaker of the House Carr that he would cane him "if he weren't such a cur." He justified this action. "You know, Mr. Sanford, that I have already compromised myself with the good people of La. on acc't. of my official position here, as far as a due regard for my own private character can stand."\(^{24}\)

Early in 1871, while David was lobbying in New Orleans, an incident occurred at the University which might well have resulted in disaster for the school. Colonel Edward

\(^{23}\)Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, p. 23.

\(^{24}\)David F. Boyd to William L. Sanford, December 23, 1871, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Box 5.
Cunningham, Commandant and professor of natural philosophy, led a biracial legislative committee on a tour of the University. Cunningham was polite, but he declined to shake the offered hands of the black legislators as they left the building. Naturally they were offended. At least two Board members expected serious retaliation. Vice-President Sanford, although he sympathized with Cunningham's personal views, thought he should have used better judgement in view of the University's "delicate position." He pointed out that one of the Board members, Harry Lott, was black, and that he had voted for Cunningham's appointment with "great cordiality and good feeling." General G. Mason Graham thought Cunningham ought to issue an official apology to the committee. He sent two authorizations to David in New Orleans. One directed him in the name of the Board to "reconcile" the aggrieved legislators. If that failed, he was to suspend Cunningham. No one, Graham pointed out, could stand in the way of the school's well-being. Cunningham tendered his resignation, but David opposed its acceptance, arguing that to succumb to Radical pressure would cost the school the support of the "old people" of the state.25

25G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, February 15, 1871, ibid., G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6; Edward Cunningham to David Boyd, February 17, 1871, ibid., Alpha File, Box 7; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 195.
The University weathered the Cunningham crisis, but in November of 1871, David himself stirred up a controversy which seriously threatened the school. On a Saturday night, November 11, 1871, an unknown group of University cadets stole the bell from the belfry of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum. When it was discovered, the cadets were interrogated, one by one, to establish the guilty parties. A number refused to respond, whereupon David issued an order expelling twenty-four cadets. A Radical newspaper, the New Orleans Republican, seized upon the incident. Professing shock that the rules allowed expulsion for such an offense, the paper sympathized with the boys "who have shown a manly spirit." The editor thought the legislature should launch an inquiry into the affair. "Perhaps," he remarked, "a legislative committee may recommend a reversal of the order of the Superintendent even though it should involve the resignation of that official."

David replied to the Republican almost at once. To preserve order and discipline, he argued, the superintendent had to be allowed the power to which the Republican objected. "With all respect" to the editor, the legislature and the people, he made it clear that when the right to expel for refusal to give information was withdrawn, he would no longer be superintendent. With his letter to the editor David enclosed one
from the uncle of a dismissed cadet, who approved David's act. The Republican, however, was not impressed. Approval by one uncle, declared the editor, did not "appease the five or six angry fathers" whom the Republican had heard criticize David. Pulling down the bell was indeed a serious offense. But a regulation that required a boy to testify against himself "violates all usual procedure." It looked like the "Spanish Inquisition." "If discipline can not be maintained by the superintendent without violating the rules of common sense, or compelling the . . . boys to betray their comrades, the fault is his own, and the misfortune is the State's."26

Friends as well as enemies thought David went too far in the bell-stealing incident. After reading about it in a newspaper, Alexandria lawyer William Seay advised David, "I could have told you that your tactics would not work. I have seen it [interrogation] tried twice, and in both cases it failed." Board member G. Mason Graham saw accounts of the incident in two New Orleans papers. He thought David's remarks to the editor could have been "a little more temperate."

Ironically, Graham wrote David the very day of the bellstealing on the subject of dismissing cadets. In his opinion the

26 New Orleans Republican, November 18, November 22, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Newspapers, Box 17.
University dismissed too many for "demerit." "People will not send their sons to so rigid a school whence dismissal is so sure. . . . It seems to me the idea should be to prevent demerit, and not rely solely on punishment (and so severe) after commission."27

David was not oblivious to the difficulties which his expulsion order and his subsequent letters to the newspapers might cause him and the University. But tact and circumspection were not his most distinguishing characteristics. He acknowledged to Vice-President Sanford that he had "some few enemies among the Radicals." If his resignation would satisfy them and save the school, he would be glad to submit it. In any case, he was determined to let the "Radical scoundrels" know exactly where he stood.28 His Report to the Board commented on "our late wholesale dismissal." Of the


28 David F. Boyd to W. L. Sanford, December 23, 1871, ibid., Box 5. Three years later, in 1874, David was still convinced that he had acted correctly in the "Bell Scrape." Commandant Cunningham thought it might have been the straw that broke the camel's back because it caused so much trouble. But David noted in his diary that in spite of the "big howl" caused by so many dismissals, the University "openly defied" all opposition and "went straight along" in its course. David Boyd Diary, November 11, 1874.
twenty-four expelled students, all but eight returned to the University after making appropriate amends for having defied the authorities. David reported that all was "happy and orderly" at the school. Those who cared to should judge conditions by the cadets, "not the false philanthropy" or sickly sentimentality" of outside "ignorance and prejudice."29

The "Bell Scrape" was barely settled before David became embroiled in another public controversy. This one developed in the midst of a political battle between factions of the Radicals for control of the legislature. David went to New Orleans in mid-January, 1872, to oversee University affairs, but by the end of the month he thought the lawmakers still showed "no disposition to go to work." He returned to Baton Rouge. Two weeks later, on February 16, 1872, he was back in New Orleans. The political crisis had abated and David was optimistic. "Our affairs seem promising," he wrote Commandant Cunningham. "I think there is no doubt of our getting the agricultural fund." He expected to leave the city in a few days.30

29 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1871, p. 15.

30 Telegrams from Jas. W. Crawford to David Boyd, January 4, 5, 6, 10, 1872; Telegrams from David Boyd to Col. Ed. Cunningham, January 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 1872, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official
But his plans suddenly changed. On February 17, 1872, "Mr. Worrall of Jefferson" introduced a resolution in the House to appoint a five-man committee with full power to inquire into the management of the state University,

Particularly with regard to the furnishing of the institution with supplies, groceries, meats, vegetables, books, apparatus, and all other necessaries . . ., to the late expulsion of pupils, to the payments demanded of the State for beneficiary cadets; to the vacancies on the academic board remaining unfilled in one case since January 1871, . . . the manner and channels of disbursing the funds, to the authority and cost of printing the official register of the institution and to all other matters re: the institution . . .

The Worrall resolution indicates plainly that there were several prospective, but frustrated, suppliers and a few disgruntled parents with a grudge against David and the University. But failure to fill the vacancy on the Academic Board seems to have been the immediate reason for the hostile resolution. Dr. James Burns, a New Orleans physician, composed the resolution after consulting with Dr. S. O. Scruggs of Nachitoches. Burns was interested in a professorship at the University. Scruggs was a member of the University Board, but by 1872 he no longer attended meetings. David considered

Papers, 1870-72, Box 1; David Boyd to Ed. Cunningham, February 16, 1872, ibid.

31 Reprint of Louisiana House Journal, February 17, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 17.
his position vacant. With the resolution in hand, Burns and Scruggs looked for a legislator to introduce it. A Major Blackman in the Senate refused, fearing to raise the "mixed" question, but in the House another physician, Dr. Worrall of Jefferson, was willing. Friends of the school (one of whom was Harry Lott, the black member from Rapides), rushed to its defense. The resolution failed by a vote of sixty-two to ten.

Almost two weeks later Dr. Burns provided the lawmakers and the public with a detailed explanation of the events which led him to draft the resolution. On February 27, 1872, in a hand bill entitled "The Management of the State University," Burns explained that months before he had applied for the vacant professorship of chemistry at the institution. He wrote first to Vice-President Sanford who advised him to send his "testimonials" to David in time for the Board meeting in June, 1871. Sanford doubted, however, anyone would be hired. Meanwhile, Burns saw David personally and received the same advice. Next Burns wrote to Governor Warmoth and the rest of the Board seeking their support at the coming meeting. He also sent his references to David. June, 1871, passed and Burns heard nothing. Later he met David in New Orleans. David told him no Board meeting had occurred, and that if he left his application on file, he might be considered the next year
if the University's financial condition improved. He declined, asking David to return his references. The "testimonials," Burns declared, were sent back unopened.

Burns then went to Governor Warmoth who promised to speak to David in Burn's behalf when he visited Baton Rouge. Burns also had several New Orleans editors (from the Bee, the Picayune, the Republican, the Bulletin, and the Times) appeal to David. They promised to use their influence to secure generous legislative appropriations for the school. Again David did not respond and again Burns saw Governor Warmoth. The governor described David as unalterably opposed to Burn's appointment as a professor. Allegedly, David objected to him because he was too old, had gout and was "too well-known." David supposedly wanted a "pushing young man who had a reputation to make" rather than an established scholar. Burns then "devoted my efforts in other directions." About the middle of February, 1872, Dr. Burns met Dr. S. O. Scruggs whom he had known for a long time. The two agreed that the legislature should investigate the University. As already described, they had a resolution to that effect introduced on February 17, but it failed to pass. On February 26 Burns received a private letter from David which he described as characteristic: "ungrammatical in construction and ribald
in expression." In his handbill of February 27, Burns quoted liberally from David's letter but refused to comment on "such language." As for the "persistent coarseness" shown him by David, Burns had nothing to say except:

That I decline any direct communication with him, and that I should have on the instant returned his miserably ill-advised missive, only that I deem it prudent to hold it as available testimony in case of necessity. *Vox audita perit, litera scripta manet.*

David soon provided Burns with more "testimony." On February 29, 1872, he issued a broadside of his own addressed "To Whom It May Concern." The explanatory preface took Burns to task for quoting selectively from his letter of February 21. Burns did so, David charged, in order to defeat the University appropriations bill then before the legislature. In justice to all David intended to publish his letter to Burns in full, omitting only the name of the third party (Dr. Scruggs) as irrelevant and improper to be mentioned in his dispute with Burns. Burns's action, commenting on a letter addressed to himself, but quoting publicly only those derogatory remarks made of "another," David left to "the keen sense of propriety of the learned (?) Dr. James Burns, of established 'reputation' for the 'gout' and bombastic pretensions as a

---

32 James Burns, M. D., "The Management of the State University," February 27, 1872, *ibid.*, Box 4
"scholar." To the lawmakers and the public David explained that his only reason for "condescending" to take "public notice" of that "contemptible creature" (Burns) was to avoid possible injury to the University. The complete text of his letter to Burns followed. The first paragraph was mild. It merely reproached Burns for asking the legislature to investigate the management of the University before addressing any questions to the superintendent or the Board. David thought one professor had a right to expect that much consideration from another.

In the second and third paragraphs David warmed to his task. They are reproduced here because they reflect accurately David's capacity for indignation and his command of invective.

From your confrere, [Scruggs], the ex-member of our Board of Supervisors, whose resignation was accepted, + because I refused longer (in June, 1870) to serve a Board, of which such a mean, slanderous creature was a member; from him, I say, I expected nothing else but a cowardly and malicious effort to mortify or injure me, even when he knew that he was unjust to the Institution, as well as to me.

You certainly did not know the man, or you would never form any alliance with him. Do you know that he now actually denies + having had anything to do with the resolution, when you know that he and yourself went together to Major Blackman, of the Senate, and he [Scruggs] handed the paper
to the senator and urged him to present it?33

Finally, David accused Dr. Burns of hypocrisy. "The next time you want the Legislature to inquire why you were not appointed a professor HERE, please say so plainly." David had discussed the entire matter with both Senator Blackman and Representative Worrall, making clear to them his belief that not a single "respectable" man in the state questioned the honesty and sincerity of those connected with the University. "If I have judged you harshly in this matter," concluded David, "I shall regret it; but you can only be excused on the ground that 'a want of decency is a want of sense.'"34

David returned from his personal Battle of New Orleans with less than he originally expected to win. Early in February he thought the University might secure the agricultural college fund. But "due to their best friends," he wrote William Sanford, the question had been deferred until 1873.

33 David Boyd to Dr. James Burns, February 21, 1872, quoted entirely in "To Whom It May Concern," February 29, 1872, ibid., Printed Items, Box 19. The asterisk indicates that David sent a copy of his letter to Burns, with the blank filled in, to "ex-member" of the Board of Supervisors, Dr. Scruggs. The single dagger refers to a note that Scruggs attended no meeting of the Board of Supervisors after June, 1870. The double dagger indicates a note that David had proof of Scrugg's denial of any part in framing and introducing the resolution.
The Burns-Scruggs affair was also dormant, but David thought it was "hardly over." He wondered if he had gone "too far" or "not far enough." Burns was probably "ruined" in New Orleans and Scruggs, in David's judgement, ought to be "tabooed" from all good society in the state. Referring to both as "liars," David remarked, "They are certainly a handsome pair to make war on the University," 35

When "war" finally came, it was not Drs. Burns and Scruggs who were the principle aggressors. The University, like the rest of Louisiana, was about to be caught up in a long power struggle among the forces of Governor Henry C. Warmoth, the more Radical Customs House officials, and the Democrats who played the first group off against the second. With assistance from the Federal government, the Customs House

35 David Boyd to Wm. Sanford, undated, 1872, in Fleming, (Walter L.) Collection, Box 5. David's antagonism for Dr. Scruggs went back as far as 1867. In September of that year David wrote Scruggs a letter which "utterly astounded" him; he assured David that he had only the kindest feelings for him. Again in June, 1870, at the last Board meeting he attended, it was Scruggs who introduced a laudatory resolution refusing David's resignation as superintendent. Finally, in January, 1872, just before the Burns incident, David's brother Charlie visited Scruggs at his home. He wrote David that Scruggs had the "deepest admiration" for him and was sorry that David should have been "so sensitive" as to misunderstand certain "jocular remarks" Scruggs made to him. Scruggs also intimated to Charlie that "others" on the Board of Supervisors were trying to oust David. Dr. S.O.Scruggs to D.F.Boyd, September 16, 1867, ibid., Alpha File, Box 11; Minutes of the
group won control of the state in 1873. The University, luckier than some state institutions, managed to survive. But for four years (1873-77) it endured under conditions which approximated those usually associated with war.

Before dealing with that melancholy period, something should be said about developments in David's family. When fire forced them to leave Rapides in 1869, the Boyds (David, Ettie and their six-month-old sons) moved into rooms in the Asylum building. Tom Boyd, David's younger brother, was still a cadet and lived in student quarters. During the summer of 1870, yellow fever visited Baton Rouge. David, to protect his wife and twin sons, sent them on an extended sojourn to Minnesota. He expected to join his family in St. Paul, but he changed his plans at the last moment. Disappointed, Ettie traveled on to Lake Como, Minnesota, where she and the children remained until David told them it was safe to return to Baton Rouge. They left Lake Como about November 10, 1870, for the trip South. 36 David's parents still had not met Ettie in 1870. They were "mortified" when they heard he had sent her

---

36 Correspondence of Ettie and David Boyd, Summer, 1870, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.
to Minnesota rather than to Wytheville to escape the fever. But David and Thomas J. Boyd were somewhat estranged in 1870. In one letter David complained that his parents had "no affection for him anymore." Thomas Boyd denied it. He admitted that he had been "mortified" by disparaging remarks in some of David's letters. To avoid them, he stopped writing "for a season." But, he insisted, he had never "lessened his affection" for his son. Ettie and the children would have been very welcome in Virginia. All of them must visit the next year.37

While his family was in Minnesota, David did some traveling in Louisiana. In July, 1870, he visited the site of the old Seminary building in Rapides. He returned to Baton Rouge, convinced that the school would never return to its old home unless interested local citizens raised the money to rebuild it. 38 Just after Ettie returned from Minnesota in the fall of 1870, she, David, the twins and S. B. Robinson, David's clerk, made a much longer trip. They left Louisiana on November 19 and did not get back to the University until

37 T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, November 20, 1870, ibid., Box 7.
38 David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, July 20, 1870, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Box 5.
December 9. During the three weeks they went first to Virginia to attend the marriage of David's sister, Minerva. Ettie and the children stayed in Wytheville, but David and Mr. Robinson continued to Washington and New York in order to visit "the principle scientific bureaus and educational establishments" in those cities. In Washington General William T. Sherman conducted them through such facilities as the Smithsonian Institution. He also gave David a letter of introduction to be used for the rest of the trip. Among the schools they visited in New York was Columbia College, where President Fredrick Barnard acted as their guide.

The excursion convinced David that educationally, the South had a long way to go. Even the University of Virginia, he thought, did not compare with the "good colleges of the North." The reason was plain. The North believed in public education and supported it. In Louisiana, by contrast, there were practically no schools in the parishes where a boy might learn simple geography, arithmetic, and English grammar. Until Louisiana took the schools and school legislation out of politics, even the small amounts spent on education would be wasted. As for the University, it could not expect to compete with other states for good professors. "Teachers are used to working for very little and are not likely to expect
much, still they must have enough to keep their families from want," he wrote. "No professor can maintain his family re­spectably on a salary of $2,000 a year on the banks of the lower Mississippi, when the very deck hands on the steamers are paid forty to sixty dollars a month."39

David's concern for the low salaries the University paid its professors only rarely extended to himself. For his several duties as superintendent, treasurer, and professor, he received $3,000 a year plus quarters. That figure had been raised during the summer of 1869, but following the fire, the Board, at David's suggestion, reduced it to the old level.40 By the end of 1870, David asked to be relieved of all duties except that of professor of mathematics. "At present I feel that I am not doing good service for the Uni­versity, nor advancing in my profession; and apart from my love for the institution, the salary is but a miserable pit­tance for all the labor and care and responsibility of my

39 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, pp. 9-10, 16; Wm. T. Sherman, Letter of Introduction for David F. Boyd (copy) November 23, 1870, in Boyd (David F.) papers, Box 8; David Boyd Diary, November 27, 1874; Henderson French (uncle) to D. F. Boyd, June 22, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

40 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1869, p. 14; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, January 28, 1870.
several offices." But the Board did not relieve him and it did not increase his pay. G. Mason Graham thought he appreciated David's struggles to keep the school going as much as anyone could other than David's wife. "This, I fear, will always be the case with you." Half seriously, Graham wrote David in June, 1871:

I have pretty much . . . lost all sympathy with your 'Angusta domires,' to use a classical expression for the Louse in the Head, for I have realized that the biggest fool on the face of the earth is one who gives away everything that he hasn't been robbed of . . . By the way, have you ever read the Grand Epic, title forgotten, but commencing 'Higglety pigglety snigglety Fritz, lost his money, and then his wits . . . ,' if not, I would commend it to your serious perusal."^42

David did indeed give away whatever he had. Besides himself, Ettie, and the twins, he supported his brother Tom at the University. Nevertheless, he offered his father a loan in November, 1870, to help pay for a younger sister's wedding. By December he had no cash to lend, but he did offer Ettie's mother and sister a place to live. Mrs. Wright's Greenwood Plantation, appraised in 1859 at $108,000, consisted

---

41 Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, p. 15.

of 1500 acres of "bare land" in 1866 when her children began to haggle seriously over it. David did not want to get involved in the division of what he called the "family pie," but Ettie considered herself so ignorant of business affairs that she asked him and Mr. William Seay to act for her. "God knows," Ettie wrote David from the family home in Cheneyville, "I want to see this division made with justice to all parties; if anybody is defrauded of a dollar, I would rather it be me." She had "perfect confidence" in whatever David might decide. 43 Three and one-half years later, in August, 1869, the family property was still not divided to everyone's satisfaction. Leroy S. Havard, married to Ettie's older sister, Julia Catherine Wright, asked David to come to Cheneyville for further discussion. David replied that he could not leave the school on such short notice. Besides, his letter, plus the one Ettie was sending to her mother the same day, ought to preclude any further consultation with the Boyds concerning Mrs. Wright's affairs.

43 Ettie G. Boyd to David Boyd, undated, in Wright (Jesse D.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family papers, Box 1. Internal evidence in Ettie's letter establishes that the letter was written about mid-January, 1866.
About the whole matter, I have but one regret— that Ettie did not, immediately upon our marriage, do as she has done today. It would have saved me much that was annoying and unpleasant. From the first I have been anxious to have nothing to do with the adjustment of the Estate, well knowing how easy it is for members of a family to disagree—and even to quarrel—about their share of the property—the most unfortunate and disagreeable of all squabbles, as well as the most unbecoming."

David hoped the remaining heirs could agree on their "respective parts." Even if they failed, he at least hoped that Mrs. Sara Wright would be "provided for." To that end he would be willing to contribute whatever he could, "which of course can be no great deal."^4^4

Apparently, the heirs could not agree nor did they provide adequately for Mrs. Wright. Through her spinster daughter Mary, she appealed to Ettie for financial advice and assistance in December, 1870. David answered for his wife. He did not see how the Boyds could help Mrs. Wright. "I am very anxious not to have any business transactions with your heirs," he declared, "and Ettie herself could do nothing for your relief." Mrs. Wright might consider his attitude "strange." But, he reminded her, all her exertions to educate and support her children had brought her nothing but bad treatment, harrassment and persecution. Now she was a "poor

^4^4David Boyd to L. S. Havard, August 11, 1869, ibid.
old lady, sick and infirm." Under the circumstances, did she ever think that it might be better for her to "get out of the whole?" He gave Ettie carte blanche to do as she chose, but he would have nothing to do with the estate. As for Mrs. Wright and "Sister Mary," David thought it might be best for them to come and live in Baton Rouge. "You must know that I am poor," he wrote. His salary hardly supported them in the way his position required them to live. But the Wrights would never lack the ordinary "care and comforts of a home" if he could possibly provide them. She and Miss Mary "had better pick up their traps, say goodbye to what is left of Greenwood and its troubles, and come and live with Ettie and her little scraps of the children. They would all be delighted to have you come." By June of the next year, 1871, Mrs. Wright and her daughter Mary accepted David's offer. They joined the Boyd family in the Asylum building, and they remained there for at least six years. They may not have left until 1880 when David, by that time no longer president of the University, had to seek other quarters for his family.  

45 David Boyd to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Sara R. Wright, December 24, [?], 1870, ibid.

46 Account Book of Sara R. Wright, January 22, 1871. June [N. D.], 1871; L. S. Havard to Mary C. Wright, January 27, 1877; David Boyd to Ettie G. Boyd, November 27, 1880, ibid. Greenwood Plantation was not finally divided among the
On October 7, 1871, Ettie Boyd gave birth to another son, Arthur J. Boyd, thereby increasing the Boyd household to eight members. But only a week later tragedy struck for the second time that year. In July David's trusted clerk and good friend, S. B. Robinson, died after a long illness. Now, on October 15, one of the twins, "Reb" or Edward J., became seriously ill. He was so heavily dosed with paregoric on the sixteenth that, "to keep him from dying from stupor," a physician administered a strong counter agent. But at three A. M. October 18, 1871, the little boy died. Recalling the event three years later, David noted in his diary that Reb "fell sick" on the second anniversary of the Seminary fire.

heirs until August 23, 1883. By that time Mrs. Sara Wright had been dead for two years. Mary C. Wright, the spinster sister, willed her property to her sister Ettie Boyd, with whom she was living at the time of her death in 1888. By 1890, the Boyds no longer had any claim to Greenwood Plantation. Ettie sold her share (the amount she received in 1883 plus what she inherited from her sister Mary), in all about 700 or 800 acres, to a "Mrs. Smith." Although dead for nine years, Mrs. Sara Wright had the last word. Scrawled across an authorization to sell the last of Greenwood were these lines attributed to her: "What you leave at your death, let it be without controversy, else the lawyers will be your heirs." Final division among heirs, August 23, 1883; Will of Mary C. Wright, April 13, 1881; Kernan and Laycock, Attorneys (Baton Rouge), to Ettie G. Boyd, September 9, 1890, ibid.; Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Genealogical Scrapbook.
He was convinced that the boy died of "malpractice;" first, by whoever administered the Paregoric; second, by the physician who employed a heroic antidote. The child was buried in the same cemetery as Mr. Robinson. Whenever he could, David visited both graves on the anniversary of Reb's death. 47

In the summer of 1871, Charlie Boyd and his wife Sally Stafford, left Louisiana to visit in Wytheville, Virginia. Apparently Charlie's family was as insolvent as David's. Thomas Boyd had to send them $150 for their fare to Virginia. He also sent David $150 "to aid you in your kind efforts to support & educate Tommy." However, if Charlie needed more money, David was to lend it to him on his way through Baton Rouge. Charlie was already in debt to his brother, but when David asked for financial aid from Wytheville in the summer of 1872, Charlie, who had moved back to Virginia, answered that even if he paid David in full "it would only be temporary relief." He thought David ought to run for governor to drive the "miscreants" from power. Then, when the state was

47Boyd (Leroy) Papers, Boyd Family Genealogical Scrapbook; David Boyd Diary, October 15, 16, 18, 1874. Leroy S. Boyd compiled the Genealogical Scrapbook in 1904. He contended that Reb died "from imprudent feeding by a negro nurse."
"safely run," capital would return to Louisiana and the state would prosper. What David thought of such preposterous advice is not recorded. He probably considered Charlie's check for fifty dollars considerably more valuable. 48

Thomas Duckett Boyd returned to Virginia in June, 1872, the same year his brother Charlie left Louisiana. Tom was only eighteen, but already he had earned a Master of Arts degree from the University. He intended to spend the summer at home, resting, before seeking permanent employment. Instead, he found himself playing shortstop on a touring baseball team which a Presbyterian minister organized to keep Wytheville youth out of trouble. Tom did not want to join the tour at first, but his refusal was interpreted as "a desire to

48 T. J. Boyd to David F. Boyd, August 27, 1871, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; C. K. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, August 29, 1872, ibid., Box 15. When he returned to Wytheville Charlie worked intermittently as a surveyor for the United States Government. He was still financially dependent; his wife and children either lived with his parents at Boyd Hotel or were partially supported by them in rented quarters. In 1873, although his wife was expecting another child and T. J. Boyd was paying their board bill, Charlie decided to attend the University of Virginia. One reference lists him as a "graduate" of the University in 1874. But it is doubtful that he could have completed a degree in one year. T. D. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, August 11, 1872; T. D. Boyd to Ettie Boyd, October 23, 1872, ibid., Box 15; T. D. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, January 4, 1873, Minerva Boyd to David F. Boyd, July 23, 1873, ibid., Box 15; South West Virginia and the Valley (Ranoke, 1892), 283-84.
remain aloof" from the town boys, so he reconsidered. By the end of the summer he began thinking seriously about a job. He planned to work for the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad for one year and then study law. But in October, 1872, he was still unemployed and sorry that he was no longer a cadet at the University. During the winter he helped his brother Charlie draw some maps, and he began "reading law" in the office of a local judge. Apparently he still had plenty of time to himself. In February, 1873, David advised him to "read heavily," especially the English poets and novelists like Scott, Dickens and Thackeray, "Do not be misled," he warned, "by what the so-called 'Practical,' but really ignorant and prejudiced people call 'useful.'"

Sometime in the spring of 1873, Tom accepted an offer to become a law clerk in the St. Louis office of ex-Commandant Edward Cunningham. However, he changed his mind later. The reason may have been ill health. Tom suffered from some

49 Wilkerson, *Thomas Duckett Boyd*, 34-35; Thomas D. Boyd to David Boyd, August 17, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.

50 Wilkerson, *Thomas Duckett Boyd*, 34-35; Thomas D. Boyd to David Boyd, August 17, 1872; Thomas D. Boyd to Ettie Boyd, October 23, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; David Boyd to Thomas D. Boyd, February 18, 1873, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd, Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
sort of malady that caused his head to erupt in very painful sores. As a cadet he endured several attacks and during the summer of 1873, the ailment returned. In any case, when David invited him to come back to Baton Rouge "if he had nothing better to do," he accepted gratefully. All David could promise his young brother was room and board. But he would have a 'fine library' and he could attend classes in botany and zoology. He could also relieve David by teaching a few classes of mathematics. Tom promised to return to the University as soon as his head improved. "I am under so many obligations to you," he wrote David, "that I hardly know how to thank you . . . I can only do so by doing all in my power to help you."

David certainly needed help. He wrote his parents in the summer of 1873, of his terrible financial plight, but all they could offer him was sympathy. "But for your kindness to us," Minerva answered, "you would not now be in your present condition." The only way she could ever repay David was

---

51 Wilkerson, Thomas Ducket Boyd, 35; Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, July 28, 1873, Thos. D. Boyd to David Boyd, August 13, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; David Boyd to Thomas D. Boyd, August 5, 1873, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
to give his family a place to live. From Tom Boyd she knew that rents in Louisiana were "exhorbitant" and the "New Orleans people" who visited the hotel thought the University's chances of overcoming its difficulties "are doubtful if not impossible." She wished David were out of the "whole mess". So did David. Six months earlier, in December, 1872, he unofficially asked the Executive Committee of the Board to begin looking for his successor. His health was breaking down, and he no longer felt able to stand the work and anxiety connected with the school. He wanted to leave no later than June, 1873. Although all of the married professors were in terrible straits, he and his family were in a "worse fix" than any of the others. Even if his salary were paid regularly, it was "inadequate" considering the work and extra expense connected with the superintendency. But now he had neither cash nor credit. As he explained to Vice-President Sanford:

For about a month this fall my wife had to be her own nurse, as well as cook for a mess of six—all because we can't pay our servants. And all I ever expected to leave my little family in case of death—a life insurance policy—I lost the other day, because I could not continue the payment. I tell you all this in no spirit of

52 Minerva Boyd to David Boyd, July 28, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
croaking, or grumbling at an ugly state of things, for which perhaps I am more responsible than any one, but to let you know the desperate private straits to which I am driven. 53

It is unlikely that David, in his anguished condition, remembered the lines sent him eighteen months earlier by G. Mason Graham: "Higglety, pigglety, snigglety Fritz, lost his money, and then his wits." By the end of 1872, they seemed prophetic. In a letter to General Graham describing his and the University's condition, he wrote, "I am nearly crazy; there is a limit to everything, and I have nearly reached mine." 54

53 David Boyd to William Sanford, December 4, 1872, December /?/, 1872, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Box 5.

54 David Boyd to G. Mason Graham, December 21, 1872, ibid., David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
CHAPTER VII

POLITICS AND POVERTY

The political chaos which reigned in Louisiana as 1872 drew to a close explained to a considerable degree David Boyd's physical and mental torment. The University was almost totally dependent upon state support, and David, despite his personal distaste for politics and politicians, had to deal with whomever ran the state. In 1872 that was anything but clear. To better appreciate David's difficulties it would be helpful at this point to summarize political developments in this turbulent period. By 1872 the Republican party was in disarray on both the state and national levels. In Louisiana the schism between Governor Warmoth's followers and the more radical Customs House faction dated back to 1870 when Warmoth announced plans to amend the state constitution in order to succeed himself. At the Republican state convention during the summer of 1870, Lieutenant Governor Oscar Dunn challenged Warmoth for control of the party. Dunn opposed the proposed amendment but
Warmoth's faction scored a victory at the polls. Later, Warmoth's supporters in the senate made common cause with the Democrats to strip Dunn of his power to name committees in the upper chamber. In the house a similar coalition re-elected Warmoth's man for speaker. But the alliance fell apart when dissatisfied Democrats shifted their support to Customs House Republicans.

The contest for control of the Republican party continued in 1871. Both sides put up slates of delegates to the state convention, and both sides resorted to fraud, intimidation, and the use of armed men during the selection and convening of the delegates. Ultimately, the Warmoth faction walked out of the meeting place, whereupon the Customs House delegates read the governor out of the party. Both sides appealed to President Grant for recognition, but he took no immediate action. In November, 1871, Lieutenant Governor Oscar Dunn died and Governor Warmoth called a special session of the senate for December 9 to elect a friendly presiding officer for that body. This was important in case the lower house, then organized by Customs House men, tried to impeach the governor. The Democrats met on November 30, 1871, to plan their strategy, but decided finally against a formal alliance with either Republican faction. However, when the
senate met in special session, the Democrats supported the Customs House candidate. One man switched at the last minute, thereby giving the senate presidency to Warmoth's choice, P. B. S. Pinchback.

The factional battle continued when the legislature met in regular session in January, 1872. The senate could not organize for lack of a quorum. In the house the two factions fought for the speakership. Both sides called for Federal troops, but ultimately the governor's men, with the aid of his police force, took control of the official meeting place, Mechanics Institute. The Customs House faction then set up its own legislature in the Gem Saloon on Royal Street. For two weeks Louisiana had two legislatures. Not until the end of January, 1872, did the Warmoth faction win over enough members from the rival body to organize for business. By that time the regular session was half over.

During the spring and summer of 1872 the several factions of Louisiana Republicans and Democrats girded themselves for the coming state and national elections. The split in Republican ranks at the national level between Grant Republicans and Liberal Republicans rendered Louisiana politics more bewildering than ever. At least five distinct groups ultimately held conventions and fielded candidates.
They have been identified as the Reformers, the Democrats, the Customs House Republicans, the Pinchback Republicans, and the Liberals. The Reformers, centered mainly in New Orleans, sought to break the power of the state over local government by repealing many of the laws instituted by Governor Warmoth. The Democrats met on April 18, somewhat disconcerted by Governor Warmoth's formation the previous week of a state Liberal party, opposed to Grant's reelection. If the Democrats and the Liberal Republicans coalesced on the national level, what should be the relationship between Warmoth and the Louisiana Democracy? The Democrats decided to await national developments before naming a slate of candidates. The Customs House Republicans met on April 30 under the leadership of United States Marshal, S. B. Packard and C. C. Antoine. They denounced Warmoth, but made efforts to win over P. B. S. Pinchback, leader of the fifth faction on the political scene. Pinchback spoke for a large contingent of black voters whom the Customs House element hoped to woo away from Warmoth. The Republican convention endorsed Grant but did not nominate a state ticket until later in the year. On May 28 the Pinchback group held its own convention. It could not agree on an endorsement for Grant. Three weeks later the two Republican factions met separately in Baton Rouge.
Failing to reach agreement, Pinchback's people withdrew to New Orleans, but the Customs House element remained to nomi­nate W. P. Kellogg for governor and C. C. Antoine, a Negro, as his running-mate. Ultimately Pinchback's group endorsed the Grant-Kellogg-Antoine ticket. In return, a Negro, William Brown, received the Republican nomination for state Superintendent of Public Education, and Pinchback, also a Negro, ran as Congressman-at-large.

Meanwhile, the Democrats reconvened, agreed to consider coalition with other groups, and named a straight Democratic slate headed by John McEnery. By July, 1872, the Reform party fused with the Democrats. They accepted the McEnery ticket, and endorsed the candidacy of Horace Greeley and B. Gratz Brown for president and vice-president. Finally, Warmoth Liberals met in New Orleans on August 5, 1872. After six days they chose Davidson B. Penn for governor and Warmoth was endorsed for United States Senator. By the end of the month Liberals, Reformers and Democrats resolved their differences in a series of private meetings. The result was a Fusion ticket composed of John McEnery for governor and Davidson Penn for Lieutenant governor. Horace Greeley won Fusion endorsement for the presidency.

Voters went to the polls on November 4, 1872. Both
sides claimed victory, but under Louisiana law the state Returning Board had to certify the results of the election. Throughout November Governor Warmoth and the Customs House faction battled over the composition of the Returning Board. A Radical Federal judge, after several suits and counter-suits, upheld a pro-Kellogg Returning Board on December 6. The night before, the same judge ordered the Federal marshal to take possession of Mechanics Institute, the official meeting place of the Louisiana legislature. Federal troops occupied the building for the next six weeks. Meanwhile, Governor Warmoth issued a call for the legislature elected on November 4, 1872, to convene in special session on December 9. The Pinchback-Kellogg forces, in control of Mechanics Institute, admitted only those members certified by the pro-Kellogg Returning Board. The Warmoth-McEnery-approved legislators met in Lyceum Hall. Both bodies organized immediately. The pro-Kellogg House brought impeachment proceedings against Governor Warmoth, thereby suspending him from office in favor of the acting lieutenant governor, P. B. S. Pinchback, of the Kellogg faction. The two legislatures then proceeded to lure each other's members back and forth in order to obtain a quorum. Again both governments appealed to President Grant for recognition. The
Warmoth-McEnery group even sent a delegation of 100 citizens to petition the President personally. But all to no avail. President Grant recognized the Pinchback-Kellogg regime on December 12 as the lawful government of Louisiana. He promised to uphold it with all the force necessary to prevent disorder. The Federal authorities did make it clear, however, that they would not prevent efforts by McEnery partisans to "inaugurate" their man in January, 1873, if no violence accompanied the ceremonies and if the Fusion forces did not try to take over the state by force.

On January 6, 1873, the Pinchback-Kellogg forces, having finally adjourned the extra session of 1872, met in regular session at Mechanics Institute. The Warmoth-McEnery legislators assembled at Odd Fellows Hall. A week later William Pitt Kellogg and John McEnery delivered inaugural addresses to their respective supporters. Both governments met regularly for business throughout the legislative session. But in the end, only the bills adopted by the Kellogg legislature received official sanction. Finally, after disturbances between the partisans of the two governments erupted on March 5, the McEnery legislature was disbanded by armed police. To most white Louisianians, it was
still the legal government of the state.¹

In November, 1872, while the Returning Board controversy was before the courts, David Boyd wrote to General William T. Sherman about Louisiana's tangled political affairs. Apparently he urged Sherman to use his good offices with President Grant to bring peace to the state. Sherman replied that everyone, from the President "on down," wanted peace and harmony, but "you can't command these." He assured David that the troops in New Orleans had orders to do nothing but keep the peace. They were responsible to the Federal marshal who in turn answered to the Federal courts. Sherman knew the Federal judges who would decide which Louisiana state government should rule. He considered them able and learned. But David was not convinced. A month later, on December 27, he wrote Sherman again, describing the "confusion and turmoil at New Orleans." Sherman answered on

¹Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 72-230 passim; McGinty, History of Louisiana, 214-15; Randall and Donald, Civil War and Reconstruction, 691. McGinty's account seems to be essentially a summary of the material presented in Lonn. Other sources which go beyond the political developments are Roger Shugg, Origins of The Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers During Slavery and After, 1840-75 (Baton Rouge, 1939), 224-33, and William Highsmith, "Louisiana During Reconstruction" (Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1953).
January 6, 1873, the same day the rival legislatures convened in regular session. He defended President Grant's recognition of the Pinchback-Kellogg regime in December on the ground that some action had to be taken until Congress or the Supreme Court could investigate Louisiana affairs. He pointed out that McEnery's legislature had been promised freedom to meet provided it did so without disorder. "I believe," Sherman concluded, "if McHenry [sic], the Governor-elect and his Legislature are the true body, they will be so declared when the case reaches Washington by appeal and in that event General Grant will surely so regard them. Keep this to yourself," he admonished David, "and don't compromise me or yourself by any disclosures."2

At the same time David was corresponding with other prominent figures involved in Louisiana's disputed election of 1872. He was even trying to devise some kind of solution to the state's incredibly complicated problem. On December 17, 1872, while the two legislatures were meeting in extra session, David wrote to one of the key figures in the

---

2General Wm. T. Sherman to D. F. Boyd, December 4, 1872, in Sherman (Wm. T.) Letters, David F. Boyd Family Papers, 1864-91; William Sherman to David Boyd, January 6, 1872 [sic], in William T. Sherman Papers, Library of Congress. This letter, incorrectly dated 1872, obviously was written in 1873.
Returning Board dispute, state Senator "Honest John" Lynch. Lynch was president of that Returning Board which declared Kellogg the victor in 1872 and whose legality was ultimately upheld in the state courts.\(^3\) Admitting that he was "no politician," David declared that he thought "truth" lay somewhere between the extreme claims made by the two parties. David voted the "Liberal" ticket (McEnery-Penn) against Kellogg and Antoine, but even before election day, he was sure that unfair tactics had been employed by registrars in the country parishes and that reprisals would result. If the election had been "honest," he thought Kellogg, Penn, and Robert M. Lusher, the Fusion candidate for state Superintendent of Public Education, would have been the winners. The Liberals, David believed, would have carried two-fifths of the house and one-third of the senate. He knew it was "too late to compromise now," but if it were possible, he would install Kellogg, Penn, Lusher, and all those legislators whose election was not in dispute. To fill the doubtful legislative seats he would hold another election. Louisiana's electoral vote should go to Grant and all of the state's congressional seats should be awarded  

\(^3\)Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 186, 190.
to Radical Republicans. Finally, the acts of both legislatures adopted during the extra session of 1872 should be declared null and void. Such an outcome would be fair and honest. As a Democrat, a Southerner, and a secessionist, David declared, "I would rather always be beaten in the right than win in the wrong!" He was glad to see Brown defeat Lusher and Antoine beat Penn if the only way they could do it was by fraud. "From the days of Mr. Slidell down to now, in all elections, God knows we have had too much ... fraud in La." 4

Lynch admired David's fairness, but he did not see how such a compromise could be brought about. "Who has the authority or the power?" he asked. Undismayed, David continued to promote his plan even though many to whom he suggested it labeled it "impractical." However, by February 20, 1872, some form of compromise seemed possible. On that day a majority of the United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom the Louisiana muddle had been referred, submitted a plan for settling the controversy. It called for reinstating Governor Warmoth and all those holding office under him until a new election, under the

4 David F. Boyd to John Lynch, December 17, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
supervision of a Federal circuit court, could take place in May, 1873. But two days of heated debate and a telling argument opposing Federal intervention in the internal political affairs of a state managed to kill any Senate action at all. By March 4, 1873, both houses of Congress had adjourned.5

David may not have been aware of the congressional adjournment, or he may have been an incurable optimist. On March 9, 1873, he wrote the Fusion candidate for lieutenant governor, Davidson B. Penn, a confidential letter, inquiring whether Penn would be willing to serve with Kellogg in a compromise administration. He doubted that John McEnery had actually won the governorship in 1872, but he did think that Penn, Robert M. Lusher and one other had been fairly elected. Because he was "compelled to deal with politicians of both parties," David knew most of them "pretty well." Kellogg he did not know at all. But he had "reason to believe" that President Grant and Kellogg would accept a compromise administration in Louisiana composed of Kellogg as governor, Penn as lieutenant governor, and Lusher as

5Senator John Lynch to David Boyd, December 26, 1872, March 15, 1873, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9; D. F. Boyd to Chief Justice of Louisiana J. T. Ludeling, March 4, 1873, copy, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 232-233, 240.
superintendent of public education. If Penn wanted his help, David promised to do all he could to bring such a compromise about. David's "reason to believe" that Grant would accept a compromise evaporated two months later when on May 22, 1873, the President publicly proclaimed his recognition of the Kellogg regime and ordered all citizens to "retire peaceably" to their homes and submit themselves to the government and laws of Louisiana.\(^6\)

Louisiana's chaotic political developments in 1872 had a disastrous effect on public institutions like the Louisiana State University. In his Anniversary Address in January, 1873, David discussed the school's history and future prospects at length. The University, he told his young audience, "is in a bad fix." In previous years the legislature appropriated funds for the school only "with the greatest reluctance." Now, under the Kellogg regime, there would

\(^6\)D. F. Boyd to Col. D. B. Penn, March 9, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 245. Only two days before Grant's proclamation General Sherman wrote David somewhat defensively: "We all deplore the sad political condition of Louisiana, and all the President aims to accomplish is to prevent actual collision—between the two state governments. There is hardly room for choice, and inasmuch as the courts have made a decision that Kellogg is governor, the President prefers to recognize him as such." William T. Sherman to David Boyd, May 20, 1873, in Sherman Papers, Library of Congress.
doubtless be no appropriations whatever. The crux of the problem was the state cadet law, something David believed in and worked hard in the past to expand. By January, 1873, however, all but seventeen of the 118 cadets were beneficiaries. Under the law the legislature appropriated $350 for each cadet annually. But the money was paid in state warrants, then selling at only forty cents on the dollar. At that rate, David thought, it would take $1,000 annually to cover a cadet's actual cost to the University. Therefore he intended to ask for the repeal of the beneficiary law in 1873. He regretted having to part with so many "clever young men," but to keep the beneficiaries from "crushing the school with debt, . . . they shd go away." In future, the University would depend on private patronage and, if it could secure it, the Agricultural and Mechanical college fund. 7

Even before 1873 the beneficiary law had contributed heavily to the University's indebtedness. In his Report for 1870 David mentioned the numerical disparity between state and "pay" cadets. This, plus the depreciated state warrants comprised the principal reasons for the school's

7David Boyd, Anniversary Address, January 2, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13.
deficit that year. The following year the situation was worse. David begged the legislature to pay the school in United States currency for the state cadets. If the amount appropriated came to only half of the request, they would cut operations in half. Between 1867 and 1872, he declared, the loss suffered from depreciated warrants would have been enough to build a new home for the University or to endow six professorships. David set University liabilities at $55,300 above assets as of November 30, 1872. This was at the height of the McEnery-Kellogg disputed election, and during the next several weeks, state warrants dropped lower than ever. As the year drew to a close, David finally admitted that the beneficiary system had to go. On December 17, 1872, he urged Senator "Honest John" Lynch to have the state cadet law repealed. He regretted his failure to recommend such action earlier. But now it was clear that the beneficiaries were "ruining the school." If they remained they might even cause it to close.8

8Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1870, p. 7; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1871, pp. 4-6; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1874, p. 9; David Boyd to Senator John Lynch, December 17, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10. As early as November, 1871, Board member G. Mason Graham advocated abolition of the beneficiary system. But David, as he explained to the students in January,
The Kellogg legislature of 1873 did not repeal the law nor did it vote any funds for the school. Neither did David ask for an appropriation. In justification he explained: "The doubt and uncertainty hovering over our State government . . . and the deplorable condition of our State Treasury, together with the great poverty of our people rendered it wrong in my opinion to ask relief." Finally, in March, 1873, the University issued an indefinite furlough to the state cadets. Before leaving, the young men adopted resolutions of thanks to everyone connected with the school. For David they reserved the highest praise. His "heroic sacrifice," "unquenchable zeal," and "indomitable will" had made the University "like a father's house."

Professors soon joined the general exodus from Baton

1873, kept expecting the political situation to improve, thereby stabilizing the state's warrants. G. Mason Graham to D. F. Boyd, November 10, 1871, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6; David Boyd, Anniversary Address, January 2, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13.


10Baton Rouge Tri-Weekly Gazette and Comet, March 27, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook.
Rouge. On April 14, 1873, Colonel Samuel H. Lockett, David's closest and most trusted friend on the faculty, announced his intention to leave at the end of the session. Two of Lockett's friends resigned the same day. By the end of the term the number rose to six. In his letter of resignation Colonel Lockett declared that he could "not go on ignoring his first duty to his wife and children." He had seen for two years "the need of this move." But he had put it off in order to help David in that "Herculean task . . . for which you were and still are sacrificing the best years of your life." Lockett's case was typical. Since 1871 the University had paid the professors intermittently or not at all. To avoid discount rates up to fifty per cent, David refused to sell some $81,000 worth of warrants in 1871. Instead, he pledged them for a loan of $39,000 with which to run the school. If conditions improved, the warrants could be sold later at more advantageous rates. Meanwhile, the salaries of professors and other employees went unpaid. They had to live on credit, thereby incurring large personal debts. David noted all this in his Report to the Board for 1871. If the University did not pay its professors, it would soon lose them to other schools. Even if it merely delayed payment, the professors' efficiency would be
impaired. Constantly "badgered by butcher & baker," a professor could not devote all his attention to his duties. A professor "is a delicate organism," David declared, whose "sensitive nature revolts" at the rough treatment meted out by creditors.  

The six men who left in 1873 were somehow replaced with new men or advanced cadets who agreed to teach without pay. But by July, 1874, the staff dropped to five. A year later only two remained, David and his brother Tom. But even with its drastically reduced faculty, the University was probably overstaffed in relation to the small enrollment. Just before the beneficiaries were sent home on "indefinite furlough," in March, 1873, the school claimed 118 cadets and approximately twelve professors. Throughout 1874, a total of thirty-one cadets received instruction from a faculty of five, and in January 1875, there were only eight students and four professors. By mid-March the numbers shrank to

11S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, April 14, 1873, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9; J. P. McCauley to David Boyd, April 14, 1873, ibid., Box 10; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 250; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1871, pp. 4-6.

12Fleming, Louisiana State University, 250-52; Tom Boyd Diary, July 10, October 17, 1875, Typescript in possession of Dr. T. Harry Williams, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
seven and three, causing Tom Boyd to comment: "How different from our condition on arriving here in 1869, after the burning of our building . . . The number of professors then was greater than that of professors and cadets both now." After the legislature adjourned in April, 1875, David finally agreed to open the school to day students. None came in that session but during the next year, a few did attend. As of January, 1876, the enrollment stood at twenty, fifteen of whom came from Baton Rouge.

The tuition paid by the cadets, eighty dollars each annually, plus the maintenance fees of those few who boarded at the University, provided the only income for the entire University staff after Kellogg became governor in 1873. Even the annuity from the endowment fund provided no support. In 1874 the legislature partially repudiated the state's debt and a constitutional amendment further reduced the state's obligations by scaling down its bonds some forty

13 David Boyd, Anniversary Address, January 2, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13; Report to the Board of Supervisors for 1874, p. 6; David Boyd Diary, January 22, February 1, 1875; Tom Boyd Diary, March 14, 1875. The nadir was reached at the end of the session, June 30, 1875, when the cadets totaled four and the faculty two. Tom Boyd Diary, June 30, 1875.

14 Tom Boyd Diary, January 6, 1876.
per cent. To the University Board this constituted a violation of a "sacred trust." In protest the school refused to surrender its old bonds. Consequently it received no annuity in 1874 and it would not cash the scaled down annuity warrant for 1875. The embattled few at the University had to survive on credit. David revealed the level to which they were reduced when he asked Vice-President Sanford to sign the 1875 annuity warrant. He did not intend to sell it. "But I wd like to have the warrant from you; it may help us to live on--if I can show it to people."15

One bright note relieved David's otherwise grim existence after 1873: the excellent relations he enjoyed with the Board of Supervisors. This may well have been due to the fact that the entire Board did not convene for several years after the spring of 1872, and the only active members, Vice-President William Sanford and General G. Mason Graham, lived miles away from Baton Rouge in Rapides Parish. In the absence of full Board meetings the Executive Committee, composed of Sanford, Graham and Michael Ryan, another Rapides resident, had the power to approve everything David

15_Fleming, Louisiana State University, 249; David Boyd to Wm. Sanford, November 3, 1874, March 4, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; Minutes of Executive Committee, March 30, 1875.
proposed. After the school moved to Baton Rouge, they usually did. William Sanford and General Graham trusted David implicitly. They had nothing but the highest praise for him as a person and as an administrator. And David, for his part, did not hesitate to exercise his administrative powers to the fullest. "You know, I am perhaps too prone to assume responsibility and act on it," he once admitted to William Sanford, "but when I see that a great good can be done the school by putting myself in a little personal danger, I assure you that I care then but little for myself..." Once, in 1865, General Graham felt called upon to remind David that his authority had limits. Later, convinced that he meant nothing but good for the school, the general merely advised caution. Vice-President Sanford, more retiring still, interfered even less. In 1873 he wrote David:

I have always thought that the best service the B. S. Board of Supervisors could render the University would be to let it alone as much as possible--only aiding the Supt. to carry out whatever line of policy

---

16 David Boyd to Captain W. C. Black, Board member, December 28, 1874; David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, February 11, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks.

17 David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, September 23, 1870, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Box 5.
he might think best to adopt—for it must be patent to everybody that the Institution can only be made a success by the tact, ability, and endurance of the Supt. 18

With two notable exceptions almost every proposal David submitted to Vice-President Sanford between 1873 and 1877 was subsequently approved by the Executive Committee. Sanford did not press for a meeting of the entire Board and he apparently did not pass on to the Executive Committee or the whole Board David's informal request to resign "as early as the interests of the University permit." David wanted a meeting of the entire Board to approve his administration of the University, to consider its future, and to prepare a report to the legislature. He thought the Board's failure to meet for over two years "looked bad" to both the Radicals and the "best people." But Sanford argued that a full Board meeting in such unsettled political circumstances might do more harm than good. As for the resignation, David submitted it informally to Sanford in October, 1874, at a time when the pressure from creditors was particularly intense. David's Letterbook and Diary entries for October recorded nothing but demands for payment by butchers, bakers,

18 W. L. Sanford to David F. Boyd, June 22, 1873, ibid., Box 11; G. Mason Graham to David F. Boyd, November 13, 1865, ibid., Box 6.
servants, and loan sharks. If he did not get "absolute rest" soon, he wrote the vice-president, he feared for his sanity. "I am sure I have weakened my mind . . . I am a used up man."¹⁹

Everything else David proposed to the Executive Committee received unquestioned approval. Among his suggestions were a "Scheme to Raise an Endowment Fund" for the University, an authorization to transfer funds from one account to another, and the adoption of new regulations to govern the University. David drafted the new regulations, which significantly broadened his authority, during the summer of 1874. He wanted to enforce them by October. But if he sent them to Rapides for approval, they might be lost.

¹⁹David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, October 16, 1874; David Boyd to Capt. W. C. Black, December 28, 1874, in Boyd (David F.,) Letterbooks, 1874-75. A letter David wrote to the school's principal agent in New Orleans reveals clearly his anguished condition. Early in October, 1874, David asked Mr. Kenton of Swarbrick's to negotiate a $750-loan for the school. To secure it Mr. Kenton committed the school to pay five per cent interest a month. David protested. The rate was so exorbitant that he felt bound to assume part of it personally. In the same letter he noted that the school opened with only five cadets. Then: "I hope to pay the $250 note due on the 10th and will do my utmost to meet the $1000 on 15th. But if I am to pay five per cent a month, I had better in decency and common sense, and in self-respect, close the University--and quit at once. There is no use struggling any more [if] remorseless money sharpers are to bleed us to death." David Boyd to J. Kenton, undated, 1874,
enroute. Therefore he asked Sanford, Graham and Ryan to endorse the new rules sight unseen. They did, "due to the exigencies of the Situation."\(^{20}\)

During 1874 and 1875 political tensions increased in Louisiana. David was sure the Kellogg regime would soon attack the school, especially if he did anything to attract its attention. Therefore he did not fire the usual salute to open the University session or advertise the school in any way. In January, 1875, the Board authorized him to accept day students, but this, too, David considered "a dangerous experiment." He even stayed away from New Orleans for fear his presence might remind Governor Kellogg of the University and encourage him to shut it down.\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\)David Boyd, "Scheme to Raise an Endowment Fund," May 25, 1872, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1870-75, Box 20; Minutes of Executive Committee, September 15, 1873, October 7, 1874; David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, September 30, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75. The "Scheme to Raise an Endowment Fund" proposed, in return for a $100-donation, to remit $220 of the $320-tuition fee (eighty dollars a year) charged by the University. "We hope to increase the number of cadets so much, that the increased amounts paid for board and other fees, now footing $320 for each cadet per annum, will more than make up the loss incurred on tuition." It did not work.

\(^{21}\)David Boyd Diary, October 3, 1874, January 22, January 28, January 30, 1875.
Radical attack did come, David wanted to be prepared.

Beginning in November, 1874, he pleaded with the Executive Committee of the Board to approve all of his financial accounts and to endorse his entire tenure as superintendent of the school. He was particularly anxious that it be done before General Graham left Louisiana to live in Virginia. As the "Father of the Institution," Graham knew more about it than anyone else. No one could be sure, David reminded William Sanford, how soon a "Bd. of Carpetbaggers & Niggers" might take over the school. Therefore he wanted formal approval of the Executive Committee on all University documents. In March he sent a number of papers concerning University indebtedness to Rapides for ratification by the committee. He also begged the former clerk-bookkeeper, William Van Pelt, to come to Baton Rouge in order to arrange his accounts. Van Pelt could not leave his job in Vicksburg, but he did organize David's affairs through the mails. David was still worried. "I am no bookkeeper" he protested. "If I can only have them \[\text{the books}\] . . . properly kept, I can stand everything else."

---

22 David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, November 3, 1874, February 11, March 4, 1875; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, March 10, 20, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75;
a Board member, former professor, and, in 1875, a Shreveport lawyer, to draft a general resolution approving his entire stewardship of the University. He wanted the draft drawn up at once and presented to the Board for its approval because "there may be changes made in the Bd. at any moment." On March 30, 1875, and again on April 12, the Executive Committee, acting for the Board, adopted resolutions ratifying all the "acts performed by Col. D. F. Boyd in his capacity of Supt. during the whole term of his service as such." In appreciation for his self-denial and devotion to duty, they conferred upon him the honorary degree of "Dr. of laws."^23

David's desire to secure formal Board approval for all his administrative acts is understandable considering the potential threat posed by the hostile Kellogg regime. But he also wanted to secure Board approval to forestall criticism from another source: the University's numerous creditors. By October 1, 1874, the University was deeply in debt. In that month David reported to Governor Kellogg that its liabilities amounted to over $100,000. Its assets

William Van Pelt to Col. D. Boyd, March 12, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

^23 David Boyd to Wm. A. Seay, March 20, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; Minutes of the Executive Committee, March 30, April 12, 1875.
in movables and real property he estimated at upwards of $150,000. But the assets represented books, equipment, furniture and land. If auctioned, they would hardly bring the value he ascribed to them. Bills from suppliers and claims for back wages accounted for most of the liabilities. The largest single creditor, Swarbrick and Company, claimed over $16,000. Unpaid salary for professors amounted to $38,000 and wages owed to servants equaled $14,500. In addition to this public debt, David owed a great deal personally. Some of it represented necessary expenditures for food and clothing. But much of it David assumed in order to protect and promote the school. For example, when the school could not borrow money on its own authority, David gave his personal note for repayment. When the Board announced its inability to pay professors' salaries, David employed a staff at his own expense. And when "friends of the University" reneged on pledges to purchase an expensive painting for the school, David assumed the cost himself.  


25 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 264; Tom Boyd Diary, January 17, 1876; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, October 18, 1874; David Boyd to J. H. McLean, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
Before he could pay for it, the artist's agent tried to reclaim it because he had found another buyer. David urged the agent to wait. If the picture left the school, the University's army of creditors would certainly misunderstand. They would not grasp the fact that the painting was secured by David's personal note. "They can't draw a line between me personally and officially; and a few of them wd no doubt consider they had a right to take the last out of the mouths of my little children to . . . secure their University claims." 26

The truth seems to be that David could not distinguish between his public and personal obligations either. He felt a deep sense of personal responsibility to the school's many creditors, especially to the several unpaid professors and employees. In his Diary and in his letters to Mr. Kenton of Swarbrick's and to several professors, he promised to remain "at his post" until some relief could be obtained. In September, 1874, he pledged Dr. Francis Hopkins, an ex-professor to whom the University owed over $5,000 in salary, that he would "try to get the school, & all of you out of the trouble I got you into." A year

26 David Boyd to J. H. McLean, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
later, when he heard that one of the school's largest suppliers was about to fail, he again took the blame. "I am sorry--sorry about it all--they and many others. Most of it is my fault." Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Swarbrick's suggested taking out an insurance policy on David's life in order to protect its investment. To David the idea smacked of playing favorites. What he did for one creditor, he felt he should "in justice" do for all. "Were my life insured for all of them, why, I wd not live six months!" David also questioned the propriety of any creditor calling on him for personal insurance when the debt was public. Then, somewhat inconsistently, he offered to assume "personally" $2,000 of what the school owed Swarbrick and Company.28

In spite of David's efforts in their behalf, many creditors became impatient. Even the former professors did not seem to understand. When he mentioned his intention of leaving Louisiana by 1877, Colonel S. H. Lockett replied

27David Boyd Diary, December 10, 1874; David Boyd to Dr. F. V. Hopkins, September 30, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, November 28, 1875, ibid., 1875-76.

28David Boyd to George Swarbrick & Co., undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
that David appeared to be abandoning all hope of ever securing relief for the creditors of the University. David was hurt. He thought Colonel Lockett, of all people, understood why he was still in Baton Rouge: to save the school and pay off the creditors. If he did not succeed by 1877, surely his old friends would not blame him for "beginning to think" of his family. David reminded Lockett how hard he had tried to get relief from the Radical legislature early in 1874. If it were similarly composed of "scoundrels" in 1875, he did not intend to go near it. He would simply wait for a new administration in 1877, even if it starved his family. After that he would "desert" and, like other people, look out for himself.\textsuperscript{29} Another ex-professor, Dr. Americus Featherman, sued the school for his back pay, demanding that its property be seized and sold to satisfy its creditors. The University lost in the lower court, but an injunction prevented the sale of its property until the case

\textsuperscript{29} Colonel Lockett hastily replied. He realized that David was doing everything possible to secure relief for everyone. Then he offered David some advice: "Go right to work now, and make arrangements to give up the La. State University . . . Try to get the Legislature to relieve you . . . If it does so, well; if not, you have done your duty, and you are not called upon by considerations of honor or duty to sacrifice yourself longer in . . . an almost hopeless undertaking." S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, November 21, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File,
was appealed and the decision reversed. The higher court held that University property was state property and could not be seized to satisfy debts. Nevertheless, David believed the Featherman suit did great injury to the school and to him personally because it accused David of squandering University funds on "fine furniture and expensive paintings." Actually, David bought the furniture and paintings with his own money and gave them to the school. But again, in the public mind, the distinction between him and the school was rarely made.  

In January of 1875 Louisiana again had two legislatures. By January 9, the Kellogg body, which David called the "Rump" legislature, was organized for business. A Negro, J. Henri Burch, represented Baton Rouge in the Kellogg Senate. When David heard that Burch intended to introduce a bill "for the relief of creditors of the State University," he was sure that fraud and collusion were afoot. Senator Burch introduced a similar measure in 1874 designed

Box 9; David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75. Internal evidence indicates the letter was written in October, 1874.

30Fleming, Louisiana State University, 265; David Boyd to Dr. A. Featherman, April 14, July 15, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
to aid a specified group of Baton Rouge creditors. David considered it grossly unfair to the rest of the creditors and did all he could to defeat it. The 1874 effort, he told one creditor, "offended even that horrible legislature." He was sure it kept them from locating the Agricultural and Mechanical College in Baton Rouge. As for the bill introduced by Senator Burch in 1875, David suspected a "put up job." A few Baton Rouge creditors, he believed, had made a deal with Burch. He would introduce a bill for their relief and, if it passed, they would pay him a "kickback." To David this was "dastardly." It amounted to simple bribery and if his speculations proved correct, he intended to "wreck the scheme." To a friend in New Orleans he commented bitterly:

What must be thought of some of them / the Baton Rouge creditors /, well-endowed with worldly goods . . . who wld, for a few dollars, ruin us all. Baton Rouge grew up around a fort—is nothing but a sutter's camp; and the morals of such trashy people, you know better than I can describe. There are a few exceptions, some fine and true men here; but the generality are . . . so small that many of them at once cld go thro' the eye of a needle at a gallop.31

31David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, January 9, 1875; David Boyd to R. J. McCabe, January 8, 1875; David Boyd to Jas. McVay, January 8, 1875; David Boyd to W. C. Annis, January 9, 1875; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, February 2, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
What David really objected to was according any recognition at all to the "Rump" legislature. He was required by law to send his annual Report to the lawmakers. But Baton Rouge creditors had no excuse to deal with "such creatures." They should ignore the "Rump" and wait for the "true" legislature to convene. David could not hide his feelings from the creditors or even Senator Burch. When the latter asked for a full statement of University accounts, David referred him to his annual Report. Then he asked Burch to "consider well the advisability" of bringing up University matters when political conditions were so "fluid." He urged him to wait. The University would have plenty of friends in the legislature when things "settled down." With creditors he was more direct. To bribe was worse than to be bribed. He would do all he could to scuttle any creditor's attempt to secure relief by offering a fee to the "infamous creatures who are ... our legislators." How, he demanded, could Louisianians ever escape their troubles if people continued to buy laws and lawmakers? If he could help it, Louisiana's legislature would not be "prostituted." 32

32David Boyd to R. M. Lusher, February 3, 1875; David Boyd to W. C. Annis, January 9, 1875; David Boyd to J. Henri Burch, January 27, 1875; David Boyd to W. E.
While the "Rump" legislature was in session, David declared to a friend that he was opposed to anyone, certainly himself, accepting relief from what he considered an "illegal body." When it adjourned **sine die**, he said he was glad he had not gone near it. The "Rump" legislature did pass a general appropriations bill, but David wanted no part of it. "I hope they have not done the University the indignity of putting our name on their **vile pay-sheet,**" he scrawled in his Letterbook. "They" did not. Neither did the "true" legislature which met a few weeks later in April, 1875. The University received no funds from the state until 1877. The creditors had to wait until 1880.33

While David struggled to do his duty by the University and its creditors, he often overlooked the well-being of his immediate family. David himself supplied the best evidence of his neglect in a diary he began keeping during the summer of 1874. The fairly regular entries continued until the next year when he no longer had time for his

Seebold, February 11, 1875, *ibid.*

33David Boyd to R. M. Lusher, February 3, 1875; David Boyd, Memorandum on Adjournment of "Rump" Legislature, undated, *ibid*; Tom Boyd Diary, April 24, 1875; Fleming, *Louisiana State University*, 318.
journal. But the two small volumes he did fill provide
graphic accounts of the impoverished circumstances endured
by the Boyds during the last years of Radical Reconstruc-
tion. So do the hundreds of letters David wrote between
1874 and 1877. An extremely enthusiastic correspondent,
David never used two pages if four were at hand. After
1874, when enrollment at the University dropped to a hand-
ful, he had plenty of time to indulge this eccentricity. A
letter he wrote to an ex-cadet and former colleague in 1874
is typical:

Last week we came near starving: We had bread, beef,
with a little coffee--but no sugar or anything else
literally . . . and our butcher determined to stop
the beef on Saturday if he could not be paid . . .
When I think of the condition of my family, and how
much worse they wld be in case of sickness, I feel
heartily ashamed, and know that I ought to go away
now. But . . . I feel it to be my duty to leave no
effort untried, and to leave no personal suffering
and privation unendured, to stand by the old school
to the last. Consequently, I try not to think of
self and family. 34

David was not exaggerating. He literally did not know, from
one day to the next, and sometimes from one meal to the
next, where he might get food for his family. The weight
of his responsibilities nearly drove him to distraction.

34David Boyd to T. L. Grimes, August 11, 1874, in
Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
As he explained to another former colleague:

To pay in part for our provisions of '72 and '73, I had to pledge our annuity of '74, which not being paid yet (and may never be) I have the weight of three years on me . . . God only knows what is to become of us. If my wife and children were not suffering so much, I could stand it better; but in case of any serious illness . . . especially to my wife, I don't see how I could possibly do.35

Random entries from David's diary are even more illustrative of his poverty and despair. On July 25, 1874, he had the brass buttons removed from his Civil War uniform and replaced by "civil" buttons. He could not possibly buy a new coat. In August, 1874, he wondered what would become of his family if he died. In Baton Rouge alone he owed $700. On September 1, he planned to go to New Orleans with only twenty cents in his pocket. The University did not have a penny. In fact, it owed him a dollar. He did not go that day, but when he did, he had "one nickel in my pocket . . . not another cent in the world."36 The trip to New Orleans was for the purpose of begging for a loan. He had exhausted long before all sources of credit in Baton Rouge. In New

35David Boyd to William Van Pelt, January 5, 1875; David Boyd to Pendleton King, ex-professor, February 10, 1875, ibid.

36David Boyd Diary, July 25, August 16, September 1, September 2, 1874.
Orleans he thought he still had some contacts. Yet, on September 5, 1874, he was "mortified" when James Gresham, one of the University's principal creditors, refused him twenty dollars. The worst was still to come. An entry in his diary for March 11, 1875, was particularly hopeless: "Next week! What does it not (of trouble) promise? Where is the money to pay that $1650 note at La Nat'l Bank, & the bill of Garig [Baton Rouge grocer and supplier] about $60, & the bread-bill, and Contreaux' bill of cloth, & Reuss' balance of tuition [remitted]? Next week!"37

What David feared most, serious illness in his family, did occur in the spring of 1875. It began with Mrs. Wright, Ettie's mother. Mrs. Wright was a chronic invalid but in March, 1875, she seemed so feeble that David did not think she could live much longer. A few weeks later Arthur, David's four-year-old son, developed an extremely high fever. He suffered convulsions and almost died. Fortunately, Superintendent McWhorter's wife reduced his fever by bathing him in cold water. Meanwhile, David and Tom Boyd walked all over Baton Rouge searching for a doctor. None would come to the University. Tom thought doctors did not

37 Ibid., September 5, 1874, March 11, 1875.
like to go out in the rain, but David believed they were afraid they would not be paid. Arthur's illness lasted several days. Even after the fever left him, he seemed so nervous that David thought his mind had been affected. David's peace of mind was certainly shattered. Concerned over his many obligations and his child's brush with death, he could not even concentrate on reading. More than ever he realized the need to leave Baton Rouge for his family's sake.38

Arthur had barely recovered when Ettie was suddenly stricken with what Tom Boyd described as pneumonia. Her condition seemed so serious that he telegraphed David, then in New Orleans, to come home at once. A few days later she suffered a miscarriage from which she did not fully recover for months. Unlike Arthur, Ettie did have medical attention during the worst part of her illness. Dr. J. W. Dupree, the University physician, was very attentive. He refused any pay, insisting that his job required him to treat the Boyd family as well as the cadets. "The truth is," Tom Boyd noted in his diary, "he knows David has no money to pay

38 Ibid., February 15, 28, March 7, April 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 1875; Tom Boyd Diary, April 1, 4, 1875; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, April 3, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
him . . . He is the only physician in the place who would come to see any of us if we were dying."^39

Conditions in the Boyd household did not improve in 1876. If anything, they grew worse. More in debt than ever, and dependent upon his mother-in-law for enough money to clothe his children, David himself was practically in rags. Yet he had to go to New Orleans in February, 1876, because the University's creditors insisted that he appeal to the legislature for relief. Tom Boyd described his departure: "D. went almost naked and carried in his valise not one single article of clothing; and besides, \( \text{he} \) had to borrow money to pay his way down."^40

In New Orleans David did not secure relief for the creditors or an appropriation for the University. But he did succeed in winning legislative approval for the merger of the University with the Agricultural and Mechanical College. The merger bill represented the end of a ten-year-long struggle. It also posed an immediate problem. As soon as Governor Kellogg signed the bill, the merged schools would

---

^39 Tom Boyd Diary, April 20, 21, 22, 24, 1875; S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, May 6, 18, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.

^40 Tom Boyd Diary, January 17, February 20, 1876.
begin operations in the Asylum building. But, since David intended to hold no office in the new institution, he would have to find new quarters for his family in the very near future. The family apartments at the University were not exactly luxurious. Tom Boyd labeled them "dismal." Located on the third floor, they reminded him of what he had read about attics and tenement houses in New York City. There were no servants; Ettie and Miss Mary Wright took care of the children and their invalid mother. They also sewed, cooked, and did the washing. Once, in 1874, Ettie proposed paying for a Negro laundress by taking in the woman's sewing, but David would not allow it. "Better do her own washing," he decided. In May, 1876, Tom Boyd wrote his father: "Our life at home [Wytheville] during the latter part of the war would compare as favorably with theirs now, as a bed of eider down with an inverted harrow." Nevertheless, as June, 1876, approached, the Boyd's miserable accommodations in the Asylum must have seemed almost attractive, for at the term's end they would have to move. But David had no job

41 Thomas D. Boyd to Thos. J. Boyd, May 14, 1876, in Boyd (Thos.) Letterbooks, 1876-80, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University; Tom Boyd Diary, March 4, 12, 1876; David Boyd Diary, October 31, 1874; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, February 14, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
and, as of June 7, not a "single dollar." To make matters worse, Ettie expected a fourth child in September. In despair, David wrote a friend, "If this state of things is to last much longer it would be better that we were all dead."42

Much of the hardship endured by David and his family was unavoidable. Louisiana, the South, and to some degree, the whole country suffered from the political and economic crises which beset the last years of Reconstruction. But unquestionably David could have improved his family's circumstances somewhat if he had not been so obsessed with his mission of preserving the Louisiana State University. To a friend he frankly admitted the injustice his single-minded course imposed on his family: "I am ashamed to say it but in all this struggle to keep the University alive I have not considered my wife and children once."43

42 David Boyd to J. P. McAuley, June 7, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, July 8, 1876, ibid., 1876-77. By 1876 the Boyd children included Thomas J., born in 1869, Arthur, born in 1871, and LeRoy Stafford, born in 1873. The fourth child, born September 18, 1876, was also a son. Ultimately he was named after his father, but the family called him Rex. David Boyd to Richard Hancock, September 25, 1876, ibid.

43 David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, June 8, 1876, ibid., 1875-76.
David did have opportunities to leave the University for other jobs, and he did have several friends who were eager to help him do so. As early as 1871, an ex-professor at the University, Richard M. Venable of Baltimore, asked David to apply for the "superintendency" of a new school to be built in that city. The position would "pay well," Venable wrote, and the "social advantages" compared to Louisiana, "speak for themselves." Two years later the same friend and another ex-professor, James Garnett, tried again. They wanted David to leave Louisiana "for a place where he would be appreciated." When Venable thought of David's hard work, it reminded him of the crumbling missions in west Texas. "How much toil they represented and yet they seem to have counted for nothing."44 In 1874 a school in Marshall, Texas, offered David its presidency, but he turned it down. By that time he was so overwrought with worry and responsibility that he considered leaving the educational field altogether. He talked of going to Colorado or California and taking any kind of work he could find. But he had been a teacher for so long he wondered if he were fit

44R. M. Venable to David Boyd, May 31, 1871, September 30, 1873, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12.
for anything else. David knew he would never earn much in his profession. "One had as well try to get rich by running an alms house."45

In January, 1875, Dr. E. W. Hilgard of the University of Michigan wrote David about a position at the University of California. The president at California had resigned to become president of the new Johns Hopkins University, the same post David's Baltimore friends tried to interest him in two years before. Hilgard himself was leaving Michigan for California where another of David's former colleagues, Dr. Francis Hopkins, would soon be employed. Professor Hilgard also informed General Sherman of the California vacancy, and Sherman, who had many influential friends in California, recommended David for the job. "If an offer comes," he urged David, "don't hesitate a moment." David was immensely flattered, but doubted his qualifications for such a high post. In any case, he thought his "duty" to the University and its creditors came first. To his friend William Van Pelt, he expressed concern that Sherman's "strong paper" might prove embarrassing. What if it

45David Boyd Diary, July 25, 1874; David Boyd to T. J. Boyd, August 12, 1874; David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, October 18, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
induced the California Board to offer him the job? For years he had vowed to keep the University "alive" and to defend its creditors. Therefore, he had to ask Dr. Hilgard to do "nothing further" in his behalf at California. He could not "get away" from Louisiana before 1877.46

Some of David's closest friends could not understand his concept of "duty." Colonel Lockett thought he was wasting his time "trying to improve an institution which might ultimately be taken over by a Radical ring." Powhatan Clarke, another ex-colleague, was more explicit. He understood a man who placed his country before everything else, but David's case was different. "That a man of your good judgement should so long forget his duty to his children, his wife and himself I can attribute only to a morbid habit." He did not think David owed any "obligation" to the University's creditors. If the debt were David's personally, he might feel compelled to repay it. But "since it is owed by a defunct institution it is ridiculous." Only one correspondent, William T. Sherman, commended him. When he

46David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, January 20, 1875; David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, undated; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, February 23, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; William T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, February 18, 1875, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
learned in April, 1875, that David had withdrawn his name from consideration in California he commented, "I cannot but admire your pluck in standing so firmly by our old 'Serninary of Learning.' If it must go under it will not be for want of fidelity on your part."\(^{47}\)

A month later David heard from Sherman again. He had been authorized by the Khedive of Egypt to employ a superintendent for a military college near Cairo. With the post went a brigadier general's commission and $6,000 a year in gold. "I would prefer you in the California University but fear that is not a certainty. This is: Speak and act quick." Sherman advised David to forget about his "duty" to the University. "In the war of life," he wrote, "desperate straits call for prompt and decisive action. You have stood at your post till necessity which knows no law compels you to seek an honorable maintenance for your family."\(^{48}\)

From previous experience Sherman must have known of David's

\(^{47}\)S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, February 12, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9; William T. Sherman to David Boyd, April 21, 1875, in Boyd-Sherman Letters; Powhatan Clarke to David Boyd, March 15, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7.

\(^{48}\)William T. Sherman to David Boyd, May 26, 1875, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
tendency to temporize and agonize whenever the question of severing his ties with the University arose. He urged David to decide within the week and to keep his own counsel.

"Consult your wife only, and if she consents, notify me, and when I affirm, then resign absolutely, and let Louisiana work out her own destiny." Sherman's advice was wasted. In the next few months David managed to ignore all of it. After days of arguing with himself, he telegraphed Governor Kellogg asking only for a leave of absence. "Even with your consent, I may not accept. But if I do go, I shall see that good men are left in charge." Kellogg graciously agreed, and the Executive Committee subsequently granted him leave of absence for six months. Because David delayed his departure so long they had to extend it twice. Far from consulting only his wife, David proceeded to correspond with friends, ex-colleagues, and Board members all over the country. By mid-June news of his imminent departure appeared in

49Ibid.

50David Boyd, "Egypt Memorandum," undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 11; David Boyd to Governor W. P. Kellogg, telegram, May 31, 1875, ibid., Scrapbook; Wm. Kellogg to David Boyd, telegram, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; Minutes of the Executive Committee, June 18, September 11, 1875; David Boyd to William Sanford, January 26, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
several Louisiana papers. David himself addressed a letter to the editor urging Louisianians not to let the University die after he left.51

David was not the only American interested in Egypt. The country became a veritable colony of ex-Confederate and Federal officers after the Civil War. General W. T. Sherman recommended many of the American officers who took service with the Khedive. The men he sent were trained in exploration, surveying, and the building of forts, dams and railroads. One ex-Federal officer, General Charles P. Stone, was a particular friend of Sherman's. On the latter's recommendation Stone became the Khedive's chief of staff. Among other things Stone hoped to improve Egyptian military academies so that the best cadets might qualify for a staff college patterned somewhat after West Point and the Virginia

51 David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, June 1, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; Newspaper clippings from Donaldsonville (La.) Chief, June 5, 1875, Shreveport Times, June 10, 1875, Wytheville (Va.) Dispatch, July 1, 1875, (New Iberia) Louisiana Sugar Bowl, July 1, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook. In his letter to Vice-President Sanford on June 1, David promised not to leave the University without first making sure of its existence through the 1875-76 session. There were reasons, he thought, why he ought to stay until the legislature completed its regular session in March, 1876. But in the meanwhile he wanted all accounts audited and the Executive Committee's acceptance of his resignation as quickly as possible so that he might leave if necessary. As indicated above,
Military Institute. To that end he encouraged the Khedive to import American teachers and officers familiar with those institutions. He also encouraged West Point graduates like Samuel Lockett, David's friend and former colleague, to become officers in the Egyptian service. After he left Louisiana State University in 1873, Colonel Lockett conducted his own military school in Alabama. But it did not prosper. Therefore, when the chance came to go to Egypt in 1875 as a major in the corps of engineers he did not hesitate. Just before the Locketts left for Egypt, David wrote them of his offer to become superintendent of the military school near Cairo. They were "thrilled at the prospect." Lockett thought David the "fittest man for the place;" in fact, he had already been planning to find David some appropriate position in Egypt. He urged David to let nothing dissuade him:

Now my dear Colonel, please don't let the old Don Quixote in you get on his Rosinante and ride you to

the Committee granted a leave of absence instead.

52William B. Hesseltine and Hazel C. Wolf, The Blue and the Grey on the Nile (Chicago, 1961), 2-9, 87-88. Colonel Lockett originally planned to go to Egypt in 1874, but a train wreck injured his wife and son so severely that he had to give up his plans until the next year. Col. S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, August 22, September 8, October 3, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.
death and destruction. Let your Louisiana ?Dulcinea? try somebody else. Your duty has been done to the fullest in regard to her. A higher, grander duty now calls you. Won't it be pleasant for us to meet in the delta of the Nile after having labored together in that of the Mississippi? But I won't write any more. You must go by all means, and if necessary at once.53

But David did not "go at once." Early in June he wrote to General Stone through Sherman that although willing to go to Egypt, he preferred to delay his departure until October (when the University opened) or even March, 1876, (when the legislative session was over). Sherman told David that he might expect a "full answer" from Stone sometime in August. It usually took two months for his letters to reach Egypt and be answered. Sherman had advised Stone to telegraph if he wanted David to come to Egypt "at once."54 On July 10, 1875, Sherman notified David that he had received a "dispatch" from General Stone. It read simply "Send Boyd--Stone." Sherman told David he might consider his employment "settled." Then he advised David to be in St. Louis or New York early in October. A Mr. Merchant, the Khedive's agent in New York, would have his

53 Colonel S. H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, July 1, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.

passage booked to Cairo. Sherman's remark in the July 10 letter, that David be in New York "early in Oct.," caused David much grief later. It failed to take into account Sherman's own letter of June 12 which said, in the event that Stone wanted David "at once," he should telegraph. Stone did telegraph and Sherman reported receipt of the telegram in the July 12 letter. But he still advised David to be in New York "early in October," instead of urging him to leave for Egypt at once.

Meanwhile, David kept busy arranging his accounts, assembling books and maps, and corresponding with friends who might later serve as faculty in the Egyptian school. In one letter written August 5, 1875, he commented casually that it might be "best for me (who can not speak French)" to go to Egypt on a French ship. Together with his delayed departure the linguistic inability proved disastrous. On August 26 Sherman relayed to David a letter just received from General Stone in Egypt. From what he had heard of David, Stone wrote, "He will be just the man for the place." Stone noted that he had discussed David with the Khedive who asked if David spoke French. Stone's answer was affirmative: "As you [Sherman] had stated that Col. Boyd was formerly a professor of ancient and modern languages, I
replied unhesitatingly yes, adding that he [David] had professed the modern languages. It would be a necessity in that position." Then Stone remarked that he was also telegraphing Sherman in order that David arrive in Egypt by September 1. "That would require him to leave New York by the 5th of August." Now Sherman began urging David to leave for Egypt immediately. But David was still reluctant to go before the fall term opened. However, after receiving Sherman's August 26 letter with Stone's note included, David felt obliged to send a telegram of his own. He notified the Egyptian authorities that he could not speak French and that he had not planned to leave Baton Rouge until October. Not hearing anything to the contrary, he "presumed" that he was still wanted and on his terms. Then, on September 21, 1875, he received a cable from General Stone which stated: "Speaking French is an absolute necessity." Immediately, he telegraphed General Sherman, "I presume this cancels the appointment." Sherman answered the next day. He agreed that the "engagement" should be ended. If David had gone to Egypt in the summer, he might have learned

55 Charles Stone to William T. Sherman, undated, included in W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, August 26, 1875, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
enough French to "pass." But considering the circumstances, David "had better give up the Egypt scheme--leaving me free to select some other." He would begin looking for another man but would wait to hear from Stone again before taking "any positive action."56

On September 26 David wrote a long and rather pathetic letter to General Sherman. It was only the first of literally dozens he would compose in the next nine months dealing with his "Egypt matter." The letter to Sherman regretted what David called his "faux pas." He had not understood General Stone's communications clearly on two points: when exactly he was to report for duty and the necessity of being able to "speak" French. On the first point he agreed that the "logical inference" to General Stone's September 21 cable was that he was "not now needed." But the cable did not say what David thought it should have--"appointment annulled." Therefore, to do Stone no "injustice," David would wait to hear from him again, through Sherman, before "engaging myself elsewhere." As for

56 David Boyd to A. D. Bayles, September 2, 1875; David Boyd to W. T. Sherman, telegram, September 10, 1875; David Boyd to Colonel S. H. Lockett, September 17, 1875; Telegram of David Boyd to W. T. Sherman, September 21, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, September 22, 1875, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
the French problem, David said he knew the "philosophy" of the French language better than any of the French professors who had taught it at the University. He could read it almost as fast as he could see it. But "not for the world cd I have gone to Egypt without letting Genl Stone know that I cannot speak it!"  

On the same day, September 26, 1875, David wrote Colonel Lockett a full history of his case, quoting all the correspondence at length so that Lockett would "understand" the situation. If Lockett could speak to Stone, David would like him to find out "what Genl. Stone's wishes may be in the matter." He wanted "this doubt as to my movements settled as soon as possible--for I am now clear out of employment." Most schools had already opened. With nothing to do for a year, what would happen to his family? On the following day, David wrote both Lockett and Stone. To Stone, after reviewing the correspondence once more, David said: "Your omitting to state in so many words: Appointment cancelled leaves some little doubt in my mind as to your full meaning." But he would do General Stone "full

57 David Boyd to William Sherman, September 26, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
justice" and wait till he heard finally that he was released from obligation before looking for another position. "Now my dear General," he concluded, "I feel it my duty, to all concerned to . . . add that if you do not consider me fit for the place, I do not want it--nor do I ask for it at all . . . If the position does not seek me, I certainly do not seek it. You are perfectly free to consider me no longer in your service."\(^{58}\) David sent a copy of this incredible letter to Colonel Lockett. In a covering letter he added:

> It is probably the last of Egypt for me . . . Egypt is a long way off--even the telegraph over there seems to run slow: it took only 23 days to get an answer to my dispatch that I paid $18.50 for! So you see it will hardly pay for me to telegraph again to Egypt, to know exactly what Genl. Stone means. . . . Meanwhile I am out of employment--my family in want, my children out of clothing, and winter at hand. Well, such is my luck; . . . I hope to learn . . . from this little experience.\(^{59}\)

Early in November, 1875, General Sherman offered to submit David's name to the Egyptian authorities again. David assured Sherman that by the time he could arrive in Egypt, about January 1, 1876, he would be able to speak

\(^{58}\)David Boyd to General Charles P. Stone, Chief of Staff, September 27, 1875, ibid.

\(^{59}\)David Boyd to Colonel S. H. Lockett, September 27, 1875, ibid.
French. If, after a trial, the Khedive were not satisfied, he would arrange his own passage home. In a letter to Lockett on November 17, David confided that although it may have been unwise to reopen the matter, he did it because he wished to avoid the harm it would do his reputation if it became known that he had lost the position for any "incompetency." To lose a job for failure to arrive on time was one thing; to lose it for some "incompetency" was quite another. David was willing to gamble that his French would be acceptable in thirty or sixty days. At least he wanted the trial. To fail after a test would damage his reputation in the teacher's fraternity no more than to fail without it. "One trouble I have in the matter, is that it is so hard for people to think, or believe, that not speaking French is the only objection. They think something else is the matter."\(^6^0\)

Meanwhile, Colonel Lockett's brother-in-law, C. Woodward Hutson of South Carolina, answered a letter David wrote him on October 31. In it David had remarked that

\(^{60}\)David Boyd to Wm. Sherman, November 6, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4; David Boyd to Colonel S. H. Lockett, November 17, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
"the singular vacillation of the Egyptian authorities" had put him in an "awkward" position. Hutson's reply, dated November 9, 1875, speculated at length about the "real" reasons for David's failure to get the Egyptian post. "The objection made to your not speaking French is so trivial in character . . . that I cannot help fancying it to be only a diplomatic pretense." Hutson thought "Egyptian intrigue" might be responsible for it. Then he suggested that the Khedive's military campaign against Abyssinia, his troubles with the "Danubian Principalities" or perhaps "financial embarrassment" might explain the "delay." He even theorized that General Stone might be jealous of the influence wielded by General Sherman, and that in retaliation, Stone might be "blocking" David. 61

Hutson's letter of speculation seems to have planted seeds of doubt in David's mind about the veracity of the Egyptian officials. After receiving it David began to express the opinion that his inadequacy in French was not the "real reason" for his Egyptian "mix-up." On December 15,

---

61 C. Woodward Hutson to D. F. Boyd, November 9, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7. Hutson was running a girls' school in Spartanburg, South Carolina. David had corresponded with him earlier about taking a job in the Egyptian school, but Hutson was not interested.
1875, he told Colonel Lockett flatly that "the French was all an excuse to save the Egyptian Treasury a miserable sum of money—money! for which I have always myself cared so little." He told William Van Pelt essentially the same thing four days later. On December 21, Lockett telegraphed David: "Abyssinia awaits attention. Wait. Will write."

David wrote a letter back at once. He would "try" to wait till Sherman received an answer to his letter of November 9, 1875, which re-submitted David's name to General Stone. David thought he could wait until January 10 or 15, 1876. He was playing a "desperate game of pride and feelings versus bread and meat." He had promised to pay three professors, his replacements at the University, out of his Egyptian earnings and the impossibility of doing so was "running me crazy." He should not, he told Lockett, have let the "pretext" of the inability to speak French cause him to go on waiting for reconsideration. If he were still in Louisiana when the legislature met in January he would have to appear before it. Not all the legislators were Carpet-baggers, Negroes or knaves; the "more sensible" will think the "French excuse" is "bosh," that David had remained in Louisiana only to draw his pay or to get a better job. Worse, they might conclude that the Khedive dropped him for
being "unfit" for the job. If the Khedive had to invent a reason to disguise his financial embarrassment, David wished he had chosen one less "mortifying" to him. On December 26, 1875, David wrote Lockett again. "The more I think of it, with all the light around me, the more I am convinced that it was the Khedive's general troubles and not 'my not speaking French,' that caused him to dispense with my services." Then he apologized for annoying Lockett with his "childish" complaints. He would wait until his fate was decided "either by his . . . Double## ship or my humble self." 62

By the end of January, 1876, David's "fate" was still not decided. Sherman wrote him that Stone had to "play the courtier." The time was not opportune to bring David's case before the Khedive, who had other troubles. David wrote Lockett again on January 25, 1876. The part of his letter which he did not send was pitiful. If Stone did not present his case to the Khedive, David considered appealing to the American consul in Cairo for "justice." He

62 David Boyd to J. P. McAuley, November 19, 1875; David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, December 15, 21, 26, 1875; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, December 19, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; Telegram of Samuel Lockett to David Boyd, December 21, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
would be ruined if the Louisiana newspapers ever discovered
that he had been "dropped."

I really feel ashamed now to go anywhere, or see
anybody. I have not been up town (in B. R.) since
October! I can't work; I can't do anything but write
occasionally to some friend; my spirit is gone; and
I feel almost paralyzed. And all because--hell, you
may fill up the blank if you have nothing better to
fill up your time. If I had been allowed ... to
stay here as I begged so hard ... till March, why
I might have done some good; but now, as things are,
I feel like an old Va. sheep-killing dog looks, and I
am practically fit for nothing."

Even though the legislature was in session, David could not
bring himself to go to New Orleans. He would be "morti-
fied." Besides, he rationalized, the lawmakers were in a
"fit of thriftiness." They would not aid the University.63

The letter David did send to Lockett was consider-
ably more restrained. He would "swallow his pride" and
lobby for the school, but he would have to "explain his
presence in the U. S. on every street corner." Meanwhile,
the University was represented in New Orleans by Board mem-
biers William Seay and William Sanford. When they urged
David to come to the city, he protested that it would be
"improper" because he might go to Egypt any day to head a

63David Boyd to Colonel S. H. Lockett, January 25,
1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76. This part of
the letter was not sent.
new polytechnic school then under construction. Sherman had written David on January 20, 1876, that such a school was being built and that Lockett wanted to get David the post. But by the end of February Sherman informed David that he felt "uneasy about Egypt." He had heard from Stone, who said nothing about David. Finally, in an undated letter probably written in March, 1876, David told Sherman that he no longer wanted to be considered for any Egyptian post. He thought the Khedive had "dumped" him on a pretext when he really lacked funds. And he thought Stone, in failing to press his case before the Khedive, had shown a lack of courage.  

In May David heard from General Stone. His letter, dated April 9, 1876, indicated regret that David was not in Egypt. It expressed the hope that he might "someday" join the Americans in the Khedive's service. Stone also discussed the financial crisis which prevented the Egyptian authorities from undertaking "any new venture." David felt vindicated. "Their money troubles," he wrote William

---

David Boyd to Colonel S. H. Lockett, January 25, 1876; David Boyd to William Seay, February 16, 1876; David Boyd to William Sherman, undated, ibid.; William Sherman to David Boyd, January 20, February 26, 1876, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
Sanford, "were really the cause of the whole difficulty; they shd have had the manliness to say so." To Stone, however, he wrote a mildly reproving but magnanimous letter of forgiveness for everyone involved in his Egyptian "mix-up." Anyone who could wait "patiently" nearly a whole year for Egypt to "do him justice," might have been of "some service" to Egypt in its "time of trial" if his Highness had not done him and himself "the injustice to dispense with his services--on a mere pretext." Two days later David wrote General Stone again. He had not meant to "offend" anyone in his previous letter. He only wanted to tell them what he "now believed" and how he "had felt" about something that had caused him more pain than anything in his whole life. He conceded that Stone probably had a better understanding of the Khedive's motives than he (David) did and, if he had judged them too harshly, he was sorry. Then he forgave them, told them his sympathies were with them and, although he could not "allow himself" to serve them, even if they should request it, he was willing to help them in any way he could. One can only speculate on David's state of mind when he wrote these letters.\(^{65}\)

\(^{65}\)David Boyd to Gen. Chas. P. Stone, June 6, 8, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
Stone replied to David on July 7, 1876. He denied categorically that the Khedive had resorted to "pretext" in David's case. Perfect knowledge of French was essential; "getting on" would not do. Furthermore, "all this occurred before anyone here believed there could be any serious financial difficulty." The trouble, Stone wrote, stemmed from Sherman's slip of the pen. Sherman wrote Stone that David had been professor of modern languages when he meant to say "ancient." Then Stone told David gently something that Lockett had written him months before. If David had started for Egypt when first engaged, stopping a month or two in Paris en route, he might well have learned enough French to please the Khedive. "Your sense of honor and modesty made you send the fatal telegram that he could not "speak French and then came all the difficulty." 66

The Lockett letter, written on November 19, 1875, appeared rather early in the dismal Egyptian correspondence. It is quoted here at length because it stated so well the

66 Chas. P. Stone to D. F. Boyd, July 7, 1876, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11. Characteristically, David replied to Stone in a ten-page letter. In it he reviewed every aspect of the whole Egyptian saga to show Stone how he had arrived at his erroneous conclusions concerning the Khedive's motives. David Boyd to Chas. P. Stone, August 4, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
real source of so many of David's problems.

Now you think you have been very badly treated in the matter and I too think it has been terribly annoying and unfortunate affair. But Egypt is not altogether to blame. Your old pet the La. S. U. has been the main cause of the trouble, and you my dear Colonel were the immediate prime mover in bringing about the unfortunate denouement. In the first place you had a divided interest, you clung to the old LSU with desperate devotion, hoping to do something for its salvation before leaving it altogether. That kept you from coming along with me last summer. Then you lost sight of your thousand and one qualifications that preeminently fit you for your duties here, and with suicidal perversity seized upon one of the 'smallest of small matters' and made a mountain out of it by putting it into an abominable brief telegram. You must excuse me for writing such hard words. You know I have often told you, you are your own worst enemy, and it makes me right angry with that part of you which is eternally bedeviling you, whenever I think about any of the troubles you have gotten yourself into.67

By the time David discovered that he might not be going to Egypt, he had already received a leave of absence from the University Board, been granted permission to leave by Governor Kellogg, and employed, at his own expense, three professors for the academic year 1875-76. To redeem his promise he had to find a job. On October 21, 1875, he wired Professor Hilgard at the University of California to "present my name" if the vacancy in the

67Colonel S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, November 19, 1875, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.
presidency there still existed. But nothing seems to have been done. However, the presidency was still vacant in March, 1876. Professor Hilgard advised David, then lobbying in New Orleans, to submit his name for consideration. David replied that he could not apply at once because he was "still waiting on Egypt. When I may make up my mind not to go there, or shd be told by Stone or Sherman, not to wait longer, then I shall immediately write you." It is hard to imagine exactly what sort of definitive statement David expected from Egypt, but it finally may have come. On April 4, 1876, he authorized Professor Hilgard to submit his name for the California presidency. A week later General Sherman approved his action. He told David that it was perfectly alright to "think no more" about Egypt: he had "done his duty." 68

When he reopened his correspondence with Professor Hilgard, David was clearly still shattered by his Egyptian experience. He was also badly in need of a job. If the California presidency were filled, he wanted to be considered for a professorship in mathematics, Latin, English or

68 Telegram, D. F. Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, October 21, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; D. F. Boyd to E. W. Hilgard, March 6, 1876, ibid., Box 7; David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, May 17, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
French. But he wanted it clearly understood ahead of time that he was "no scholar" and did not claim to be. He also told Hilgard something which was certainly not known in Louisiana: that he was "no titled graduate" of the University of Virginia. He had "graduated in several schools," but he did not have a formal degree from the University. Again David displayed his lack of self-confidence when he asked Hilgard to get assurances of his acceptability from professors and trustees before submitting his application for the presidency. Some might object to him because of his Southern origin. Hilgard and Hopkins must "frankly" tell all his bad points; then, if there were no major objections, Hilgard might send in his name. Neither did he plan to send any testimonials, because "anybody can get a cart-load of such paper." Instead, he would write the Regents a simple letter of application. "Picking a professor, or president, shd be done much like choosing a wife; and in the latter case, potent recommendations wd hardly do."

David remarked that he would never have "aspired so high" if Hilgard had not insisted. But if nothing came of his application he would not be surprised. "One lesson has been pretty thoroughly rubbed into me of late years: to expect
nothing."69

David may have learned "to expect nothing" from his Egyptian experience. He did not learn to keep his own counsel. Immediately after applying at California, he fired off letters to friends and creditors in four states and on three continents telling them of his plans. He also advanced explanations as to why he probably would not get the job. His "southern birth" and "Confederate record" would work against him with the "California people." Dr. Hilgard did not think so, but David did not wait to find out. On July 2, 1876, he asked Hilgard to withdraw his name from consideration. He could not expect to get the appointment, he told Hilgard in explanation, and besides, his "duty" required him to stay in Louisiana until the two schools, the University and the Agricultural College, finally merged.70

69 David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, March 6, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, April 10, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.

70 David Boyd to A. B. Levisse (legislator), April 11, 1876; David Boyd to Pendleton King, April 11, 1876; David Boyd to J. P. McAuley, April 12, 1876; David Boyd to Dr. Americus Featherman, April 15, 1876; David Boyd to Swarbrick's, April 15, 1876; David Boyd to C. C. Lockett (Mrs. Samuel H. Lockett), April 10, 1876; David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, May 4, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, July 2, 1876, ibid., 1876-77.
During the summer of 1876, friends of David's in New Orleans urged him to run for state superintendent of public education. The Democratic convention was preparing to meet in Baton Rouge and some thought David had an excellent chance to win the nomination. Swarbrick's, the school's largest creditor, argued that David had "great influence" in north Louisiana and "more here [New Orleans] than you imagine." Besides, his election could save the University. David answered at once: "Please say no more about it . . . I don't want that or any other office in La., nor will I stay in the state any longer than I can find something to do out of it." Swarbrick's could not understand David's adamant refusal unless he had committed himself to support Robert M. Lusher. An ex-student teaching in New Orleans also pressed David to be a candidate for the nomination. In the general election, he reported, Republicans would vote for David in preference to anyone else. As late as July 23, there were still some delegates who wanted to place his name before the convention. But David pleaded with them to refrain. To Dr. Dupree, a delegate from Baton Rouge, he insisted it would violate his pledge to support Lusher. More important, it might cause the Radicals to wage war against the school. Under no circumstances did he
want to estrange those Republicans who had been friendly to the University.71

As the fall of 1876 approached, David was still out of a job and still determined to stay in Louisiana until the University and the Agricultural and Mechanical College "merged." After that, he told William Sanford, he would probably open a boarding school in Virginia. But someone else would have to "provide the property." Tom Boyd, then in Virginia, asked David if he planned to live in Wytheville. David answered with a "firm NO." If he had any funds he might locate in Charlottesville, "but as for Wythe, I doubt I'll ever even go there." David did have a friend in Virginia who could help him find a suitable property for a school. Richard Hancock had been his student at Homer before the war. In 1876 he was living in Albemarle County, Virginia, and raising blooded cattle. He thought David ought to apply for a professorship in one of the Virginia schools. But David replied that a professor had to be a

71 Swarbrick's of New Orleans to David F. Boyd, June 9, 13, 1876; R. S. Stuart to David Boyd, July 5, 1876, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha file, Box 11; David Boyd to Swarbrick's, June 9, 1876; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, June 18, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, July 23, 1876, ibid., 1876-77.
"special scholar." He was barely a "general student." It had been years since he had done any study. "I am only fit to manage a large school, or teach a little one." David thought he would open a boy's school in Orange or Albemarle county if he returned to Virginia. He asked Hancock to let him know if any suitable properties would be available after January 1, 1877. Hancock set to work at once. He found one property, Blenheim, which possessed all the features David wanted for his school. But it was for sale, not for rent. Hancock offered to lend David $5,000 for twelve years if David could raise the other $5,000 for a down payment. David had to reply that Blenheim was "out of the question." Meanwhile, he corresponded with other friends about possible sites because he was too poor to investigate them himself. Besides Virginia, David tried to find suitable rental property in West Virginia and in Mississippi. By November he was quite discouraged. To his

72 David Boyd to William Sanford, July 29, 1876; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 2, 1876; David Boyd to Richard Hancock, September 25, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.

73 David Boyd to Richard J. Hancock, October 15, 28, 1876; David Boyd to R. M. Venable, October 26, 1876, ibid., R. J. Hancock to David Boyd, October 20, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
friend at Swarbrick's he wrote:

It is not a very agreeable prospect, at best--starting a Boarding School now, in these times, and at my age. I don't fancy it at all. Yet I don't see what else I can expect to do, by which I cd. hope to make anything. I might get me a professorship in a college; but such a position wd. never get me even again with the world.74

In December, 1876, Richard Hancock reported to David that he had found another suitable property in Albemarle County. Called Greenwood, it was owned by a Reverend Dinwiddie of Alexandria, Virginia, and had once been a boy's school. Dinwiddie was willing to rent it, but with the proviso that his aged parents live on the property. David was unenthusiastic. "I don't like partnerships--to be 'mixed up' with people, hence I wd rather not go to Greenwood, if I am to live with old Mr. Dinwiddie." He had been a school-master for so long, a "little Monarch," that he had to "rule the roost" wherever he went. "There is no compromise on that point!" he told Hancock. Yet only five days later he was thinking seriously about engaging the Greenwood property.75

74 David Boyd to John Kelly, November 15, 1876; David Boyd to Swarbrick's November 16, 19, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.

75 R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, December 13, 1876; Wm. Dinwiddie to Col. R. J. Hancock, December 12, 1876, in
Relatively speaking, David did not disclose his boarding school plans to many people. Besides William Sanford, the Swarbrick firm, and a few ex-colleagues living outside Louisiana, very few people knew what he intended to do or where he might go when he left the University. As he explained to Colonel Lockett, his failure to go to Egypt after announcing his plans "to all and sundry" led people to question his "good sense, ... powers of decision and even ... my veracity." David wondered if he were talking too much even to Colonel Lockett. If he did not go to Virginia, Lockett might "exclaim like many others, 'poor, weak vacillating fellow, he does not know what he is about: he can't make up his mind about anything!'" The difference between a weak man and a strong one, David declared, was that the latter thought to himself. The weak man thought out loud. Everyone heard him "weighing ifs and ands."

David did not want to make that mistake again. He promised to let Lockett know his decision "as soon as this weak

Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, December 18, 1876, ibid., Box 5; David Boyd to R. J. Hancock, December 13, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
specimen comes to anchor."\(^76\) But the "weak specimen" did not even weigh anchor for almost five years. Not until 1881 would he leave the University to establish a boarding school in his native state.

\(^76\) David Boyd to Colonel Samuel H. Lockett, October 20, November 26, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
When the beneficiary cadets were sent home in March of 1873, the University was left with less than twenty students. Until 1877 enrollment rarely climbed above that number. The faculty was also sharply reduced. But even so, there were periods when the few remaining professors had little to occupy their time. Tom Boyd kept busy studying Latin, arranging papers, and copying David's correspondence. He also seems to have discovered Baton Rouge society. Numerous entries in his diary describe his frequent visits to the homes of prominent citizens in the community. Ultimately David complained to his young brother. "Sociability," he told Tom, was only for rich people. But Tom thought David used their poverty as an excuse. The real reason for David's objection stemmed from his own "inborn horror" of paying and receiving social calls.¹

¹Tom Boyd Diary, January 23, October 17, 1875; March 17, May 13, 1876. In his own diary, David admitted that all forms of social activity were repugnant to him. David Boyd Diary, December 22, 1874.
Instead of "socializing," David spent most of his time trying to borrow money to keep the school and his family "alive." He still had many hours left to read widely, to write literally hundreds of letters, to campaign for the agricultural college fund, and to engage somewhat in politics. His reading was eclectic. Besides perusing the several British quarterlies to which the University subscribed, he kept abreast of the best American periodicals. He enjoyed biography and history and he was familiar with the works of Emerson, Milton, John Tyndall and Thomas Huxley. In 1874 he exchanged a number of unused text books for the works of such authors as Montesquieu, Descartes, Kant, Comte, Mill, Spencer and Darwin. He also found time that year and the next to read John Quincy Adam's Life of John Adams, The Diary of John Quincy Adams, Herbert Spencer's Sociology, a work on Greek literature, and a History of the English People by Greene.2

David made an effort to stay abreast of new developments in the field of education and educational administration too. Much of his voluminous correspondence between

2Fay, History of Education in Louisiana, 93-95; David Boyd to Jas. A. Gresham, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; David Boyd Diary, September 1, 7, 19, 1874; January 26, February 7, 13, April 1, May 22, 1875.
1873 and 1876 was directed to other college presidents, state and city superintendents of public education, state secretaries of agriculture, and various officials in the Federal government such as the United States Commissioner of Education. From most of them he sought copies of the reports they submitted to their respective legislative bodies. He asked college presidents to share with him their views and experience as to the most efficient manner of organizing agricultural colleges and from everyone he requested materials relating to "scientific" and "industrial" education.

Another scheme which kept David busy was his plan to solicit Congress for Federal funds to create and maintain a university in every state. He asked Charles Eliot of Harvard, the educational giant of the era, what he thought of the idea. Eliot replied that two or three "real universities" were enough for a nation of forty millions. But if David meant "polytechnic" schools, he agreed that there was "room" for one "good one" in each state. Even before contacting Eliot, David enlisted the aid of a congressman to pursue his plan. General William Terry of Virginia agreed to introduce

---

5 David Boyd Diary, November 1, 1874. See also numerous letters for October and November, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
a bill which would grant one million acres of Federal land, or the proceeds from the sale thereof, to each state for the purpose of supporting a college or university. David insisted that the bill stipulate the aid would go to one college only in each state. It must not be "frittered away" on several "puny institutions." Congressman Terry presented David's bill in 1872. At the time another measure to increase Federal land grants to the states in proportion to their size was also before the Congress. A compromise bill emerged. It would augment each state's existing land grant for agricultural and mechanical colleges by one half million acres.

When the bill passed the Senate in 1873, David asked the Board for a leave of absence. He wanted to go to Washington to help Congressman Terry lobby the bill through the House. If it passed, he was "almost certain" the University could claim half of Louisiana's share, perhaps $30,000 a year. The Executive Committee of the Board granted David's request. He could lobby in Washington "as long as necessary." But circumstances forced David to change his plans. The Kellogg legislature adjourned without appropriating any funds for the University, and the beneficiary cadets had to be sent home.

The Board had no money to spend in Louisiana, let alone in
the nation's capital.\textsuperscript{4}

Convinced that the Kellogg legislature meant to "starve them out," David redoubled his efforts to secure the agricultural fund for the University. His long struggle to that end will be described below. A more immediate problem confronted him in mid-1873. In that year Superintendent McWhorter and his Board stepped up their efforts to evict the University from the Asylum building. To prevent it, David appealed directly to the governor in August, 1873. He also asked General Sherman to use his influence with Kellogg. Sherman telegraphed the state house in behalf of the school and seemed satisfied with Kellogg's reply. "I think Governor Kellogg feels a full share of interest in having a successful University," he assured David. The general invited David to call on him again if he thought his influence could help the school.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{4} Charles Eliot to David Boyd, October 26, 1871 in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8; David Boyd to General William Terry, August 29, 1871, \textit{ibid.}; Box 4; David Boyd to William L. Sanford, January 23, 1873, \textit{ibid.}, Box 5; Minutes of the Executive Committee, February 3, 1873.

\textsuperscript{5} David Boyd to Governor William P. Kellogg, August 9, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; William Sherman to David Boyd, August 12, 1873, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
David's own relations with the Kellogg regime remained strictly formal. He submitted his annual Reports to the legislature because the law required it, and he addressed a few brief letters to the chief executive until he decided further correspondence would do no good. For example, in December, 1873, he proposed to Kellogg that the upcoming legislature merge the State University, the University of Louisiana, and the "proposed Agricultural and Mechanical College." They should all be "one," he argued. Separately they would each be "weak and puny, and very apt to die." He also asked Governor Kellogg to give the entire Asylum building to the merged schools for a permanent home. The law and medical departments (the University of Louisiana) should remain in New Orleans.6

Whether Governor Kellogg ever replied to his letter is not clear. But in February, 1874, David tried again. The legislature was in session and David was in New Orleans to look after the University's interests. He attempted to see the governor twice. When that failed, he wrote him a letter, enclosing one from Sherman which requested the governor to do what he could for the University. David's

6David Boyd to Governor William P. Kellogg, copy, December 23, 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7/
letter asked for an appropriation large enough to pay off the clamoring creditors, for a permanent home in Baton Rouge, and for the agricultural and mechanical college fund. Instead, the legislature adopted a concurrent resolution to investigate the affairs of the state University. J. Henri Burch, the black senator from Baton Rouge, introduced it on February 3, 1874. David tried to speed it through the house so that the investigation could take place before adjournment. To the house chairman of the Education Committee he wrote: "I hardly know its object; but you know that all such special investigations are reflections on those in authority--altho' Burch protests against such an interpretation."7

The report of the committee levelled a series of charges at David: reckless mismanaging of funds; expending money on pictures, statues and artillery instead of paying creditors and faculty; allowing the cadets to bore peep holes in the walls so that they could spy on the Asylum inmates, and pocketing funds acquired by the unauthorized sale of bricks taken from the Asylum building. Professor

---

7 David Boyd to Michael Hahn, February 24, 1874; David Boyd to Governor William P. Kellogg, February 20, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
Francis V. Hopkins wrote a multi-page refutation of every charge and declared that the entire investigation stemmed from the spiteful "machinations of a small clique in this town [Baton Rouge]." Behind the whole thing, Hopkins declared, were Superintendent McWhorter and several members of his Board who wanted the University evicted from the Asylum building. He urged his correspondent, a prominent Orleanian, to do all he could to correct the "slanders." The University had to acquire the agricultural fund and it had to have an appropriation to pay off its creditors. "Otherwise, we are ruined."8

But the University got nothing from the lawmakers in 1874. Board member William Seay was completely disgusted with the public and "public things." Both, he wrote David in May, 1874, could "go to the dogs." Seay advised David to abandon the University. "Let no idea of your duty to make another effort . . . in favor of higher education in La. have any effect . . . La. is not ready for higher education." The failure of the legislature to bestow the agricultural fund on the University constituted its "death blow." Even a Democratic legislature in 1875 would do no

8 Dr. F. V. Hopkins to Dr. A. W. Smythe, copy, March 1, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 4.
good. "Such an administration would come in on such a wave of Economy that considering the debt of the University, . . . they would do nothing at all but let the school die."

Colonel Samuel Lockett told David essentially the same thing. Louisiana was not ready for a first class University. David's massive efforts to give her one and her miserable failure to support those efforts should have been enough to convince even David. But Lockett knew from experience that he "was writing to no purpose." He was right.

In December, 1874, in spite of his and the school's impoverished circumstances, David could still write optimistically:

The Radicals are disappointed, I have beaten them. They turned us out to starve--they had not the machinery to wipe us out of existence by legislation . . . They expected us to go down . . . when they refused to aid the 'rebel set' as they called us this year . . . Burch, the negro senator from here told them they cld not kill us that way.¹⁰

What probably saved the University in 1874 was the whole state's preoccupation with the coming legislative election. Not even David, an avowed hater of politics and

---

⁹W. A. Seay to David Boyd, May 24, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11.

¹⁰Colonel S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, November 21, 1874, ibid., Box 9; David Boyd to Dr. J. C. Egan, December 10, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
politicians, could remain aloof in that supercharged political atmosphere. Besides, he had little or nothing else to do. The University's total enrollment for the year 1874 was only thirty-one students, who from July through September were not present. David stayed close to his office, worrying, writing letters, and making entries in his diary.

Two themes dominated his correspondence and his journal entries for the summer and fall of 1874: politics and poverty. By September the former assumed so much importance that he even forgot the "starving condition" of his family. The events responsible for David's distraction may be sketched briefly. In the spring of 1874 it was clear that political alignment in Louisiana had polarized along racial lines. The Fusion tactic of appealing for black votes, so widely endorsed in 1872, found almost no favor in 1874. Only one conservative New Orleans paper still supported it. The rest joined the country press in calling for the formation of a white man's party. By June whites and blacks were organizing themselves into armed leagues all over the state. Military drills in the streets and rumors of stockpiled weapons further increased tension. In New Orleans some of David's friends played leading roles in the
Crescent City White League. But other conservative Democrats were slow to join the new organizations whose avowed purpose was to oust carpetbaggers and scalawags from office, whatever the cost. Like the Radicals, they considered some of the League rank and file to be nothing but Klansmen undisguised. David shared their opinion. He thought some compromise had to be found; the two races had to live together in Louisiana. However, by late July, 1874, the prospects were not promising. In Baton Rouge the White League held nightly meetings, and the blacks, organized in what purported to be fife and drum corps, staged nocturnal marches through the streets. To David it "looked like trouble" in November. He thought it would be "2 years more" before peace came to Louisiana.11

Nevertheless, he tried to avert disaster. During July, August, and September, 1874, David went to New Orleans five times for the purpose of borrowing enough to feed his family. While traveling back and forth he discussed politics with men from all over the state. The conversations

11Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 253-58; David Boyd Diary, July 24, 25, 1874. David obviously anticipated trouble in Baton Rouge when the Democrats assembled there for their convention in late August. On July 24 he told the University "man of all work" to dismantle the artillery and store it in the cellar by "early next month."
did not encourage him. Although prominent Democrats in Baton Rouge deprecated White League strength, David thought that "rash, thoughtless, extreme men" might well provoke a race war in November. Certainly the Radicals were concerned. When David arrived in New Orleans on August 3, 1874, he thought the Republicans gathering there for their state convention seemed to fear for their safety, especially the "carpetbagger" class.\(^{12}\)

In the Crescent City, David saw his old commanding officer, Major General Harry Hays. Hays said he had been approached by President Grant's brother-in-law, Lewis Dent, about supporting the President for a third term in 1876. Hays informed Dent that Grant might be "acceptable" if he could get rid of the Federal judge who upheld Kellogg in the election of 1872, and if he pursued a "peaceful and liberal" policy toward the South. David agreed and so did Lieutenant Governor Davidson B. Penn. A "liberal, conservative policy--no radicalism or White Leaguers" was the best policy for Louisiana. And the best way to achieve it was to work for a third term. Then David remembered why he had come to New Orleans: "Here I am talking politics and

---

\(^{12}\)David Boyd Diary, July 29, 30, 1874, August 3, 1874.
my wife and children nearly at starvation point."\textsuperscript{13}

On August 5, 1874, the Republicans convened in the state house (Mechanics Institute) to nominate candidates for the state central committee, state treasurer, six congressional posts, and the state legislature. They renominated the incumbent, Negro A. Dubuclet, for the treasurer's post. David considered Dubuclet and state Superintendent of Public Education, William Brown, the best officers in state government, "a credit to their race." He thought Democrats ought to support Dubuclet. It might help to win over the Negro race and conciliate President Grant.\textsuperscript{14}

When David returned to Baton Rouge he found most of the leading citizens favorably disposed to the "third term idea," providing the President would "keep out" of the coming state election. "I think the leaven is working," David noted in his diary. But a few days later he was less certain. On August 14, he wrote William Sanford about the parish convention of Democrats and anti-radicals, then meeting in Baton Rouge. It disturbed him to see such "grim determination" for change but no agreement on how to bring it

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., August 4, 1874.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., August 8, 1874; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 261.
about. "I think Louisiana's surest way out of her troubles is through Grant and the third term, and I happen to know almost direct that Grant wants the 3rd term, and . . . the support of the whites of La., as well as of the whole South." If the delegates only had a definite policy and an understanding with Grant before they convened in state convention on August 24, David was sure it would be "merely a walk over the track" in November. But he doubted that they would be so prudent. They preferred to let prejudice be their guide and they would probably go down to defeat. Meanwhile, he asked Swarbrick's in New Orleans to find out from his friend, Fred Freret, if anything had been heard from Washington. "He will know what I mean."

The Democratic state convention met in Baton Rouge on August 24, 1874. White League sentiment predominated, and "Governor" John McEnery catered to it when he delivered what David described as an "inflammatory speech." McEnery endorsed "bloodshed" if that were necessary to rid the state of carpetbaggers. The delegates approved. They adopted a platform which began "We, the white people of

---

15David Boyd Diary, August 11, 16, 1874; David Boyd to William Sanford, August 14, 1874; David Boyd to Swarbrick and Co., August 17, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Lettersbooks, 1874-75.
Louisiana." From there they pledged themselves to remove Radicals and Negroes from power, "peacefully if possible, forcibly if necessary." Although he considered the 300 delegates "able and dignified," David thought they went too far. To Lockett he wrote:

I think I could bring them out of their troubles on a more conservative line. I wd draw no white and black line and wd go for Grant for the third term. Then I wd try to pursue the policy of Gov. Kemper of Va. . . . Individually most of our leading men here think that way; but when they get together in body or convention with no one bold enough to express his real views the White League mania rises to a white heat.

If the convention were consistent, David thought, it should have pledged itself to fight even the Federal government if it continued to uphold carpetbaggers "with the bayonet."

Any other course he considered "neither sensible or man-

During the next several days David recorded in his diary his fear that extremism was growing. White Leaguers were "running Carpetbag office-holders off;" newspapers re-

ported a "race war" near Shreveport and rumors that Grant intended to send in troops circulated throughout the state. David disapproved of the violence; it was bound to bring

16David Boyd to Colonel Lockett, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; David Boyd Diary, August 24, 25, 1874; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 262-63.
retaliation and ultimate defeat for the whites. But if the whites meant to wage war, they should not stop after murdering a few "poor devils." That was cowardly. They should go after the real "author of Carpetbaggery (Uncle Sam)," even though failure was certain.\textsuperscript{17}

When he returned to New Orleans on September 2, 1874, David found nothing to encourage him. Even his friends were talking of "running off" Governor Kellogg and Lieutenant Governor C. C. Antoine so that the more acceptable Tom Anderson, president of the senate, might assume the governor's office. David countered that Kellogg, Antoine, McEnery and Penn should all resign. Then Anderson would be the governor "legally." But he had little hope that his idea would be accepted. His friends were too impatient. Besides, the white man's party in New Orleans was a "miserable set." William Freret, a former Board member, said even the leaders could not agree on a course of action.\textsuperscript{18}

To avoid bloodshed and almost certain Federal

\textsuperscript{17}David Boyd Diary, August 28, 31, September 1, 2, 4, 1874.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., September 4, 1874.
intervention, David decided to approach Lieutenant Governor Davidson Penn to see if he would resign along with Kellogg, Antoine and McEnery. Penn doubted that such an arrangement could be worked out, but he was willing to do anything possible to make the resulting government legal. Although he thought Anderson worse than Kellogg, he would accept him as governor in the interest of "peace & legality." The lieutenant governor did not promise to resign in so many words, but David thought he was willing to consider it. He asked Penn to present the idea to all the other parties. If Kellogg objected, David suggested that President Grant could induce him to change his mind. ¹⁹

For the next several days David went about New Orleans promoting his compromise scheme. He saw Tom Anderson who thought Kellogg and Antoine would resign without difficulty. Anderson intimated that Kellogg would expect to be compensated with an appointment to the Senate. On the Democratic side, David thought McEnery was the main problem unless the "Old Democrats" could force him to withdraw. Meanwhile, the New Orleans Metropolitan police outraged Orleanians by seizing large quantities of weapons destined

¹⁹Ibid., September 5, 1874.
for White Leaguers. The citizenry howled at what they considered a violation of their "constitutional rights."

Fearing an outbreak of hostilities, David and William Freret redoubled their efforts to get the resignation plan accepted. If they did not succeed by Friday, September 11, David thought, it would be too late. The people would be "rushed into war" by their thoughtless leaders and the result would be disaster. 20

David had to go home on Saturday, September 12, but he was back in New Orleans at 6:30 a.m. the following Monday. Before reaching the city he wrote a letter to Vice-President William Sanford describing conditions in the metropolis and summarizing his own attitudes:

All is seemingly quiet in N.O. . . . but the truth is the feeling is at a white heat . . . It may be a month before the people move; but they are busily organizing . . . there is as yet a want of a clear-cut plan; nor is there a leader. . . . At present, opinion is divided whether they shd stand back for Uncle Sam if he attempts to uphold the Carpetbaggers . . . . I think half-measures in war are not wise; and once we are satisfied there can be no peaceful solution, we shd draw the sword, and fling away the scabbard.

He told Sanford of his efforts to effect a compromise. But he now thought it "hardly practicable." They must get

20 Ibid., September 8, 9, 10, 1874; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 268-69.
ready for a fight, which would put them in a "bad box."
But at least they would perish "like true men in a good
cause." 21

Nevertheless, when David got to New Orleans he and
Will Freret made another vain effort to see Tom Anderson in
the interest of compromise. By that time it was eleven
o'clock. A huge citizens' rally called for on the previous
Saturday night was assembling at Clay Statue. David did
not attend. He was trying again to find Anderson but with­
out success. The citizenry, meanwhile, demanded that
Governor Kellogg resign. Judge Dibble declined in his name,
stating that he would not treat with a group representing
an armed mob. About three-thirty p.m. David went to the
steamer Selma on which he planned to return to Baton Rouge
later that day. Enroute he saw Metropolitan police sta­
tioned at various locations along Canal Street. Besides
muskets and side arms, they had four pieces of artillery.
Then he checked the relative strength of the citizens
massed in adjoining streets. At about four p.m. the citi­
zens' forces attacked the Metropolitanss. The police fell
back to the Customs House, losing three of their guns to

21 David Boyd to William Sanford, September 14, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
the citizens. Governor Kellogg withdrew to the Customs House also, and the citizens occupied the state and city public buildings. The next day Lieutenant Governor Penn replaced all the Kellogg officials with those "legally elected" in 1872. By eleven a.m. of September 15, the revolution was declared a success and the populace proceeded to celebrate with a parade.22

David was sure that Federal troops would intervene as soon as word reached the President. If Grant did not act, the Kellogg regime was certain to topple. But Washington would not let Louisiana's "poor people" off so easily. If the citizens meant to fight, David thought, their commander, F. N. Ogden, should fall back to the Atchafalaya and the Red Rivers. About three p.m. on September 15, President Grant's proclamation appeared on the streets. It ordered the citizens to disperse within five days. The next day David went to see Lieutenant Governor Penn. He urged that an explanatory wire be sent to Sherman. Penn agreed and by three p.m. David borrowed enough money to send it. The telegram made a strong plea for understanding.

22 David Boyd Diary, September 14, 15, 1874; Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 270-72. Lonn put the number killed at forty-four.
In David's words: "The intense disgust of the intelligence and worth of our people came naturally to a head, and like a huge boil burst." He insisted that no hostility for the United States government or the President was intended. The city was "quiet and orderly" and, with only a few exceptions, "perfectly satisfied" with the outcome. Only the black politicians were displeased. Acting Governor Penn was represented as a Liberal Republican who opposed the White League, took no part in the Baton Rouge convention, and was highly regarded by the blacks. "If the government can only let matters remain as they now are, all classes of our people, except a few politicians, will be satisfied; the political status of La. will trouble the govt. and General Grant no more; and the great majority of our people (white and black) will become his fast friends." Meanwhile, rumors circulated that General Emory, the Federal commander, would soon demand surrender from the Penn government. Conferences involving McEnery, Penn, Kellogg, Packard, and General Emory took place on September 17, and David hoped that some compromise would be effected. But if the rumors proved correct and Emory insisted on surrender,  

---

23 David Boyd to William Sherman, telegram, September 16, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
David thought the people should fight to "the bloody end." 24

In the midst of the excitement David received word from Baton Rouge that Negroes had attacked the nearby community of Bayou Sara on the night of the 17th. General Emory despatched U. S. troops from Baton Rouge to put down the disorder while in Baton Rouge itself, a Committee of Fourteen took over the town and demanded possession of the University's guns to keep them out of the hands of Negroes. On September 18, David explained to William Van Pelt, then in charge at the University, why he was staying on in New Orleans. He wanted to help find a way out of "the scrape which our people have gotten into." He was keeping Sherman "informed" and he thought a compromise was possible. But the next day, David learned that the Kellogg government was about to be restored. Despondent, he telegraphed Sherman again before leaving for Baton Rouge. Restoration of Governor Kellogg would result in anarchy and lawlessness, he declared. "Due regard for the protection of life and property demands a military or provisional government, he

24 David Boyd Diary, September 15, 16, 17, 1874; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, September 17, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
A few days after he reached home David heard from Sherman. The general had not been at his headquarters when David's telegrams arrived. They were copied and sent to him at Columbus, Ohio. "I did not answer because it simply would have complicated matters. Matters of this nature involving the safety of a state do not belong to me as head of the army, but are properly the function of the President whose action is of course binding on me and all parts of the army." Then Sherman expressed regret that the people of New Orleans had taken it upon themselves to change the government of Louisiana. No matter how unpopular Kellogg was, he was the legal governor. Mob action, however "respectable" the mob, could not change that fact. He assured David that uprisings like the one in New Orleans did nothing but harm to "the people of your section in the estimation of all people everywhere." He counseled patience and forbearance in the interest of the entire country. He also appeared to

25 David Boyd Diary, September 18, 19, 1874; William Van Pelt to David Boyd, telegram, September 18, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; David Boyd to William Sherman, telegram, September 19, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, September 18, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
be offering David a mild reprimand and a bit of advice:

I am determined so far as I am personally concerned, to stick close to my office, which is simple and plain--viz. mind my own business, and if all will do likewise I think prosperity will return to all parts of the land more speedily than by any attempt to reach it by violence or unlawful measures. 26

David answered a few days later. He was sick over La.'s case." The people had hoped that President Grant would find "as much law to let us alone now as he did to interfere with us two years ago." David knew Sherman had not had anything "officially" to do with the Federal action against Louisiana. He only wanted him to know the "real state of the facts." He marked his telegrams "private," never expecting that anyone except Sherman would see them. His only intention, David declared, was to have "poor La.'s" side known by a "thinking man" of the North in case President Grant happened to ask his (Sherman's) opinion. David thought most of President Grant's advisers gave him incorrect counsel intentionally to better serve their party and to "keep themselves in office." Then he concluded by attacking the "gangrene" in Louisiana, universal suffrage. Unless it were removed, it would spread over the South and

26 William T. Sherman to David Boyd, September 21, 1874, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
the whole nation, "and then you--the General of the Army--will have your hands full indeed."27

David's letters to his friends about the New Orleans Riot were somewhat more emotional than the wires he sent Sherman. To Colonel Lockett he castigated the "extreme Democrats" who, in the days before the uprising, refused to consider the resignation of McEnery in the interest of compromise. They were "old moss-backs." To Dr. Francis Hopkins he wrote:

The La. question is now a national question. Mr. Cuffey, to secure his freedom, brought us one war--a terrible one. Will he bring on another war, in his and the Radical's silly attempt to make him, what God has said he shd not be--the equal of the white man? When Uncle Sam conforms to the law of nature and to the wish of nature's God, he will be safe and happy; otherwise our Uncle Sam, like all things earthly, that oppose God and nature, must perish. This must be the white man's country. It was never designed to be the Negro's or Chinaman's country. With a negro for President, John Chinaman for vice-president, an Indian for Chief Justice, a Malayan for Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Anglo-Saxon to foot the bills, this will indeed be a glorious country.28

27David Boyd to William T. Sherman, September 26, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.

28David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, September 26, 1874; David Boyd to Dr. F. V. Hopkins, September 30, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
When David reached Baton Rouge on September 20, 1874, he found a citizens' Committee of Fourteen in charge of the town. As in many parishes of the state, the whites had "run off" Radical officeholders during the late summer and fall of 1874. But when Kellogg was restored and Federal troops began to arrive in support of his regime, the various White League Committees around the state had to give up power to the Kellogg officials. In Baton Rouge the Committee of Fourteen discussed the mechanics of retrocession for two days. David, invited to sit in at the discussion, thought they should do nothing until they heard from McEnery and Penn. But the Committee decided to step down at once. However, before Kellogg's officials took over, David reclaimed the University's guns. He would not give them up again unless assured they would be sent out of the parish. 29

During the rest of 1874 David's political activity consisted almost entirely of letterwriting. He was bitter in the extreme. The East Baton Rouge Radical candidates for the legislature especially offended him: "One ... is a poor negro who was actually born in the Penitentiary

29 David Boyd Diary, September 20, 21, 1874.
here—while his mother was a convict! . . . Is that not literally conceived in iniquity and born in sin?" He was not much kinder to the opposition. Louisiana not only needed less of the "Carpetbagger and the nigger." She also could stand some improvement among her "oldest and best."

"Men of influence and high standing who abuse the carpet-bagger for taking a bribe themselves offer that bribe!"\(^{30}\)

On November 2, 1874, David went to the polls. He disliked having to wait in line with Negroes for the "august privilege" of voting. He also deplored the ballot system as a "cheat and a swindle," designed to enable some "cowardly sneak" to hide the way he voted. The only honest way to vote, he thought, was \textit{viva voce}. Radicals carried East Baton Rouge Parish easily. J. Henri Burch, the black senator, won reelection and all three members elected to the house were Republican. But on the state level, David expected Democrats to carry the house. If they did, he hoped they would order a recount of the 1872 returns. A few days later David began to express fears that the

\(^{30}\)David Boyd to W. L. Broun, October 21, 1874; David Boyd to Col. E. L. Cunningham, October 24, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
Returning Board would count the Democrats out. General Longstreet was on the Board and he "will do anything." But David refused to believe that Tom Anderson, president of the senate, would tolerate anything "deliberately fraudulent." By late November he was not so sure. The Returning Board, he wrote Edward Cunningham, would surely make a "false return" unless restrained by a wholesome "fear for their lives." Most of them were "great scoundrels,--Longstreet, Gov. (Mat) Wells & a negro son of Duncan F. Kenner being a majority." It hurt David to see Longstreet in such company, but he was forced to conclude that the general was a very bad man. "What a fall for the associate of Lee." Congress reconvened on December 7, 1874. David believed the Returning Board was waiting to see what Grant's attitude toward Louisiana would be before announcing its decision. If Congress and the President intended to sustain the Radicals, no doubt the Returning Board would act accordingly. In that case, everyone on it plus the Radical leaders should be "seized and hung." David was ready to help. He wrote J. C. Moncure, the Democratic candidate for state treasurer, that he was willing to fight if Moncure were

31David Boyd Diary, November 2, 5, 9, 1874.
"counted out." When the Returning Board finally acted, it certified fifty-three Republicans and fifty-three Democrats, leaving five vacancies to be decided by the house. But the Democrats claimed a seventy-one to thirty-seven seat majority. David thought there was but one thing left: "for the people to seat their candidates by force in the parishes."

Then, on January 4, as many men as could possibly arrange it, should go to New Orleans. "Grant seems determined to bring on a conflict, ... to stir up the northern masses against us and to give him a new lease of power. And if he is 'spiling' for a fight, why let him be accommodated."32

The legislature convened on January 4, 1875, and a frantic struggle for control ensued. When it was over, Republicans supported by Federal troops took control of the government. The Democrats met separately elsewhere. Louisiana again had two legislatures, and civil disorder seemed certain to erupt. Meanwhile, under special orders from

32 David Boyd to Col. Edward Cunningham, November 29, 1874; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, December 9, 1874; David Boyd to J. C. Moncure, undated; David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, December 24, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75; David Boyd Diary, December 7, 1874. General Longstreet resigned from the Returning Board before it issued its final certification. The Democrats claimed a seventy-one to thirty-seven majority. Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 287-89.
President Grant, General Philip Sheridan assumed command in the area. He suggested to the President that the "ring-leaders of the Armed White League" be declared "banditti," arrested and tried. The effect was electric. Protest meetings occurred all over the country. In the United States Senate, the Louisiana situation provoked a debate that continued for weeks. But in the end, nothing was done. House action was also inconclusive although a subcommittee from the lower chamber did go to Louisiana to investigate affairs. Due mainly to the efforts of William A. Wheeler, a representative from New York, a compromise plan finally emerged. Under its terms Democrats would control Louisiana's lower house and Kellogg would be allowed to occupy the governor's chair until his term ended in 1877. Some Democrats, notably John McEnery and his partisans, objected, but after much pressure they too accepted the terms by a narrow margin. Finally, on April 14, the Wheeler-approved legislature met for a ten-day session. At its adjournment many were optimistic about the future. The state seemed to have settled down enough so that attention could be turned to something besides politics.  

33Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, Chaps. 14-16. In spite of her admitted bias, Miss Lonn's book provides an
David's contact with the 1875 legislatures was minimal. He refused to have anything to do with the Kellogg "Rump" as he called it. Instead, he stayed in Baton Rouge, too poor to do anything else, and wrote letters to all his friends about the withering away of the Constitution. In one letter he interrupted himself long enough to marvel at a man "with nothing to feed his family for dinner ... who sits and conjectures on constitutional questions and civil vs. military authority.... We cld laugh if it did not hurt so bad!" 34 David did go to New Orleans when the adjusted legislature organized under the Wheeler compromise met on April 14, 1875. But he expected nothing from it. Almost the entire brief session was spent "frittering away time on partisan measures." He returned to Baton Rouge, his ailing family, and a practically deserted University. Only five cadets were enrolled as of April 30, 1875. On June 30, when the session ended, there were four. 35

---

34 David Boyd to Pendleton King, January 21, 1875; David Boyd to A. D. Bayles, January 25, 1875; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, January 20, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.

35 Tom Boyd Diary, April 21, 30, June 30, 1875.
The Wheeler Compromise was not very old before it began to deteriorate. By mid-1875 a small but aggressive group of Democrats, always opposed to any compromise with Kellogg, declared their intention to continue war on the governor. They appealed directly to the people, urging them to demand a statewide convention at which the Democratic party could be reorganized. The main body of Democrats opposed the convention, fearing that it would reopen the whole issue of the Wheeler Compromise. But by the end of 1875, the "no-compromise" Democrats were in the ascendent, and the party scheduled a convention at New Orleans on January 5, 1876. Besides reiterating their undying opposition to Kellogg, the delegates petitioned the President and Congress to "blot from our national history this shameful record of usurpation." They also selected delegates to the national Democratic convention.

Two days before the Democrats met, Louisiana's legislature assembled in regular session. Rumors that Governor Kellogg would be impeached flooded the Crescent City. But not until February 28 did the house take action. The senate, dominated by Republicans, acquitted the governor at once. They branded the charges against Kellogg as false, frivolous and politically inspired. Tom Boyd agreed. In
his diary for March 4, 1876, he likened the Democratic repudiation of the Wheeler Compromise to an honest man attempting to win by breach of faith in a game with a professional pickpocket. By mid-March the legislators moved to adjourn in order to devote themselves completely to a game with higher stakes: the presidential contest of 1876.36

In such a politically volatile atmosphere, David expected little attention from the legislature. Even his own correspondence dealt almost exclusively with state politics and the coming national election. He wrote General Sherman in January, 1876, describing the "deplorable" conditions in southeastern Louisiana. The violence and lawlessness, particularly against blacks, appalled him. As a Southerner, David was "heartily ashamed." Wild young white men were "allowed to have their own way" because the older political leaders wanted their votes. David himself had to call off some rash young men who wanted to "throw out McWhorter," the superintendent of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum. Much of the violence was the work of the "Regulators," a secret society originally organized to punish

36 Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana, 380 passim; Tom Boyd Diary, March 4, 1876.
cotton thieves. But by 1876 it was "mixed up" in politics. In order to carry the parish for the Democrats in the next election, it was killing and intimidating as many blacks as possible. White Radical office-holders were little more secure. In late February, 1876, Tom Boyd wrote his sister that Baton Rouge had no sheriff, judge, or tax collector. All had been driven off after a mass meeting of Democrats. A Committee of Thirty-two then assumed control of the parish.37

Conditions had not improved much by June, 1876. David reported to a friend that a "reign of terror exists in this corner of La." The whites in East Baton Rouge Parish meant to carry it for the Democrats "by means foul if not fair." David thought it would be better for whites never to regain control if they had to resort to such methods. But he knew most people disagreed with him. To a

37David Boyd to W. T. Sherman, January 15, 1876; David Boyd to Swarbrick's and Company, January 24, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; Tom Boyd to Mrs. W. H. Spiller (sister), February 27, 1876, in Boyd (Thos.) Letterbooks, 1876-80. Dr. Dupree, David's friend and the University physician, was chairman of the committee which informed the Radical parish judge that he had better leave Baton Rouge or be prepared to take the consequences. David advised Dupree to beware of "Uncle Sam." Dr. Dupree and others were arrested and taken to New Orleans. But later they were released on bond. David Boyd to William Van Pelt, March 21, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
Virginia friend he contrasted the morals of Louisiana with those of his home state. "In politics . . .," he remarked, "John Slidell debauched the Democratic party before the war; . . . With his N. Y. Tammany ideas, John Slidell was a worse man than H. C. Warmoth is today!" Then David commented on the fact that outrages against blacks, which would earn a prison sentence in Virginia, went unpunished and uncondemned in Louisiana. In fact, to protest against them was to almost risk one's life:

What think you of one negro called out of his cabin at night by masked men, lassoed, dragged along the road till dead, and then hung to a tree? Another shot, but not killed, and then coal oil poured over him, and burnt to death! And for what? Nobody seems to know. Such things have been done in this parish recently.38

David seems to have had mixed emotions about the presidential candidates in 1876. In June he predicted that Democrats would carry Louisiana "sure," but that Hayes would be elected. He thought Hayes was a "good man" although he intended to vote against him. It was too bad he was not the Democratic nominee. Two weeks later, to another friend, he remarked that "any Demo." was better than

38David Boyd to William Van Pelt, June 18, 1876; David Boyd to Pendleton King, June 27, 1876; David Boyd to Charles Venable, August 8, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
Hayes. By July he was praising Hayes again. Hayes and William Wheeler, he thought, were better men than "Tammany" Tilden and his running mate. A few months later David changed his mind again. Now he disdained the Republican nominee as "Mr. Returning Board Hayes." 39

In July, 1876, the Democrats met in convention at Baton Rouge. They nominated Francis T. Nicholls for governor, Louis A. Wiltz for lieutenant governor, and Robert M. Lusher for superintendent of public education. The Republicans met earlier in New Orleans and nominated S. B. Packard for governor and C. C. Antoine as his running mate. David liked Packard personally. He had been "very kind and considerate" two years before when ex-professor Featherman sued the school to recover his back wages. But David thought Packard would not get a single vote "outside the Radical camp." Nicholls, a West Pointer and ex-Confederate general, was an old acquaintance of Samuel Lockett. In August, 1876, David wrote to Lockett, who was still in Egypt, to tell him of Nicholls's nomination. Repeating a witticism then current, David declared: "With his one arm

39 David Boyd to William Van Pelt, June 18, July 15, 1876; David Boyd to Pendleton King, June 27, 1876; David Boyd to William Sherman, July 1, 1876, ibid.
& one leg—all that is left of him being right—we hope he can successfully stump the state."40

Three days before election day David predicted to General Sherman that Nicholls would carry Louisiana by 20,000 votes. He also thought the Returning Board would "count him out." David said he would be very surprised if Louisiana, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, or Mississippi were counted for the Democrats, but he thought all would cast Democratic majorities. "And if the Presidential election shd turn on the vote of any one of those states; then what? You can best say if there is wisdom, and forbearance enough among the non-political masses of the north to prevent serious trouble and disorder."41

David's worst fears were realized. The election did indeed "turn" on the vote of three Southern states. To avoid at Washington what had occurred in Louisiana since 1872 (the establishment of two governments, each claiming to be the "lawful body," ) Congress had to devise a special

40 He forgot to mention that Nicholls had also lost his left eye. Tom Boyd Diary, July 27, 1876; David Boyd to Swarbrick's, July 12, 1876; David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, August 7, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.

41 David Boyd to W. T. Sherman, November 4, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
mechanism, a sort of super Returning Board. On January 29, 1877, it created an electoral commission with power to evaluate the conflicting returns from Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana. In each case the commission accepted the Hayes slate of electors, thereby certifying the Republican contender. The agreements which made that certification possible had been carefully, if less formally, worked out in the several weeks before March 4. Not only the "non-political masses" but their leaders, too, had enough "wisdom and forbearance" to prevent "serious political disorder." 42

Of the several struggles David waged during the hostile Kellogg administration, perhaps the most significant was his long battle to acquire the agricultural fund for the University. From 1866 on every Report David submitted to the legislature pleaded that the agricultural fund be granted to the University. It was his contention that the best educational theory demanded a "concentration of resources" at the college level. To create a separate agricultural and mechanical college would be a waste of

42 Randall and Donald, Civil War and Reconstruction, 693-701. See also C. Vann Woodward, Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction (Rev. Ed.; New York, 1956).
money and could only produce two "weak and puny"
institutions.

The agricultural fund rested on the Morrill Act of 1862. The measure awarded to each state 30,000 acres of public land (or its equivalent in land scrip) for each representative a state sent to Congress. The land or land scrip was to be sold and the proceeds invested in "safe" securities yielding at least five per cent a year. The capital could not be touched, but the interest represented an annuity to be used for the support and maintenance of one or more colleges wherein:

The leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes.

None of the annuity could be used to buy, build or repair buildings and states had to begin educational operations no later than 1874.43 David's opponents argued that it would violate Congressional intent to award the agricultural fund to the University in which "classical" or traditional courses dominated the curriculum. They rested their argu-

---

43Fleming, Louisiana State University, 279-80.
object to be the promotion of "practical education" for the "industrial classes." David replied by citing other phrases in the same section of the act. The measure aimed at promoting the "liberal" education of the industrial classes too. And the law stated specifically that while the "leading object" was to teach "such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts," it was to be done "without excluding other scientific and classical studies . . . including military tactics."  

In 1868 or 1869 David found a pamphlet which expressed perfectly his ideas about what Congress had intended. Published by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce in London, the report advocated the restructuring of existing schools and the creation of new ones because those available were too few in number and too restricted in course offerings. It argued that "science" should form the "backbone" of the restructured schools, just as the classics then dominated the curricula at Harrow and Rugby. Science should be taught as a means of developing "mental discipline" and "culture;" and "science," as used in the report, meant mathematics,

44 Ibid.
mechanics, chemistry and physics. In no sense did this mean the exclusion of languages, ancient or modern, from the curriculum. What the study did propose was the elevation in status of the new studies to the level of the old. Care had to be taken that the new schools were as well endowed as the old in buildings, staff, and financial resources. Otherwise, a "social stigma" would handicap their graduates. And finally, in no sense should the new institutions be thought of as "trade schools." Instead they must provide a general education "broadly liberal" and theoretical in approach. Practical application could be provided for in postgraduate programs.45

Two or three years later David acquired another valuable report from Professor W. LeRoy Broun of the University of Georgia. Broun's pamphlet also provided him with ammunition which he used effectively in his battles for the agricultural fund. In 1872 the state of Georgia was considering whether to give its Morrill Act funds to the existing university or to set up an entirely separate institution. Many states were then struggling with the same problem.

The Georgia pamphlet, prepared by the university trustees and addressed to the public, gave David a ready-made argument when the same question arose in Louisiana. In essence, the trustees argued that (1) it would be more expensive to create a separate institution because of the necessary duplication of buildings, libraries, apparatus and staff; (2) most states had awarded the agricultural fund to existing institutions; in one instance a state first created a separate institution and then consolidated it with the existing institution in the interest of efficiency; (3) graduates of strictly Agricultural and Mechanical colleges were considered by others to have had "inferior" training; (4) an institution which prepared students for all "walks of life" was "broadening"; and (5) at a university a student might transfer freely from one program to another with little or no interruption in his academic career. The Georgia pamphlet concluded with a quotation from President A. D. White of Cornell University:

It is an error to suppose that agricultural education is the only kind of education that this fund is designed to provide . . . It is designed for the 'liberal and practical education of the industrial classes;' and in order to do this, the College is required 'to teach such branches as are related to
agriculture and the mechanical arts, without excluding therefrom other scientific studies." 46

But even when established independently, Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges were sometimes attacked by the more "practical" members of the public. In July, 1873, David's friend, Dr. E. W. Hilgard, addressed a letter to the editor of the American Farmers' Advocate. Hilgard, a professor of "agricultural chemistry," disputed those extremely "practical" persons who thought it was foolish to educate farmers. There would hardly be so much "worn out" land if farmers knew anything about soil chemistry. He denied that Congress intended to establish "simply labor schools or handicraft schools" when it passed the Morrill Act. Had such schools been created they would have been shunned by the very people for whom they were provided. Finally, Hilgard attacked the "practical" men in state legislatures who thought "experimental farms" had to be self-supporting to justify their existence. 47

46 Board of Trustees, Present Organization and Proposed Plan of Expansion of the University of Georgia, 1872, ibid., Box 20.

47 E. W. Hilgard, letter to the editor, American Farmer's Advocate, July 1873, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook, 1874-1907.
In addition to serious and sincere disagreement about what Congress intended in the Morrill Act, plenty of controversy arose as a result of rural-urban hostility, rich-poor antagonism, and, of course, political partisanship. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Louisiana did not apply her Morrill Grant funds until almost the last moment allowed under the law. In April, 1874, the Louisiana Agricultural and Mechanical College was organized by act of the legislature. It was housed temporarily in New Orleans, in buildings belonging to the suspended University of Louisiana. A Board of Control including the governor, the chief justice, the superintendent of public education, and nine others to be named by the governor was directed to secure a permanent location "in the parishes," and $10,000 annually for five years was to be appropriated to construct a building for the college. The act outlawed discrimination in every phase of the "admission, management or discipline of the institution."\(^4^8\)

The Board of Control opened the Louisiana Agricultural and Mechanical college in the summer of 1874 in order to insure Louisiana's title to Morrill grant funds. On

\(^{48}\) Fleming, *Louisiana State University*, 278-84.
July 14 the president of the institution made his first report. There were 120 students and four professors including the president, Thomas Nicholson. Nicholson urged the Board to prepare thoroughly for the fall session in order not to lose "public sympathy" or the "patronage" of the legislature. He also pointed out that the state owned 200 acres of land near New Orleans and the city owned an additional 200 nearby. The property, he thought, would make an excellent permanent home for the college. In conclusion, he noted that his Report had been set up in type by the students "as part of their practical education." 49

While the Agricultural College was conducting its summer session in 1874, David Boyd was busily gathering data to be used in the next legislature against the permanent organization of the new college. He wrote to his friend Dr. Hilgard, then at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. In that state the legislature had established a separate Agricultural college, and David understood that "it was a

49 Report of the President to the Board of Control, Louisiana Agricultural and Mechanical College, July 14, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1870-74, Box 19. One of the professors listed on the Agricultural College staff was David's old enemy, Dr. James Burns. However, he was replaced almost at once by another M. D.
mistake." He asked Hilgard for documentation. If Louisiana's "next legislature shd be better," David thought Louisiana's schools might be united. He wrote President A. D. White of Cornell for persuasive arguments about "whether such colleges shd be on a broad and liberal basis, like Cornell, or restricted to little else besides practical Agriculture and Mechanics. . . . I do not believe the object of the Congressional Act can be attained unless the young farmer or mechanic is first made a man; and only liberal . . . study can do that." David thought he could count on support for his position from both blacks and whites in the country parishes. As he wrote his New Orleans friend, J. D. Kenton, "We fear only your able city delegates."50

In October, 1874, David thought the Agricultural College, temporarily located in New Orleans, had not resumed operations. In November he was disabused. Instead, he discovered that the Board of Control was preparing to acquire a permanent campus. One of the sites under consideration was property belonging to Mrs. John Lynch, wife of

50 David Boyd to Andrew Ten Brock, University of Michigan, August 14, 1874; David Boyd to Dr. E. W. Hilgard, October 24, 1874; David Boyd to Dr. A. D. White, October, 1874; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, November 8, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
"Honest John" Lynch of Returning Board fame in 1872. Lynch happened to be in charge of the public land sale which provided the principal for the agricultural fund. He also became a member of the Board of Control when the Agricultural College was set up. His (or his wife's) plantation, offered as a site for the college, had been acquired only a year before. David was suspicious. "Shall a partisan Board, composed mostly of notoriously corrupt people, thus trifle and insult the intelligence and worth of the state?"

David charged that all the appointed members of the Board but three were either Negroes or Governor Kellogg's "henchmen in N. O." He wanted his friend, J. D. Kenton, and Mayor L. A. Wiltz of New Orleans to "wake up the public."

The whole thing was a fraud, done in haste before a Democratic legislature (elected in November, 1874) could be seated. ¹

One of David's major opponents on the Agricultural College Board was Colonel W. M. Burwell, an editor of the Radical New Orleans Republican. In 1874 Burwell appeared against David before the Education Committee of "Kellogg's

²David Boyd to E. W. Hilgard, October 24, 1874; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, November 20, 1874, ibid. ¹
Menagerie; and tho he bristled with statistics for his side, he made nothing off me," David reported to General Graham. If a "decent" legislature were seated in 1875, David thought Burwell would be "easier to beat." Regardless of their personal differences, Burwell and David were in correspondence. In November, 1874, he asked David for a set of military regulations for possible adoption by the Agricultural College. David sent them promptly, advising Burwell at the same time that some of the Board members of his school, as well as some of the legislators who created it, were "refugees from the penitentiary."

Another of David's opponents was Dr. Robert Ryland of West Feliciana Parish. Ryland, like Burwell, was a former Virginian. In 1874 he was chairman of the Grange Education Committee and therefore extremely interested in the whole question of agricultural education. When the Louisiana Grangers met in Baton Rouge early in December, 1874, David invited Dr. Ryland to stay at the University. He accepted and while there asked David to write his committee report. He also invited David to a Grange Education Committee meeting in New Orleans the following February. The

---

52David Boyd Diary, November 29, 1874; David Boyd to Col. W. M. Burwell, November 29, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
report David prepared for Ryland was very general. It outlined the courses a young man should pursue in primary and secondary education before entering an "Agricultural and Mechanical College." The college itself should offer "all the branches relating to Agriculture and Mechanic Arts . . . taught theoretically with great thoroughness and practicality." There should also be a number of agricultural stations located around the state where a resident chemist and physiologist should continually experiment and report on the best methods of raising crops and stock.\(^{53}\)

In December, 1874, David learned that the Agricultural College Board had purchased property at Chalmette in St. Bernard Parish as a permanent home for the college. Through a friend he persuaded the New Orleans Commercial Bulletin to demand a review of the entire Agricultural College question by the forthcoming legislature. He also arranged to have a petition, drawn up the previous year,

\(^{53}\)David Boyd Diary, December 3, 5, 6, 1874; David Boyd, Plan for Industrial Education as Submitted to Dr. Robert Ryland, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1873-90. In the course of study David would include English literature, French, German, mathematics, theoretical and practical "Mechanics," astronomy, drawing, civil engineering, chemistry "(Elementary and Applied to the arts and to agriculture)," anatomy, physiology, veterinary surgery, political economy, constitutional and international law, bookkeeping,
circulated around the state. The petition urged the legislature to award the agricultural fund to the University at Baton Rouge. 54

Meanwhile, the Agricultural College Board of Control did not sit idly by. It paid the first installment on the Chalmette property and announced plans to move there as soon as it could erect the necessary buildings. It also planned to establish an experimental farm, equipped with all the "appurtenances necessary for practical agriculture," and a workshop in which the "practical art" of typesetting would be taught. As 1874 drew to a close the college employed three professors and two "tutors" and counted sixty students. It offered two four-year courses (one in agriculture; one in mechanical arts) and a two-year preparatory course. It also offered night classes for those who worked during the day. All "able bodied" students were required to perform a "small amount of labor for practical instruction," and those who wanted to could do extra work for pay. Finally, the Board claimed a total estimated worth of some "Commercial Usages," business forms, and correspondence.

54 David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, December 12, 1874; David Boyd to A. A. Gunby, December 18, 1874, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1874-75.
All of David's well-laid plans to win the agricultural fund for the University came to nothing in 1875. There were two legislatures that year, and Federal troops supported the Kellogg, or "Rump" body before which David refused to appear. By the time Congressman Wheeler's Compromise established the "true" legislature, it was April. David went to New Orleans for the brief ten-day session, but he knew before he arrived that nothing would be done for the University that year.

By 1876 conditions had changed. Democrats were firmly in control of the lower house and David had found a staunch supporter of the University in the Republican senate. J. Henri Burch, the black Radical from Baton Rouge, offered to present David's bill to merge the University and the Agricultural College in the upper chamber and another Republican, Judge A. B. Levisse, introduced it in the house. One other factor contributed to the University's ultimate

55 J. L. Cross, Report of the President of the Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College for 1874, in Boyd (Thos. D.) Papers, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University. The valuation was based on the face value of state bonds in which the amount of money realized by the sale of public lands had been invested. The market value of the bonds was no doubt considerably less.
success: the Grangers. By 1876 they claimed to control several legislative votes. Rather belligerently they de­manded a large role in determining the nature and the per­manent location of the existing Agricultural College. In a letter to Judge Levisse David remarked that Daniel Dennett, a leader in the state Grange, seemed to want that organiza­tion to control the Agricultural College completely. If his merger bill passed, David was willing to offer the Grange, and perhaps the Mechanical Association of New Or­leans, representation on the Board. But he did not believe any group should exercise exclusive control over an educa­tional institution. That would make it "too narrow."

Another leading Granger, Dr. Ryland, agreed with David that the Agricultural and Mechanical college should be located in the "country parishes," but he did not share his opinion about what it should teach. Ryland argued that the Agri­cultural College should be "purely agricultural, conducted on a practical, not theoretical or 'scientific' basis."

David thought both opponents could be overcome. If the Grangers moved to take control of the Agricultural College so much the better for his merger bill. It would cause the Radicals and many conservatives in the legislature to act together. "A Radical hates a Granger as he does the
Additional opposition to the merger of the University and the Agricultural College came from New Orleans and, naturally enough, from the Agricultural College itself. In its Report for 1875, the Board of Control maintained that a "mere glance" at the Morrill Act proved the "absurdity" of the proposition to merge the two schools. It might be "practicable," if undesirable, to merge the State University with the Agricultural College, but it was utterly "impracticable" to absorb the Agricultural College in the State University. That might forfeit the national grant, "which probably is regarded by the advocates of amalgamation as the most attractive feature in the Agricultural College."57

New Orleans opposition to the merger bill came principally from two sources: Radical politicians and conservative newspapers. Most of it developed after the bill passed the legislature in March, 1876. The Radical politicians opposed granting anything to Baton Rouge while that

56 David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, January 26, February 17, 1876; David Boyd to Judge A. B. Levisse, February 13, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.

57 Annual Report of the Board of Control of Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1875, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1876-79, Box 20.
parish remained in defiance of the Kellogg administration and engaged in widespread intimidation of its black population. They did their best to keep Governor Kellogg from signing the bill for the next ten months. The newspaper opposition grew out of an unwillingness to lose the college to another city. For several weeks after the merger bill passed the city papers offered lengthy arguments against its approval by the governor. Among the principal charges made were that (1) The University was "defunct;" (2) its property and that of the Agricultural College would be attached to liquidate its debt; (3) the merger bill was a violation of the Morrill Act which allowed only "Agricultural and Mechanical" courses to be taught; and (4) the state University was governed by a "ring" anxious to keep itself in power. Each charge was taken up and categorically denied by "JWD" in a letter to the editor of the New Orleans Times. "JWD" were the initials of Dr. J. W. Dupree but the letter which appeared over them was David's, just as everything else in defense of the merger bill, as well as the bill itself, was written by him. He complained bitterly that the very papers which attacked him and the merger bill charged him to print the letters to the editor which he wrote in rebuttal. Not only that, they usually
appeared "in small type on the last page along with the Plow Pictures!".\(^{58}\)

One attack leveled by the New Orleans Times against the merger bill seems to have disturbed David particularly. The paper reported on April 3, 1876, that Senator J. Henri Burch, the Negro Republican from Baton Rouge, "originated" the merger bill in the upper chamber. David realized that Burch's name attached to any measure, however worthwhile, might well destroy it. When a Baton Rouge paper copied the Times article, David appealed to the editor. He reminded him that the merged college could mean a great deal to the town. "The college will come . . . if the papers don't succeed in rendering it odious to our own (Democratic) people." He pleaded with the editor who had helped the University so much in the past "not to scuttle . . . [the bill] now just because of prejudice against Burch." David also pointed out that a little praise for Burch's part in assisting the bill through the legislature might well win

---

\(^{58}\) "One Who Has Read the Bill," letter to the editor, New Orleans Times, February 23, 1876; "J.W.D.," letter to the editor, New Orleans Times, March 2, 1876; "Merger of LSU and A&M," editorial, New Orleans Times, April 3, 1876; David Boyd to Swarbrick's & Co., April 4, 9, 1876; David Boyd to W. C. Annis, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letters, books, 1875-76; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 292-95.
some black votes for the Democrats in November. 59

David certainly wanted Burch to have full credit
for his part in passing the measure. As he wrote to Dr.
Dupree:

After Stafford /his nephew and a member of the House/, I rely on Burch, who seems determined to . . . /secure the governor’s signature/. And to his force in the senate we are indebted . . . for the passage of the bill. There was some trouble . . . in the House . . . but that was as nothing to the opposition we wd have had in the Senate, if Burch had even been neutral! Without his active advocacy, the bill could never have been passed. Also, we may be indebted to his efforts in having the Gov.’s signature. I think the people of B. R. should do Burch credit on that score, whatever be his faults otherwise. 60

To Burch himself David wrote essentially the same
thing in December, 1876. "On the record of this Universi-
ty," David promised, "your acts shall stand written." But
if it ever was, it has since been expunged. That William
T. Sherman was the University’s (Seminary’s) first super-
intendent is still unknown to many persons not familiar
with the institution’s history. That David Boyd spent a
lifetime in the University’s service is slightly better
known; he has been recognized to the extent that a campus

59 David Boyd to W. C. Annis, editor of the Baton
Rouge Advocate, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks,
1875-76.

60 David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, March 10, 1876,
ibid.
building bears his name. But that a black Radical Republican played a vital part in bringing the Agricultural and Mechanical College to Baton Rouge, thereby aiding the University in its fight for survival, is one of Louisiana's better kept secrets.  

David Boyd to J. Henri Burch, December 27, 1876, ibid. David certainly tried to give Burch credit publicly. In April, 1876, he wrote an article for the Baton Rouge Advocate. The article was very complimentary to Senator Burch. David wanted the papers to publish it as an editorial. But Editor W. C. Annis refused. He sent it back to David for revision and then printed it as a letter to the editor over David's signature. David's only intention, he assured Annis, was to give Burch credit for "the great public good he did, and to keep our people from opposing the bill because Burch introduced it." David Boyd to W. C. Annis, editor of Baton Rouge Advocate, April 7, 1876, ibid. According to Professor R. S. McCulloch, J. Henri Burch "engineered" the merger bill through the Louisiana senate and later protected it from a gubernatorial veto "with the hope of escaping punishment for his defalcation." Allegedly Burch embezzled part of the parish school funds. But even if he had not been accused of theft, the political climate in Baton Rouge by 1874 was such that he could not have visited his district safely. R. S. McCulloch, Reasons For His Resignation From the University, April 2, 1880, pamphlet, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, Box \( \text{?} \)
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CHAPTER IX

WINNING A BATTLE

David Boyd's bill to merge the Louisiana State University with the Louisiana Agricultural and Mechanical College received legislative approval in March, 1876. But as David expected Governor Kellogg did not sign it. "The Old Agric College Set" would do all it could to keep the governor from giving his approval. Radicals in New Orleans would also interfere. "But the uniting of the two schools," David wrote Vice-President Sanford, "is only a matter of time. In all human probability, the 1st Monday in Jany. next 1877 will see either a good Democrat or H. C. Warmoth, Gov. of La. Either will sign the bill."¹

Only part of David's prediction came to pass. By the "1st Monday in Jany. next," Louisiana again had two governors. As David expected, one was "a good Democrat," General Francis T. Nicholls. But the other, S. B. Packard,

¹David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, April 6, 1876; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, March 12, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76.
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was a Customs House Republican and a long-standing political foe of Henry Clay Warmoth. Under the circumstances David's merger bill received the signature of neither. However, the measure was not dead. Article 66 of the Constitution of 1868 provided that acts passed by the legislature automatically became law on the first day of the succeeding legislative session if not signed or vetoed by the governor before then. Senator J. Henri Burch assured David that the outgoing governor, William Kellogg, had not vetoed the merger bill. It had become law. Nevertheless, David was concerned. His bill, like many others adopted by the preceding legislature, had not been promulgated. He was afraid that it might be lost, stolen or destroyed in the struggle then going on between the Nicholls and Packard governments. David knew that as of January 3, 1877, the merger act reposed in the office of Judge Dibble, acting attorney general in the Kellogg administration. He suggested to Dr. J. W. Dupree, the school physician recently elected to the legislature from Baton Rouge, that it stay there until he (David) arrived in the Crescent City. David knew Judge Dibble, who might "do for him what he might not" for Dr. Dupree.2

2David Boyd to Swarbrick's, January 3, 1877; David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, January 13, 1877, ibid., 1876-77;
By January 23, 1877, the merger act was promulgated by the Packard government. Three days later David thanked Senator J. Henri Burch for the "noble work" he had done in behalf of the new school. He promised to see that Burch was "properly credited" for his services. He also suggested that further steps to organize the school and to appoint a Board of Supervisors be postponed until conditions became more stable. Then he offered to help Burch. The senator had been forced out of Baton Rouge by Regulators more than a year before. Only at the risk of his life could he return to the district he represented. Tom Boyd was unsympathetic to the senator. He did not trust Burch and thought his efforts to secure the merger act were insincere, designed only to conciliate white opposition in Baton Rouge. But David was more charitable. In his letter of January 26 to Burch he remarked "If you shd, possibly, have reason to fear any personal harm, in these troubous times, please let me know, and I shall try to protect you."  

Reprint of Louisiana Senate Journal, January 30, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1875-86, Box 19.

3Tom Boyd Diary, December 31, 1876; New Orleans Republican, January 31, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 17; David Boyd to J. Henri Burch, January 26, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
Promulgation by the Packard legislature did not end opposition to the act of merger. If anything, it gave the strongest opponents of the law, the Grangers and the administration of the Agricultural College, another chance to challenge it. When the Packard government fell in March, 1877, they could claim that nothing it did had any validity. But they did not wait for the Nicholls government to be formally recognized before launching their attacks. On January 30, 1877, a resolution in the Nicholls senate authorized the Committee on Public Education to investigate the affairs of the State University at Baton Rouge. David was not sure of the author's intent. Was it designed to help the creditors, to discredit his administration, or to block the merger with the Agricultural College? In any case, how could he legitimately defend an institution of which he was no longer a part? The University and his job ceased to exist when the merger law was promulgated. Besides, he questioned the propriety of appearing before a body which itself was not formally recognized. What if the Packard legislature were finally sustained?^

^Reprint of Senate Journal, January 30, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1875-86; David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, February 1, February 2, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
David eventually overcame his misgivings. After repeated urgings, he went to New Orleans about February 12, 1877, to testify before the appropriate committees of the Nicholls legislature. He remained in the city until late April. By that time there was no question about the legality of the Nicholls government, but the merger act was still being challenged. A petition against the union of the University and the Agricultural College had been presented to the Nicholls legislature early in February. About the same time a bill to repeal the merger act appeared in the lower house. By a vote of six to three the committee to which it was referred reported it unfavorably, but the minority presented a substitute, similar in intent. A few days later the substitute was indefinitely postponed. Even final adjournment on April 26, 1877, did not end the opposition. An ex-student informed David in mid-May that the "Old Agric. & Mech. College party" was still trying to prevent promulgation of the merger act by the Nicholls administration. But their efforts did not succeed. On May 19, 1877, another ex-student, in his capacity as secretary of state of Louisiana, finally announced promulgation of "An Act to unite the Louisiana State University . . . and the Agricultural and Mechanical College . . . into one and the same
Long before the act of merger received official sanction from the Nicholls administration, David began thinking about the men who might be appointed to serve on the Board of the new school. On January 13, 1877, he confided to Dr. Dupree that if Governor Nicholls asked his advice, he would not hesitate to suggest some "suitable names." Until then he did not "wish to play partisan."

But at the risk of "breaking his own rule" not to interfere, David urged Dupree to work for the appointment of Dr. Robert H. Ryland. Ryland was Master of the State Grange and a member of the Board of Control of the Agricultural and Mechanical College. For months he had fought David's attempts to consolidate the University and the Agricultural College. However, David reasoned, if Governor Nicholls made Ryland a supervisor, the Grangers might cease their

---

5David Boyd to E. W. Hilgard, May 1, 1877; David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, February 2, 1877; D. F. Boyd, Memorandum, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77; D. M. Brosnan to D. F. Boyd, February 6, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, Register of Correspondence, 1874-77; Majority and Minority Reports of the Committee on Charitable and Public Institutions, March 8, 1877, Louisiana House Journal, Extra Session, 1877, pp. 23-24, 41; New Orleans Democrat, June 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Newspapers, Box 17.
objections to the new school and "do it much good." David also wanted William Sanford of Rapides and Judge W. B. Egan of Shreveport appointed to the Board of Supervisors. Apparently acting on his own authority, he obtained Sanford's "consent" to serve as early as January, 1877. But Governor Nicholls did not announce his appointments until April 26, the last day of the session. David boasted that he compiled the list from which the governor made his selections. If so, he was very generous to New Orleans and the "old Agricultural College Party" in preparing that list. Besides Dr. Ryland, the final appointees included the secretary of the State Grange and the president of the New Orleans Mechanics Association. David expected even more concessions to be made when the Board met to organize the school. He wrote a friend that some of "the old profs. of both schools" would probably be named to the faculty of the new University. For himself he wanted and expected nothing. "I may have to stay here [Baton Rouge] till July, to close

---

6David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Dupree, January 13, 14, 27, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77. Ryland was not an easy man to conciliate. In 1877 he was a member of the legislature and part of the minority on the House Committee on Charitable and Public Institutions, which recommended repeal of the merger act. Louisiana House Journal, Extra Session, March 8, 1877, p. 24.
this session of the old school; but I am going away sure.
I shall never hold office in the new school."7

Before the Board of Supervisors of the new University could assemble, the Agricultural College Board, or a part of it, convened in New Orleans to plan a strategy of legal delay and obstruction. The group met in the office of Robert M. Lusher, state superintendent of public education. Lusher was in the peculiar circumstance of being a member, by law, of both the Agricultural College Board and that of the new University. So was Governor Nicholls, but he was not present at the meeting. Counting Lusher, whom the other four chose to preside, a bare quorum of five was present. The main item of business was the presentation by President J. L. Cross, of the Agricultural College, of a report which challenged the legality of the act merging the College and the University. Cross wanted the Board to seek an injunction against the new school's Board until the statute could be tested in the courts. Essentially, he disputed the accuracy of the language in section one of the merger law. It described, by location, the two schools to

7David Boyd to W. A. Seay, January 2/7, 1877; David Boyd to William Van Pelt, May 1, 1877; David Boyd to E. W. Hilgard, May 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
be united. There was, Cross maintained, no "State University in Alexandria, in the parish of Rapides; nor does there exist an Agricultural and Mechanical College in the Parish of St. Bernard." The State University was in Baton Rouge and the Agricultural College was still operating in New Orleans. Although it owned land in St. Bernard, for "want of funds" it had not moved to the new location. Cross maintained that "all other sections of the ... law depend upon the 1st section, and if that is defective, the whole law must be."  

Robert Lusher suggested that the Agricultural College Board ask the attorney general for an opinion before applying for an injunction, but the others apparently sided with Cross. David could not have been surprised. Fifteen months before, when the merger act was first passed by the Kellogg legislature, he had anticipated delaying tactics, specifically an injunction, by "the Old Agric. College Set." What he probably did not expect was the passivity with which the new University Board responded. The new Board met on July 2, 1877, in Baton Rouge. Beyond naming a committee to

---

8Report of J. L. Cross to the Board of Control of the Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College, June 5, 1877, reprinted in New Orleans Democrat, June 6, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 17.
confer with the Agricultural College Board about the transfer of its property, the supervisors did little of any consequence. They did offer David the presidency of the new school, but he declined "the high and honorable" position for "purely personal reasons." Then they adjourned to meet in New Orleans on July 31. David was despondent. He told his brother Tom that the injunction, if not quashed, might result in litigation which would drag on until November, 1877, or even January, 1878. In the meanwhile the new school, scheduled to open on October 5, would have no funds with which to operate. It would have to make do with the fees paid by the few boarding students because the merger act made tuition free to all. But worse than the shortage of money was the danger of losing too much time. If the Agricultural College failed to win its point in the District Court, it would probably appeal to the Supreme Court. By that time the legislature would be in session and the University's enemies might try to get the merger law repealed.9

David could not bear to stay in Baton Rouge, doing

9Ibid.; David Boyd to Wm. Van Pelt, March 12, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1875-76; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 2, 3, 1877; Tom Boyd to L. Bourgeois, July 14, 1877; Tom Boyd to Dr. J. L. DesLattes, July [2/], 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1876-80.
nothing, until the next Board meeting took place. He went to New Orleans on July 8, 1877, to spur Governor Nicholls and the other Board members into action. The governor, he told his brother, was "too slow;" he would not authorize the new University's agent to "take over" the Agricultural College property in St. Bernard parish, and no one on the Board seemed willing to act against the injunction unless specifically empowered by Governor Nicholls or the attorney general. In mid-July David went home for a brief visit. When he returned he found nothing changed. The injunction still went unchallenged, and Governor Nicholls still refused to convene the Board before July 31. David tried a new tack. He asked Nicholls to employ a lawyer to "follow the University's case." Nicholls agreed to discuss the idea with the attorney general. Later David made the same suggestion to the attorney general, who said he would "consult the governor" about it. Frustrated, David grumbled to a friendly Board member: "If I were officially connected with the school, I might say more, do more. But as it is, I must be careful how I even suggest, lest I be told politely to 'mind my own business.'"10

10Tom Boyd to L. Bourgeois, July 14, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas) Letterbooks, 1876-80; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, July
As the days passed, David grew increasingly worried. He feared the cautious University Board would refuse to open the school if its funds were still encumbered in October. There was no reason for such timidity. It would be easy, David thought, to find five or six young professors willing to work without pay until the legal "mess" was settled. Then, if the University lost the case, the Board would owe the professors nothing. But in David's opinion, the school would win easily in the courts. Apparently the Board did not agree. When it did meet on July 31, it spent two days in desultory discussion and adjourned without positive action. Only if the "injunction matter" were settled before October would the members reconvene to "organize" the University. Meanwhile, matters drifted, and David's alarm increased. He doubted that the legal questions would be resolved in time for the fall term. "And if it doesn't open in Oct. it will be closed till after the Legislature meets and then it will be hard to save the merger bill." David pleaded with various Board members to open the school, regardless, and to elect a faculty for it. But Governor

21, 1877, in Boyd (Thos. D.) Papers, Box 1, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University; David Boyd to A. A. Gunby, July 23, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
Nicholls remained adamant, and others on the Board took the same position.  

During August, 1877, David tried several new approaches to ensure an October opening. Careful research convinced him, he told Governor Nicholls, that none of the Agricultural College Board members bringing the injunction had a legal claim to his post. Either their appointments had expired or they had never been confirmed by the senate as required by law. When that argument left Nicholls unmoved, David approached Dr. Williams, the Board's vice-president. He begged Williams to call a Board meeting on his own authority. The governor, David argued, would not interfere, especially if Dr. Dupree instigated the Baton Rouge citizenry to "clamor" for action. But Dr. Williams did not succumb. Then David suggested that failure to open the school in October might result in its return to Rapides Parish, to which Williams replied that he opposed opening the school in October under any circumstances if funds were not "in hand." On this issue Williams felt more strongly than Nicholls. The governor did finally agree to call a

---

11David Boyd to A. A. Gunby, July 23, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, July 31, August 1, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1.
Board meeting before October if David could provide him with a list of two to four professors and a prospective president, all of whom would pledge themselves to work without pay. They must also promise to make no future claims against the state in case the injunction were not quashed. David thought he could secure the professors, but finding a president of any ability who would agree to such conditions might be considerably more difficult. However, he began searching at once. 12

By the end of August David was disillusioned. The governor, he found, spent very little time in his office. That was the "last place" anyone tried to find him. Nevertheless, David intended to "badger" the chief executive until he called a meeting of the Board. "Our school must open Oct. 5; or I'll annoy the Govr., and Board of Sprs. to death," he wrote his brother Tom. His tactics proved successful. Governor Nicholls finally scheduled a Board meeting for September 18, 1877, the day after a hearing on

12 David Boyd, "Status of Members of Board of Control, La. State Agric. & Mechl College," undated, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 4, 7, 8, 13, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, August 10, 16, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1876-80.
the injunction was to be held. David felt relieved. He now was sure the school would open as long as "our own" members of the Board stood firm and were not swayed by Dr. Ryland's "nonsense" or some "mistaken idea of courtesy to the Gov." But when the members assembled, David's supporters were greatly outnumbered. He was particularly hurt that the University's three alumni, provided for in the act of merger, failed to put in an appearance. The "Ryland group" attended en masse. Too late David realized his mistake in having Grangers named to the Board after defeating them in the legislature. They repaid his generosity by voting against a resolution to open the University. After twelve years of struggle, he wrote one of the errant alumni, it would break his heart to see all his work go for nothing.  

By the end of September the injunction against the University had been set aside, and its authors had decided not to appeal to a higher court. The governor hastened to

13David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 28, 30, September 3, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1.

14David Boyd to E. W. Sutherlin, September 19, 1877; David Boyd to T. L. Grimes, September 19, 1877; David Boyd to A. A. Gunby, September 19, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, September 19, 1877.
convene the Board in time for the scheduled opening, but
two meetings held during the first week of October failed
to produce a quorum. David, therefore, proceeded on his own
authority. He opened a "free school" at the University on
October 5, 1877. Two weeks later enough members of the
Board assembled to elect a president and appoint a faculty. David's twelve-year-old dream finally became a reality.15

Because he vowed never to "hold a post" in the new
University, David had to start looking for other employment
fairly soon after the merger act passed. As already
described he made serious efforts late in 1876 to find
property suitable for a boarding school which he hoped to
establish somewhere in Virginia. But those efforts had to
be abandoned when the disputed election of 1876 and the re-
sulting dual governments prevented promulgation of the
merger law until May, 1877. Meanwhile, several other possi-
bilities developed. Friends in New Orleans tried to inter-
est David in the city school superintendency, but he re-
fused to consider any job in Louisiana. A boarding school

15L. Bourgeois to Tom Boyd, October 17, 1877; David
Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 7, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.)
Papers, 1875-77, Box 1; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors,
October 1, 4, 17, 18, 1877.
in Virginia still seemed like the best idea. When someone wrote him that Monticello might be available, he contacted the owners in New York and Charlottesville. Their replies were not encouraging, but by June, 1877, he had other prospects. His friends in Maryland, Richard Venable and James Garnett, had found a suitable school property near Baltimore. And Greenwood, one of the Virginia sites located by his ex-student Richard Hancock in 1876, was also still available. Finally, in June, 1877, he was invited to apply for the presidency of East Tennessee University at Knoxville. To Thomas Jefferson Boyd, the Tennessee post seemed more attractive than all the others. He thought David would do his family and himself a grave "injustice" if he did not "lend a willing ear" to any offer from Knoxville.16

When the Tennessee Board of Trustees met in July, 1877, it failed to elect David president by a margin of two

16David Boyd to Swarbrick's, January 14, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77; A. H. Levy to David B Boyd, February 26, 1877; Geo. Carr to David Boyd, April 16, 1877; J. M. Garnett to David Boyd, June 4, 7, 1877; Dr. J. R. Page to David Boyd, June 5, 1877; R. J. Hancock to David Boyd, June 5, 17, 1877; R. M. Venable to David Boyd, June 25, 1877, Register of Correspondence, 1874-77, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks; T. J. Boyd to David Boyd, June 20, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
votes. Later he learned that his name was the only one presented against the incumbent in what proved to be an effort by conservative Board members to oust the University's entire staff. According to Knoxville newspapers, the faculty at East Tennessee was largely Republican and had been Unionist during the war. The Board wanted to replace them with more "acceptable" men. David was outraged. If he had known "all the facts" he would never have become involved. He was even angrier when Northern papers picked up the story and labeled it as one more example of a "concerted effort at the South" to displace Yankees and Unionists in favor of Confederates and ex-rebels. The papers mentioned David by name as the president of "the dying La. State University." If he could not succeed "there," they demanded, what good would he be in Tennessee?  

Ultimately David found out that his attacker was an ex-resident of Massachusetts residing in Knoxville. He intended to "demand satisfaction" from him until he learned

17 David Boyd to J. P. McAuley, July 22, 1877; David Boyd to John W. Paulette, August 2, 7, 1877; David Boyd to Col. John M. Fleming, August 11, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; David Boyd to Editor, Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican, August 20, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8. David saw the Springfield Republican editorial reprinted in the New York Times of August 3, 1877.
his identity, "an old man . . . and a Unitarian preacher."

Under the circumstances David had to defend himself with a pen. He sent a long explanatory letter to the papers denying any political motivations whatsoever in seeking the Tennessee position. Ironically, its publication offended David's friends on the conservative Board of Trustees. In acquitting himself of political motives, they complained, he had indicated them of the same charge. 18

Almost immediately following his failure to secure the position at East Tennessee, David authorized Richard Venable to negotiate for him with the owners of the Maryland boarding school property. If all went well, he could leave Louisiana about August 15 and open his school, called St. Clement's by its former operators, on September 21, 1877. At the time David made his decision he was still in New Orleans urging Governor Nicholls to act against the injunction. He informed his brother of his intentions, but asked him not to tell anyone outside the family except Dr. Williams and Dr. Dupree. The Maryland venture might not

18 David Boyd to Editor, Knoxville Tribune, August 21, 1877; David Boyd to John W. Paulett, August 28, 1877; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 4, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; David Boyd to Editor, Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican, August 20, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8.
materialize if Venable could not get satisfactory terms. Even if he did David could not take his family with him the first year. "It is so late now," he wrote Tom gloomily, "that I fear I shall have almost no boarders, and the chances are even that I shall fail in Md."19

David's pessimism must have increased a few days later when he learned from Venable that the Maryland boarding school was incorporated by the state. Consequently, it operated under a board of trustees and with various restrictions imposed by its charter. For example, the charter would prevent him from changing the school's name. As for a board of trustees, David informed the owner's agent, "I will not have any Board of Trustees, even nominally over my little school." He hoped that "these little points" of difference could be resolved, but his brother was less sanguine. Tom advised him to abandon the entire project. If David left his family in Baton Rouge, they would be miserable and unhappy. Only "extraordinary success" in Maryland could prevent them from suffering and that seemed highly unlikely. The entire enterprise, Tom wrote his brother, was "a very risky undertaking." Unlike David, he saw no reason  

19David Boyd to Tom Boyd, July 19, 20, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1.
to keep an agreement made when one party was not in
possession of "all the facts."20

David did not take Tom's advice. By mid-August he
was still in New Orleans and still planning to go to Mary­
land as soon as possible. However, the delay in the injunc­
tion case and the unwillingness of the Board to organize the
new school without money in hand might keep him in Louisiana
for some time. To meet his Maryland commitment, therefore,
he would need an assistant. Venable, David's agent in Mary­
land, suggested a Dr. Garretson who had taught at St.
Clement's the previous year. Otherwise, Venable warned,
Garretson might open a competing school in the same vicinity.
But David refused Venable's advice also. And he resisted
Venable's and his brother Tom's suggestions that he "cul­
tivate the community" and open his school to day students.
"I expect to see and know but little of Elicott City /the
location of the school/ and its people . . . The less I see
and have to do with the people round about, the better I
will like it." As for taking day students, "I would rather
jump into Chesapeake Bay with a ton weight about my neck."

20 David Boyd to James MacKuben, agent for St.
Clement's School, July 28, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letter­
books, 1877-78; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, July 31, August 1,
1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1876-78.
David did not expect any "patronage" from Maryland; instead he intended to bring a "few boys from the South."\textsuperscript{21}

David's attitude must have exasperated his friends in Maryland. On August 24, 1877, Venable informed him that by not hiring Garretson and by refusing to admit "day scholars," he had seriously jeopardized his school's chances for success. His delay in leaving Louisiana was also a mistake. Venable urged David to come to Maryland at once; sending an "assistant" would not do. David wrote a rather brusque reply. The next day he sent a more conciliatory letter. After a detailed explanation of his struggles with the Agricultural College, the injunction, and the hostility in the Board of Supervisors, he declared:

My whole soul is wrapped up in the salvation of the school. Never since the war has it stopped a moment; and for it now to stop (after our own people get in power) wd be an outrageous shame. And it shall not be if I can help it. All this labor is of course self-imposed; but when you bear in mind what I have passed thro'-how much I have suffered in body, mind and soul, to save the school from destruction of the

\textsuperscript{21}David Boyd to Thomas Boyd, August 22, 23, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 21, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; Thomas Boyd to David Boyd, August 22, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1876-80; R. M. Venable to David Boyd, July 21, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12.
Radicals, I can't stand idly by and see it destroyed by the apathy of our own people. 22

Finally, because he would not leave Louisiana himself, David sent Tom Boyd to Maryland to "open" his school. He did not expect any students to appear, but he insisted that the commitment made in his advertising circular, to open a school on September 21, be honored to the letter. If no one tried to enroll, Tom was free to make whatever arrangements he thought best with the owners of St. Clement's. After a brief investigation Tom was sure that no students would appear, and even if they did it would be too costly to prepare the school to receive them. Nor could he possibly sublet the building to some other schoolmaster. Someone wanted to rent it earlier but David's prior lease forced him to make other arrangements. David, therefore, owed the owners of St. Clement's for a year's rent amounting to $1,000.

After visiting Richard Venable, Tom went to stay with relatives in Alexandria, Virginia. There he waited to hear from David about events in Louisiana, specifically,

22R. M. Venable to David Boyd, August 24, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12; David Boyd to R. M. Venable, August 27, 28, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
the outcome of the scheduled hearing to dispose of the injunction. But days passed and no letter from David ever came. A friend in New Orleans sent him some newspapers containing information about the injunction, and David finally wrote to him on November 1, 1877. By that time the new University had begun operation. David sent his letter to Wytheville where he "assumed" Tom went after disposing of his affairs in Maryland. He excused himself weakly for failing to keep his brother informed; then he declared:

I have been, and am now, almost literally crazy. I am in money troubles till I can have no peace at all. Since you left, I have not had a dollar from the old school or the new . . . I am now in worse fix than I have ever been in my life, and feel meaner this night than I ever did before in all my life. A little longer . . . and no matter what position I may hold, my own self-respect will be gone, and everybody else's respect for me too.23

David's despair and diminishing self-respect were not surprising considering his mounting debts and his inability to provide adequately for his growing family. Nor did his failure to win appointment at East Tennessee

23 Tom Boyd Diary, September 9, 1877; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 11, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, September 18, October 9, 23, 1877, ibid., Alpha File, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 1, 1877; David Boyd to Dr. J. W. Williams, November 9, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks), 1877-78.
University do anything to restore his self-confidence. If anything, it seems to have reinforced the sense of inadequacy which tormented him ever since the collapse of his "Egypt venture" in 1875. Therefore, when the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to make him president of the new university early in July, 1877, David's flagging spirits must have revived somewhat. But the offer presented him with another problem. For months he had insisted publicly and privately that he would "hold no post" in the merged school. Under the circumstances he could hardly accept the position in spite of the pain it cost him to refuse.\(^2\)

Soon there were indications that David might reconsider this decision. On August 8, 1877, he wrote his father that he did not know if he could leave for Maryland by September 1. The "pressure" on him to remain in Louisiana was very great. "But I must go, and wd only stay temporarily if I shd really find that my presence was needed."

\(^2\) Whether Tom returned to Baton Rouge in 1877 or not, David wanted his brother to visit Colonel Lockett, then teaching at the Knoxville school. Lockett, he was sure, would explain the "real" reason for the Khedive's rejection of his services two years before. And while in Knoxville Tom could interview David's friends about his failure at the University. They could tell Tom "exactly how I was treated there last July." David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 3, 1877.
Even earlier, in July, he wrote an ex-colleague that some of his "best friends are almost abusing me for leaving La. at such a juncture."25 The end of August approached, and David still had not found anyone willing to accept the presidency while the salary remained uncertain. For weeks he tried vainly to convince W. LeRoy Broun of Vanderbilt to accept the job, but Broun would not agree as long as the injunction remained alive. Besides, he considered David the "only man for the job." However, David was reluctant to offer his services to Governor Nicholls for fear his motives would be "misunderstood." It "would not look well," he explained to Professor Broun, for the architect of the new school to become its "beneficiary." Finally, because he thought it was the only way to get Governor Nicholls to convene the Board and organize the school, David overcame his personal misgivings and offered to serve as "acting president" until the Board could secure a permanent chief.

---

25 Some of David's "best friends" also happened to be the University's largest creditors. Sometime in June, 1877, they petitioned him not to refuse the presidency. If he did the school might go out of existence and they would lost heavily. They begged him not to leave until the new school was running "soundly," its destiny "assured," and their claims secure. Petition to D. F. Boyd, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1873-90, Box 2.
Governor Nicholls did not accept David's offer when he made it the first time. A month later David tried again, but this time he approached the governor through various members of the Board. After talking with General Joseph Brent in New Orleans, he wrote to Vice-President J. M. Williams in Baton Rouge. "Modesty" compelled him, David told Williams, to get help in making the governor and some others on the Board aware that he could be persuaded to accept the University presidency. "For the good of the school and the state," he would set aside his own convictions if "responsible men" like Brent, Williams, and others, in and out of the Board, thought it his "duty" to serve the school. A sense of duty also compelled him to inform Dr. Ryland, his principle antagonist on the Board, of his "availability" for the post. "Very reasonably--since your ideas and mine wd seem to differ materially as to the proper manner of organizing and conducting our proposed new school, you wd ... prefer another as President," David

---

commented to Ryland. However, the Board might yet find some one else to whom it would be willing to "entrust" the institution. David hoped so. "It wd only be with great disappointment and great violence to my personal feelings that I cld find myself actually the President ... Such during the long struggle to unite the two schools, was never my intention."²⁷

As already described, the Board met twice during the first week of October, 1877, but could not muster a quorum. Finally, on October 17, eight members assembled in New Orleans to organize the University. None of Dr. Ryland's "faction" appeared, and the others voted unanimously to elect David president. Almost casually he announced the news to his wife:

Nothing of consequence was done, besides the election of a President ... I was unanimously elected again, and I have thought it best to accept the position. It is my duty to notify you of this as soon as possible. It means that we are all to stay in La.--in Baton Rouge, maybe forever!²⁸

²⁷David Boyd to General Joseph Brent, September 20, 1877; David Boyd to Dr. J. M. Williams, September 21, 1877; David Boyd to Dr. R. H. Ryland, September 21, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.

²⁸Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 1, 4, 17, 1877; David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, October 17, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
David professed to regret the necessity of
remaining in Baton Rouge, especially for the sake of his
wife and children. Perhaps to lessen her disappointment,
he authorized Ettie to begin looking for a house to rent
somewhere near the University grounds. But they could not
occupy it until the following year. His salary, he told
Ettie, was $4,500 and "quarters." Then he asked her to do
something which absence from Baton Rouge prevented him from
doing himself:

Tomorrow is the anniversary of the death of poor
little Reb. Every year since, I have visited his
grave April 29 [his birthday] and Oct. 18th, and put
cedars and flowers on his grave--and also on poor
Mr. Robinson's. Do you please represent me in that
sad, but sacred duty to our child and to my old
friend tomorrow!"29

When David finally wrote to Tom in Virginia about
his election to the presidency, he justified himself for
having decided to stay in Louisiana. The new school, he

29David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, October 17, 1877, in
Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78. This letter repre-
sents one of very few in the entire Boyd Collection between
David and his wife. It may be that the family removed per-
sonal and family letters before depositing them in the
Archives. But it may also be due to David's failure to
write his wife many letters. On July 21, 1877, he remarked
as an afterthought in a letter to his brother, "I hardly
have time to write to Ettie. Indeed, it is not necessary.
Tell her that I must go to Md. about August 15, to Sept. 1,
and that I fear she must stay behind." David Boyd to Tom
Boyd, July 21, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77,
explained, might never have been organized if he had not "consented" to take the presidency. "If, after . . . it gets under head-way again, I can quit & go to Maryland, I wd much prefer it." Then he told Tom whom the Board had appointed to the faculty. None of the young men, all ex-cadets, who offered to serve the new school without pay had been elected to a professorship. David did not even present the name of one of them for consideration. "I am afraid some of the Alumni are a little sore," he wrote Tom. But it would not have "looked well" to bring up the names since one "University Man," David himself, had already been chosen.30

Besides David, the faculty appointed by the Board at its October 17, 1877, meeting consisted of J. W. Nicholson of Claiborne parish, W. C. Wilde of the old Agricultural College staff, and Dr. Joseph Jones, a New Orleans physician. Nicholson was a self-taught mathematician who in 1877 was running an academy in Claiborne parish. Letters of recommendation which David asked him to submit

Box 1.

30David Boyd to Thomas Boyd, October 25, 1877; L. Bourgeois to Thomas Boyd, October 24, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1.
described him as a very successful teacher of eleven years standing, a good "moral preceptor," and a "mathematical genius" without "eccentricities" and "idiosyncrasies."

Nicholson agreed to come to Baton Rouge anytime, but he hoped the University would not require his services until January, 1878 so that he could conclude his affairs in north Louisiana. Wilde, named professor of ancient and modern languages, was chosen to appease the partisans of the old Agricultural College, and Dr. Jones, another Orleanian, received the chemistry professorship because of his reputation as an expert in soil analysis and cotton culture. David doubted that Jones would accept. If he did not, David hoped to secure another chemist, R. S. McCulloch of Washington and Lee University. By September 19, 1877, he had already offered McCulloch the position. Admitting that he held "no formal job" in the University, David assured McCulloch that he would be acceptable to the Board. "You have only to signify your willingness to come, say at a salary of $3,000 with perhaps quarters for your family."

31 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 18, 1877; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 25, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1; J. W. Nicholson to David Boyd, October 14, 27, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.)
McCulloch was not the only man to whom David offered a job on his own authority. On September 23, 1877, before he was employed himself, he asked Colonel S. H. Lockett, then on his way home from Egypt, to "come back" to Louisiana. At the time Lockett already had a job at East Tennessee University as professor of mathematics. He had been appointed when the conservative Board purged the staff of Republicans during the previous summer. On October 31 David wrote Lockett again. Describing the professorships created by the Board at its October 17 meeting, David explained that he was president and professor of engineering "nominally." But if Lockett accepted, David remarked, he could "guess who will really get that post." He also told Lockett that he could probably get a salary of $3,000 a year and "quarters" in Louisiana. Lockett answered a few days later. After a long explanation of his disenchantment with Egypt and Egyptians, he remarked that David was lucky not to have gone there. "You would have tried to conquer it and cleanse it as you have the Augean stable of Louisiana." Then he asked David to "let him alone." He found

Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; David Boyd to R. M. McCulloch, September 19, 1877; David Boyd to Joseph Jones, M.D., October 26, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
Knoxville charming and had no wish to leave it for Baton Rouge. "I do not like Louisiana. It is a little too much like Egypt in climate and population." 32

It is just as well that Lockett did not accept David's unauthorized offer. If he had, it might have caused David some embarrassment with the Board of Supervisors.

Some time in late October, 1877, Vice-President Williams raised a question about the extent of the Executive Committee's authority to act in the periods between regular Board meetings. David, who with Dr. Williams and General Joseph Brent composed that committee, was sure it included hiring professors. But the minutes of the October 17 Board meeting, which created the Executive Committee, revealed no such grant of power. When Dr. Williams raised the question, Professor McCulloch of Washington and Lee had not yet responded to David's "unofficial" job offer, and David was planning to approach someone else. However, after receiving Williams's letter, he agreed not to do anything "to obligate the Bd." until McCulloch replied or he received authorization.

32 David Boyd to Col. S. H. Lockett, September 23, October 31, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, November 4, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.
from the Board. 33

Besides David, only one of the professors elected at the October 17, 1877, organization meeting reached Baton Rouge before November. W. C. Wilde left New Orleans with David in late October to begin his duties as professor of ancient and modern languages at the University. A graduate of the old University, Louis Bourgeois, was already there conducting classes for the students who arrived on opening day. But other than room and board he received no remuneration for his services. Sometime during November, J. W. Nichollson arrived in Baton Rouge from north Louisiana. David had written Nicholson urging him to come as soon as possible so that the "old A & M College party and the Grangers" would not accuse the University of violating the merger law. He was afraid they might demand its repeal if the school were not fulfilling its commitments when the legislature met in January, 1878. Tom Boyd joined David, Wilde, Bourgeois, and Nicholson on November 30. Like Bourgeois, he received no salary from the Board. But for "reasons which he could communicate to no one," he decided to return from Virginia when David offered to send him the

33 David Boyd to Dr. J. M. Williams, November 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
fare. The "reasons" were Tom's infatuation with Miss Annie Fuqua of Baton Rouge and his fear that Bourgeois might be courting her in his absence.34

As 1877 drew to a close, only the chair of "General and Agricultural Chemistry" remained unfilled. But its vacancy caused David particular anxiety. After his initial, and unauthorized, offer of it to R. S. McCulloch in September, 1877, David made an official proposal to him on November 2. He told McCulloch that his salary would be $3,000 and "quarters." As president and professor of civil engineering, David received $3,500 and Wilde and Nicholson each got $2,000. McCulloch accepted conditionally on November 8, 1877, but he wanted to delay his arrival in Baton Rouge until the session of 1878 because he was delivering a series of lectures at Washington and Lee and did not know if he could be released before then. In addition, he planned to attend an exposition in Paris in the summer of 1878. If the Board of Supervisors agreed to those conditions, he would be happy to come to Baton Rouge. David answered that

34 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 25, 1877, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1875-77, Box 1; David Boyd to J. W. Nicholson, November 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; Tom Boyd Diary, August 26, 1878.
the University wanted him by January 1, 1873, "if at all possible." He explained that one reason why the University won the Agricultural College was due to its promise to provide a good agricultural program for Louisiana youth. It could hardly keep the farmers and planters "happy" if it did not have a professor of agriculture and chemistry "on the ground." The Grangers, he noted, were already "howling" at the University in their well-circulated magazine. Professor McCulloch capitulated. On December 12, 1877, he agreed to be in Baton Rouge by January 1 unless some "unforeseen event" arose. Again he reminded David of his plans to go to the Paris exposition in the summer of 1878. He did not expect the state to underwrite his expenses. All he wanted from Governor Nicholls was an "honorary commission" as the official representative of Louisiana.

Neither did he expect any support from the Sugar Planters' Association unless he devoted himself entirely to their interests while in Paris. They could wait to discuss any other "problems" until he reached Baton Rouge.35

35 David Boyd to R. S. McCulloch, November 2, December 5, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, November 8, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, December 12, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
The hostility of the Grangers and the "Old Agric. College Party" which David reported in his urgent letters to Professors Nicholson and McCulloch was also present in the Board of Supervisors. As early as November 1, 1877, David, then in New Orleans sorting and receiving the Agricultural College property, remarked to his brother Tom:

> There is a hard and bitter feeling in our Bd. of Supervisors; and the upshot of it may be that we must put Ryland and Co. out—even if we must defeat their nomination before the Senate. And I look for the fight to begin in the State Grange, which meets here [New Orleans] in Dec. . . . Nicholson, our Math professor is a Granger; and I expect we shall make things lively for Ettie's Baptist friend Ryland . . . Ryland and Harris [also on the old Agricultural College Board] both stayed away from our last [Board] meeting here to prevent a quorum.³⁶

David's allusion to "Ettie's Baptist friend Ryland" probably referred to Ryland's visit in the Boyd household two years before. In 1875 the Grange Convention met in Baton Rouge, and David invited Dr. Ryland to stay at the Asylum building while the convention was in session. Ettie Boyd was an ardent Baptist and apparently found Dr. Ryland a very compatible house guest. But whatever cordiality David

³⁶David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 1, 1877, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78. Apparently not all Grange leaders agreed with Ryland. David planned to attend the December Grange convention and one of its leaders, Daniel Dennett, wanted him to make an address. "He [Dennett] has no use for Ryland," David told Tom.
may have felt for Ryland in 1875 had certainly vanished by November, 1877. In one of his rare letters to Ettie from New Orleans he declared bitterly:

I am now fighting a desperate game—one in which we have very little to gain, much to lose! Your good Baptist brother Ryland is giving me all the trouble he can. He is a mean man—a hypocrite and a coward too, I think—his religion is all on the surface; under the skin is much of "human nature" of the worst type! And he—the sneaking dog he is—is poisoning others toward me—including perhaps the Govr. 37

The Board of Supervisors of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College submitted its first formal Report in February, 1878. It consisted of several parts. The first section, written by Secretary of the Board, W. G. Goodale of Baton Rouge, was a broad statement of the Board's educational philosophy and an explanation of the letter and spirit of the merger law.

37 David's letter was in reply to one from his wife in which she apparently complained about her circumstances and wondered when he would return to Baton Rouge. David answered that he had troubles too; "a great deal before I ever knew you, or even came to La.---much since." It hurt for her, in the midst of all of his struggles, to say that "your heart is not in my work! If so, your acts will show it soon enough! Spare me for the time your (such) words." Then he explained how he had been spending his time in New Orleans and promised to return to the University by the end of the week. "My love to you all---to you especially. I love you, and respect you much more than you ever thought I do (or did). Yours ever, D. F. Boyd." David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, November 15, 1877, ibid.
David's Report to the Board of Supervisors came next, and a series of appendices relative to "Industrial" and "Technical" education in Europe and America completed the document. Noting how recently the merger had taken place, David remarked that he would report not on what had been done, but on what was planned. He reminded the Board that students were present and classes in session before the Board met to appoint a president and staff. "In a word, the Institution opened itself--began of itself! And those of us afterwards entrusted with its care, have been trying hard ever since to catch up with our work."38

Then David offered a series of comments and recommendations. He urged the legislature to either enforce or repeal the beneficiary law. Personally, David supported the law, but the rest of the Board apparently did not. Next, he noted that General Sherman was doing everything possible to secure an army officer for the University. In the meanwhile, Tom Boyd taught infantry tactics and conducted a daily drill although the Board paid him nothing for his services. David also reported that the University, through Professor McCulloch, was in contact with the

38Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1877, p. 37.
Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association concerning ways in which they might work together for the good of the state. The State Grange, at its December, 1877, convention also manifested good will by passing a resolution of good wishes to the University. In return, David offered office space on the campus to the Granger secretary who accepted with thanks. To provide for an expected increase in enrollment, David asked the Board to hire more professors. To pay for them, he declared, all "legal obstacles" to the use of the Seminary (old University) fund would have to be removed. In addition, he advised the Board to ask the legislature to restore the forty per cent loss suffered by the Agricultural fund when it surrendered its old bonds for new securities in accordance with the Funding Act of 1874. Another proposal urged that steps be taken to remove the deaf-mute students from the Asylum building. Still others asked for the creation of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish chaplaincies and the acquisition of new volumes for the library.

"The library of any institution of learning," David declared, "is its main arm--more important even than its faculty; and too much expense can hardly be bestowed on it."

David thought the Board should beg the legislature
to relieve the creditors of the old Louisiana State University, and he advised them to consider disposing of University property owned, but not used, in Rapides and St. Bernard parishes. Finally, David suggested a little empire building. The "wisest citizens," he claimed, had thought for a long time that it would be good policy "to unite under one charter" the University of Louisiana at New Orleans and the school at Baton Rouge. Each, without the other, was "but a fragment of a University." The New Orleans school in reality was composed of only a Law and Medical school, while Baton Rouge had only an Academic department. Why not amend the constitution to effect a union? "Let us try and rid Louisiana of her present anomalous condition as to higher education--with two universities, yet with none!" The law and medical "departments" could remain in New Orleans and the "Literary and Scientific" departments would operate in Baton Rouge. All would be under one charter, managed by a "common corporation," and the faculties of each kept entirely separate and distinct. But nothing in the law should preclude the establishment of preparatory departments in law and medicine at Baton Rouge. There was even a good model for Louisiana to follow: "We wish to establish here, . . . just such a preparatory school, or feeder, for the
During the next two years several of David's proposals were acted upon by the Board of Supervisors and the legislature. The suggestion to incorporate the University of Louisiana will be discussed later. Of the others, those involving increased expenditures generally failed to be enacted. For example, the Board did increase the faculty from four to thirteen between 1877 and 1879. But it was done by cutting salaries or employing "assistant" professors, "instructors," or even advanced cadets at very minimal figures. Even so, David had to persuade the Board by offering to accept a reduced salary and, in one instance at least, to pay part of the salary of one of the men employed. The library and other facilities of the University were not improved to any degree before 1880, nor were chaplains employed by the University. The beneficiary law

39Ibid., 37-54.

40Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 15, 1878, October 18, 1879, February 13, 1880; (Baton Rouge) Louisiana Capitolian, October 18, 1879; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 309-11; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 2, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
was neither repealed nor implemented, and the Board did not ask the legislature to relieve the creditors of the old University. Instead, it resolved formally that it was not the legal successor of the old Board; hence it could not be held accountable for its debts. David disagreed, but as a member of the new University Board, he thought it improper to differ publicly with his colleagues. He simply abstained from voting on the resolution after expressing his dissent in a Board meeting.\(^{41}\)

Other proposals made by David in his \textit{Report} for 1877 were carried out. The Board did appeal for the restoration of the forty per cent loss the University sustained when the Agricultural and Mechanical College Fund bonds were funded under the law of 1874. It also took action to free the old University or Seminary Endowment fund from a legal snarl resulting from the old Board's refusal to present its bonds for scaling down in 1874. As a result, no annuity had been paid on the Seminary fund since that year.\(^{42}\)

\(^{41}\)Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, May 9, 1879; Fleming, \textit{Louisiana State University}, 312-13, 318-20, 428-29.

\(^{42}\)Report of the Board of Supervisors for 1877, p. 7-8; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, May 9, 1879.
Finally, the Board endorsed David's suggestion to ask the legislature for control of the entire Asylum building. David drew up a resolution to that effect himself and found a friend to present it to the legislature in 1878. The immediate result was a breach with John Preston, Superintendent of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum. As finally presented the resolution did not provide for an appropriation to cover moving costs for the Asylum inmates. Preston accused David of bad faith and authorized the bearer of his accusatory note to "act for me" when he delivered it to David. In reply, David sent Preston a characteristically underlined, detailed and tortuous explanation. It must have satisfied Preston. At least he withdrew his first letter and welcomed the "complete restoration of our formal relations." 43

The Preston imbroglio was not the only affair of honor to engage David's attention in the spring of 1878. At the Board meeting in January, 1878, E. H. Farrar of Orleans,

43 John Preston to David Boyd, March 16, 1878; David Boyd to Major John Preston, March 16, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; John Preston to David Boyd, March 17, 1878, ibid., Box 10. David's letter was sent only after he put it through several drafts. The one Preston received was considerably more conciliatory than some of the drafts.
a Ryland partisan, introduced a resolution, endorsed by the Board, requiring the president of the faculty to prepare a report of the name, residence, age and coursework of each student plus the textbooks "actually used" in each course. The report was to be submitted at the next regular meeting, April 1, 1878. David's sense of "duty" compelled him to make the report, but he thought the request for a list of the textbooks was "improper" and "extraordinary." "A professor shd be treated with at least as much consideration as a common mechanic: he shd be allowed to pick his own tools!" David sent a sealed envelope to W. H. Goodale, secretary of the Board. In a covering letter he noted that the sealed letter was dated April 1, 1878. He was sending it to Goodale on March 30, before he could possibly know which Board members would be present the next day. He did not care who came or stayed away, but he did not want anyone to say later that the contents of the sealed letter were in any way influenced by the "kind of quorum" which assembled. Then he asked Goodale not to open the sealed letter until after his official reply (report) to the

---

44 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, January 18, 1878; David Boyd to Professor J. W. Nicholson, March 28, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
Farrar resolution had been received by the Board. If no quorum appeared, Goodale was directed to send David's letter, unread, to Governor Nicholls. The sealed envelope contained David's resignation and an explanation for it. The Farrar resolution, with which he had complied with feelings of "humiliation and shame," he considered improper.

"It wd seem, if the order was meant in good part—for the public good—and I can presume nothing else—that the professors are incapable of selecting their textbooks! In short, the resolution means a want of confidence. My duty, then is plain; and my resignation is in your hands."  

In the next two days David wrote more letters. One, addressed to E. H. Farrar, regretted that no quorum assembled for the Board meeting on April 1. David had done his "official duty" by turning in the required report.

I must now do my duty to myself; and I hereby charge you as the author of the resolution, to have acted with no proper or worthy motives, but with the deliberate intent to injure this institution and to cast reflections upon my colleagues and myself professionally.

He accused Farrar of an action "unbecoming" a supervisor and a gentleman. His letter would be presented by his

---

45David Boyd to W. L. Goodale, March 30, 1878; David Boyd to the President and Members of the Board of Supervisors, April 1, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
nephew, George Stafford, who "is fully authorized to act for me." 46 David wrote a covering letter to George Stafford. After explaining the circumstances of the Farrar resolution, he gave Stafford his interpretation of its intent and noted that he had resigned. "I take it for granted," he concluded, "that this [David's letter] will lead to serious consequences with Mr. Farrar. I am ready for it." The next day, April 2, 1878, David wrote another letter to his friend W. A. Freret asking him to go with Stafford when he called on Farrar. "I wish to be a man of peace," he told Freret, "as any poor man with a wife and four children ought to be; but I cannot permit Mr. Farrar . . . to willfully and meanly try to injure me personally." 47

Two weeks passed before David heard from Stafford. His nephew urged him to reconsider; he had not delivered the note to Farrar and if David insisted on pursuing the matter, Stafford wanted him to come to New Orleans so that the letter could be "re-worded." But he thought David

46 David Boyd to E. H. Farrar, April 1, 1878, ibid.

47 David Boyd to George Stafford, April 1, 1878; David Boyd to W. A. Freret, April 2, 1878, ibid.
should drop the whole matter. Farrar's act was official, he pointed out. In no way must David appear to be avoiding an "official" investigation into his "official" career. David must have been convinced. He did go to New Orleans, but he sent no challenge to Farrar. The two men did not meet again until August, when the Board convened in special session.48

Meanwhile, David's resignation was in the hands of Governor Nicholls. Presented to the Board on April 1, 1878, it could not be acted upon because a quorum had not assembled. On July 4 it came up again and was referred to a three-man committee. After a recess during which the committee conferred with the president and faculty, another letter from David was submitted to the Board. In it David claimed that he "never intended" to question the Board's right to make any inquiry concerning the University "which it thought proper." Nor did he think the Board intended to reflect on him personally in the Farrar resolution. He only feared that was what the public and the professors might conclude. But the committee had convinced him that he

48George W. Stafford to D. F. Boyd, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; David Boyd to George W. Stafford, telegram, April 12, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
"labored under a misapprehension." Therefore he agreed to the committee's request that he withdraw his resignation. Ironically, a resolution introduced the same day played a large part in forcing David out of the presidency almost exactly two years later. On July 5, 1878, Dr. J. A. Taylor moved that the Secretary of War be requested to assign Lieutenant M. F. Jamar to the University as professor of military tactics. David's campaign to block the appointment and later to have Jamar removed contributed to his own removal by the Board on July 2, 1880.49

Besides late organization, factionalism in the Board, lack of funds, and two narrowly averted duels, David had to deal with a yellow fever epidemic in the merged University's first year of operation. By August, 1878, yellow fever reached Baton Rouge from New Orleans although local physicians and the Board of Health did not want to admit its presence. In his diary entry for August 29, 1878, Tom Boyd noted the existence of over eighty cases in the town "and only 5 deaths so far." The fever, he thought, came to Baton Rouge earlier that month when New Orleans delegates arrived

49Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 1, July 4, 5, 1878, July 2, 1880. The details of David's struggle with Jamar will be discussed at length below.
to attend the state Democratic convention. To combat the disease, the town ordered a general "disinfection." David had the University buildings and grounds "thoroughly dosed with ... carbolic acid and quick lime." But by September 4 twelve persons were dead, and the number of stricken persons climbed to somewhere between 150 and 300.\(^{50}\)

In 1878 the cause and manner of transmission of yellow fever were still subjects of heated debate in medical circles. Tom Boyd's diary reflects one commonly-held theory: that the disease generated in filth. In his words:

The disease began near the Oil Mills in the extreme northern part of town. The Board of Health overlooked that part of town when disinfecting. It is said 2 bbls of water had been standing for 6 mos. They were thrown into a ditch one day last wk and the 5 workmen who emptied them all took ill at once. Stench unbearable. Whole factory was filthy as was yard of Dr. Curry which adjoined it.

Thence fever spread to the blind asylum nearby, thence south along river. As yet few cases south of Boulevard ... Few precautions taken to prevent spread of disease. People meet as usual in market place, on corners. Go to funerals of Y. F. victims. Inmates of blind asylum where fever is raging walk the streets in groups of 2 or three.\(^ {51}\)

On September 4 an ex-professor then visiting the Boyds developed a fever which Dr. Dupree labeled "suspicious"
He was treated with calomel and quinine and after three days the fever disappeared. His rapid recovery makes the diagnosis seem questionable, but there was no doubt about yellow fever's presence in the Asylum building later that month. On September 16, 1878, Mrs. Jonathan Preston, the wife of the superintendent of the Asylum, developed chills and fever. The next day she was dead. Dr. Dupree also became ill but survived. David's death was reported, but like Mark Twain's, proved to be grossly exaggerated. Other citizens were not so fortunate. Even the city fathers, concerned to preserve the town's "image," admitted to 139 deaths and 2,274 cases of fever by mid-October, 1878. Many persons escaped the fever by leaving Baton Rouge. But flight became more difficult when news of the dead and dying reached potential refugee centers. On October 25, 1878, Superintendent Preston decided to leave Baton Rouge to protect his four small children. With Tom Boyd and two other adults, the Prestons went by covered wagon from Baton Rouge to Amite City. From there they traveled to Louisville, Kentucky, by train. It was necessary, however, to "hide the fact that they came from Baton Rouge."  

52Ibid., September 4, 16, 22, October 3, 5, 21, 25, 1878, September 14, 1879. A detailed description of the
Because of the epidemic the Board of Supervisors did not meet in October, 1878, and classes did not resume until December. Nevertheless, enrollment for the year 1878-79 increased over that of the previous session. Conditions were certainly normal by late February, 1879, when General Sherman, two of his daughters, and a military aide paid a visit to the University. Although he was a "bitter enemy in war," General Sherman had been a "good friend in peace," one of the local papers remarked. It was, therefore, a pleasure to welcome him. Sherman reviewed the cadet corps, made an address and visited with several of the local dignitaries invited by David to meet the renowned soldier. One guest described him as "plain and unostentatious . . . jovial and frank." The general, noted the guest, favored turning over to the University the United epidemic of 1878 and all of Louisiana's bouts with yellow fever may be found in Jo Ann Carrigan, "Yellow Fever in Louisiana" (Ph. D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1961). W. H. Goodale to David Boyd, November 16, 1878, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8. Goodale was in Greenwell Springs, outside of Baton Rouge, when he heard of David's death and the details of his alleged funeral. When he found the report of his "much esteemed" friend's death to be untrue, he thanked God that "the cause of education in La. has not received this blow." As late as November 16, 1878, the authorities still refused Goodale permission to reenter Baton Rouge.
States barracks property at Baton Rouge. 53

The idea of acquiring the United States barracks as a home for the University was at least nine years old in 1879. David corresponded with General Sherman about it soon after the fire which forced the University to leave Rapides. But at that time Sherman opposed giving up the barracks on the ground that troops had to be accessible if "necessity" required it in Texas, Arkansas, Alabama, and Florida. By 1879, he had changed his mind. He endorsed David's request for the property, pointing out that the school must promise to keep it in repair and surrender it on demand if the government ever needed it again. But Congress would have to make the cession. The War Department could not dispose of any property without Congressional enactment. The qualification seems to have caused David to lose interest. On April 23, 1879, he wrote Sherman that the Asylum building was "better suited to their purposes" than the barracks would be. Not until 1886 did the University finally occupy the barracks property. By that time United States troops had not used it for several years. 54

53 Fleming, Louisiana State University, 312; Louisiana Capitollian, February 15, March 1, 1879.

54 W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, April 24, 1870, in
As the end of the session approached in 1879, the new University seemed to be functioning well under its two-year-old charter. "Hundreds of people" witnessed the graduation exercises according to a local paper. Especially well received were the closing remarks of the "learned and gifted President." In the editor's words:

The Colonel by his indomitable will has carried the University successfully through many reverses that would have discouraged a man of less energy and ability. But he finally surmounted all obstacles and has about completed the . . . structure of one of the most complete educational institutions in the great Southwest. It is the duty of our people to afford him all the aid and encouragement in their power . . .

Typescript of Sherman-Boyd Correspondence; Louisiana Capitolian, March 15, 1879; W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, April 5, April 29, 1879, in Boyd-Sherman Letters; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 442.

55 Louisiana Capitolian, July 12, 1879.
CHAPTER X

LOSING A WAR

The man who praised David so extravagantly after the July, 1879, graduation was Leon Jastremski, ex-Confederate captain, newspaper editor, mayor of Baton Rouge, and a growing influence in the state Democratic party. His support for David's administration, so firm in 1879, turned to active opposition by the following year when, as vice-president of a reorganized Board of Supervisors, he led the drive to oust David from the University presidency. Before discussing the events which led Jastremski to change his mind, it would be helpful to outline the political developments which put the editor in a position to act against David.

Louisiana was "redeemed" in April, 1877, when Francis T. Nicholls and Louis A. Wiltz became the undisputed governor and lieutenant governor following the Federal government's decision to withdraw support from their Republican opponents. Nicholls was a typical Redeemer. A graduate of
West Point and a lawyer, he served as a general in the
Confederate Army. After wounds which left him severely
maimed, he returned to his home in LaFourche parish where
he engaged in planting and politics until his election as
governor in 1876. Wiltz came from New Orleans. A banker
by profession, he became mayor of the Crescent City in 1872.
A third figure contributed to the Nicholls-Wiltz success in
1877, Major E. A. Burke. Burke's history before 1870 was
obscure, but by 1876 he was powerful enough in Louisiana
Democratic councils to act as a liaison man between the
Nicholls government and Hayes Republicans during negotia-
tions leading to the Compromise of 1877. The next year the
party rewarded him with its nomination for state treasurer.
By that time, Burke and Wiltz were already allied against
Governor Nicholls in a struggle for control of the Demo-
cratic party. They had another ally in the Louisiana Lot-
tery Company and its president, Charles T. Howard. The Lot-
tery Company, chartered by Radicals in 1868, was astute
enough in 1876 to switch its allegiance. Allegedly it
bribed away enough Packard legislators in 1877 to provide
the Nicholls body with a quorum. The Lottery Company also
played a prominent role at the Democratic convention of
1878 at which Burke won nomination for state treasurer. Ton
Boyd remarked on Major Burke's "most wonderful shrewdness" among the delegates; he also noted the obvious lobbying engaged in by Lottery Company agents, who according to rumor sought to protect the company's monopoly charter by offering liberal bribes. But the agents' efforts did not succeed. In 1879 the legislature passed and Governor Nicholls signed an act to repeal the Lottery's charter. Only a rapidly-secured injunction saved the company from going out of business.

While the Lottery case was still before the courts, delegates assembled at Baton Rouge in May, 1879, to construct a new state constitution. This time the Lottery Company agents proved to be more effective. As finally adopted, the new organic law incorporated the company charter, thus protecting it from reformers and ingrates who might control Louisiana's government in the future. Another provision in the new constitution disciplined Governor Nicholls by shortening his term more than one full year. The Supreme Court was also "reorganized" and the way opened for its personnel to be entirely replaced. Only one elected officer escaped this "clean sweep," E. A. Burke. The length of his term was increased to six years. According to one scholar, this was Burke's "payoff" for having led the
fight in the constitutional convention against repudiation of the state debt. Contracted during Reconstruction, much of the debt was fraudulent, and poorer Democrats, from the country and New Orleans, demanded that it be written off. But by 1879 wealthy Louisianians of both parties held the state's bonds. In the name of saving Louisiana's "honor," they opposed scaling down the interest as well as the principal owed by the state. After much haggling and amid charges of large-scale bribery, a compromise emerged: the principal owed by the state remained intact, but the interest rate owed the bondholders was reduced from seven to four per cent.

E. A. Burke continued to be a power in Louisiana when Louis Wiltz and S. D. McEnery of Monroe ran for governor and lieutenant governor in December, 1879. Wiltz had tuberculosis and died in October, 1881. But long before then Burke's influence in the governor's office was already well established. If anything, it increased when McEnery took office. Described as a "weak, affable man," McEnery let Major Burke, Charles Howard of the Louisiana Lottery Company, and a few others run the state. In time, various individuals complained of fraud and corruption. Some newspapers demanded reform, but they were silenced when the
governor's friends equated any attack on the McEnery regime with disloyalty to the South and collaboration with Republicans.

Among those McEnery supporters who let loyalty to party and patron overcome their better judgement was editor Leon Jastremski, mayor of Baton Rouge and, by 1880, potential antagonist of David Boyd. Jastremski was a close personal friend of McEnery's, which probably explained why he was made vice-president of the University Board of Supervisors in May, 1880, and why his brother, John Jastremski, won appointment as Supervisor of the Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb after the death of Superintendent Preston. Early in McEnery's tenure Jastremski's newspaper urged the Democratic party to purge itself of corruption. But by 1882 it was defending the administration against any and all charges. To do otherwise, it argued, would merely lend comfort to the Republican enemy. Also in 1882, the state capital was moved to Baton Rouge, and Jastremski's paper became the state's official journal.

Like Nicholls, Wiltz and McEnery, Leon Jastremski was a typical Bourbon. He even liked the term although he thought Stuart would be more appropriate. Louisiana in the 1880's, he explained, was like England in the 1660's; sick
of the "pseudo-Liberalism" of Cromwell and ready for a restoration of safe conservative rule. Like many of his more famous contemporaries, Jastremski was an ardent Confederate veteran who loved to invoke memories of the past, but who also did all he could to promote the expansion of business and industry in the South. Efforts by rural interests to regulate business annoyed him. The South should admire and emulate northern millionaires, not denounce them. Unlike some Louisianians, Jastremski was not disturbed when Jay Gould moved to increase the size of his already immense holdings in Louisiana. It merely represented the working out of a natural law: survival of the fittest. The "grumbling" of the poor against that law was "futile, infantile and impudent."¹

The accession to power of Nicholls, Wiltz and McEnery may have represented "Redemption" for most Louisianians. For David Boyd it meant personal disaster. Under the Nicholls administration David encountered increasing antagonism in the University Board of Supervisors, a Board

which Nicholls chose from a list made up by David himself, but which included several partisan of the Grangers and the old Agricultural College. Under Wiltz conditions grew worse. Only four months after his inauguration in January, 1880, Governor Wiltz replaced the Nicholls Board with another body even less sympathetic to David's conduct of the University. Finally, under the leadership of Lieutenant Governor McEnery, presiding in the absence of the ailing Wiltz, the hostile Board fired David in the summer of 1880, amidst charges of incompetence and maladministration. The reasons the Board offered to justify its action will be examined in detail later. But to understand some of the underlying causes for David's removal, it would be helpful to review a series of events which occurred in 1878 and 1879 concerning University and local politics.

By 1879 the University seemed to have met and conquered its most serious challenges and finally settled down to its primary task: the education of Louisiana youth. Editor Leon Jastremski announced to his readers that under David's "able supervision," the merged schools had become a "great success." The University had an able faculty, the experimental farm and "mechanical appurtenances" were being rapidly developed, and there was no longer "a shadow of a
doubt" that the University would soon join the "first rank among similar ones in this country." Even observers as familiar with the school's past as former Vice-President William Sanford thought the future looked encouraging. In the spring of 1878 he trusted that David was "getting along smoothly now." If so, he wondered how David managed to live without trouble. "You have been in it so long that you can hardly be content to sail in smooth water now."  

In fact, David was not "getting along smoothly." Neither was he happy in adversity. To a Virginia friend he regretted ever having left his home state. "I am very free to say that were I back again to 1857, no earthly consideration cld . . . induce me to leave Va. It was a great mistake for me. I have really never been satisfied. Am not now." Basic to David's dissatisfaction was the growing opposition his administration of the University encountered after 1877. His difficulties with Dr. Ryland and other Board members who championed "practical education," have already been described. So has his disagreement with Board member E. H. Farrar whose demand for a list of textbooks  

---

2William Sanford to David Boyd, April 28, 1878, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11; Louisiana Capitolian, February 22, 1879.

3David Boyd to Chas. M. Venable, March 25, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78.
employed by each professor led David to submit his resignation in April, 1878. Both disputes represented something new in David's experience: division within the Board and the Board's determination to participate actively in running the University. The Boards before 1877, led by William Sanford and G. Mason Graham, imposed few restraints on David. They delegated much of their authority to him and they usually endorsed his actions after the fact. After 1877 the Boards were never as passive and rarely of one mind. Considering David's distaste for sharing power and his reputed zest for combat, clashes between him and the Boards he served were practically inevitable.4

Besides antagonists in the Board of Supervisors, David acquired some powerful enemies among state and local politicians. One, W. B. Leake of West Feliciana, was a delegate to the constitutional convention in 1879, and a

4In 1876 David admitted that he had been a "little monarch" for so long that he would find a partnership impossible. As for his combative tendencies, G. Mason Graham and Samuel Lockett to David Boyd, August 26, 1879, ibid., Alpha File, Box 9; the two men who knew him best, noted his "delight in troubles" and tendency to "upturn things." G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, September 1, 1879, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collections, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6; S. H. Lockett to David Boyd, August 26, 1879, Alpha File, Box 9; David Boyd to R. J. Hancock, December 13, 1876, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1876-77.
member of the Louisiana senate in 1880. In the convention
Leake fought David's efforts to consolidate the profession-
al departments of the University of Louisiana with the
state University at Baton Rouge. The following year he in-
troduced a bill in the legislature to completely reorganize
the state University. The reasons Leake offered for his
opposition in 1879 had to do with the quality and cost of
food at the University. Sometime earlier his son attended
the school. The fare was so poor, charged Leake, that he
had to send the boy several dollars-worth of "extra provi-
sions" to supplement what had already cost him twenty
dollars a month. David replied publicly and sarcastically
in a letter to the editor of the New Orleans Times. He
declared that Leake paid only ten dollars a month for his
son's food. The other ten dollars covered his room rent,
laundry, medical and fuel bills. Besides, there was no
need to send a "particle" of extra food; if the father sent
his boy a food box, it was simply a "sign of parental af-
fection." However, if the elder Leake insisted that the
box was necessary, David could only explain it on the ground
"that Father knew [his son] to be of the Leaky stock . . .
[the boy] cld not hold his provisions well." David pointed
out that Leake could have boarded his son any where he chose
under University regulations. "To expect St. Charles Hotel fare on $10 to $15 a month," he remarked, "shows conclusively, I respectfully submit—that the delegate from West Feliciana is Leaky in more ways than one: in brains as well as in belly!" 5

David's intemperate letter was particularly unfortunate considering the fact that Leake's complaints were not without foundation. Only a month later one of David's best friends on the Board of Supervisors, General Joseph L. Brent, urged him to improve the quality of the food at the University. In the interest of keeping costs low, Brent thought, David was charging too little for board and consequently providing inferior fare. Brent had heard several complaints which convinced him that improvements were essential. 6

The issue which sparked the clash with delegate Leake won David additional enemies in the constitutional convention of 1879. Sometime during late June, David introduced a Mr. George of Webster Parish to introduce an

5 David Boyd to Editor, New Orleans Times, July 9, 1879.

6 Jos. L. Brent to David F. Boyd, August 20, 1879, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7.
ordinance which would have united the law and medical
departments of the University of Louisiana in New Orleans
with the state University at Baton Rouge. David did not
propose to move the professional departments out of New Or-
leans or make any essential change in their organization.
He merely wished to join them with the state University at
Baton Rouge under a single charter. This was by no means a
new idea in 1879. A superintendent of education suggested
it as early as 1858, and David proposed it in his Report for
1877. But nothing positive was done until 1878 when a pro-
posed amendment to the Constitution of 1868 authorized the
"academic department" of the University of Louisiana to
locate outside New Orleans. At the time there was no oper-
ating "academic department." But the very suggestion that
it be set up somewhere outside the Crescent City caused one
to be created in November, 1878. In a memorial presented to
the convention on July 7, 1879, David explained the reasons
behind George's resolution. He wanted the state to support
"one good school, complete in every way." If it provided
for a separate University of Louisiana with its own "Academ-
ical Department," it would again be "scattering . . . money
in all directions." Let the city take over the newly cre-
ated "Academical Department" and run it as a city college
or high school; the law and medical schools should be added to the state University.  

Both George's proposal and David's memorial caused a furor in the convention and the New Orleans press. Apparently, the New Orleans Democrat charged, Baton Rouge would not be satisfied until she "stole" every "State facility" from the Crescent City. She already had the University, the schools for the blind and deaf, the penitentiary and the state capitol. Now, the editor declared, she was after the city's law and medical schools too. The George proposal did not succeed. Neither did David's attempt to keep the state from "scattering its resources."

As finally approved, the Constitution of 1879 authorized the legislature to appropriate up to $10,000 each for the two universities. About the only thing David gained from his efforts in the convention of 1879 was the enmity of the New Orleans delegation.  

---

7David Boyd, "Notes for arguments favoring unification of L.S.U. and U. of La.," undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; David F. Boyd to the Constitutional Convention of 1879, June 25, 1879, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, Box 2; David F. Boyd, Memorial to the Constitutional Convention, July 7, 1879, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1876-79, Box 20.

8Louisiana Capitolian, July 12, 1879; Official Journal of the Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of
Finally, for the first time in his experience David faced serious opposition from his own faculty. Several professors ultimately manifested some dissatisfaction with his administrative policies. But two in particular spearheaded the drive which led to his dismissal: R. S. McCulloch, professor of "agricultural and general chemistry," and Lieutenant M. F. Jamar, instructor of military tactics and strategy. Professor McCulloch came to the University from Washington and Lee in January, 1878, because, he explained to David, General Lee's "dream of a great University at Lexington has been a failure." McCulloch's reputation rested on a long teaching career at Princeton, Columbia and Washington and Lee; a textbook entitled The Mechanical Theory of Heat, and some field research in sugar manufacture he carried on in Cuba for the United States government. The book and the research were done before the Civil War. When he came to Louisiana in 1878, McCulloch was over sixty years old. Nevertheless, the Board of Supervisors must have been impressed. They hired him at $3,000 "and quarters" to inaugurate the University's program in "scientific" agriculture. Up to that time no professor ever
received so much. The Board of Supervisors hoped to have Professor McCulloch conduct experiments in sugar culture in addition to teaching chemistry at the University. Board member Joseph L. Brent, David's old cavalry commander, was president of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association in 1878. In that capacity he prepared a list of experiments the Association wanted the University to perform. Brent asked David and Professor McCulloch to examine the list and to make one of their own consisting of the apparatus the University would need and an estimate of the amount it would require to set up an appropriate laboratory. The Association would then appeal to the legislature for the necessary funds. David and McCulloch figured that $10,000 would "outfit" the proposed laboratory, which could also be used to analyze soil for Louisiana farmers. Considering how vital sugar culture was to Louisiana's economy, General Brent thought the state would be happy to "fit up" a laboratory and "endow" the school with sufficient funds to run the necessary experiments. But he did not count on the

---

9R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, October 17, 1877, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 308-9, 332-33.
extreme thrift practiced by the Redeemers, particularly in areas like education. Not only did the lawmakers fail to make a special appropriation for a University laboratory in 1878; in 1879 the new constitution reduced the interest owed by the state on Seminary and Agricultural funds, thereby significantly lowering the University's guaranteed annual income. It also set a ceiling of $10,000 a year on any additional appropriation the legislature could make for the school.  

The constitutional provisions did not take effect until January, 1880. But even before then the state's failure to make adequate University appropriations or to pay the guaranteed annuities when due contributed to the breach between David and Professor McCulloch. In July, 1878, McCulloch asked the Board for an explanation of the term "quarters" as it pertained to his salary. He was informed that his "quarters" allowance amounted to $200. But

---

10Genl. Jos. L. Brent to D. F. Boyd and R. S. McCulloch, undated; David Boyd and R. S. McCulloch to Sugar Planter's Association, February 5, 1878; Jos. L. Brent, speech to Sugar Planters' Association, January 3, 1878; Memorandum, February 7, 1878, in Summary of Correspondence between Louisiana State University and Sugar Planters' Association, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1875-86, Box 19; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 318-24. Professor Fleming provides a detailed explanation of precisely how much the University lost through repudiation and scaling down of the state debt between 1877 and 1880.
at another Board meeting two weeks later, David undercut McCulloch's position. He asked that his own salary, including his quarters allowance, be reduced by $700. The legislature had not provided enough funds for the school in 1878 and David wanted to expand the faculty in the coming year. To do so there would have to be an adjustment in the salary scale. David's salary dropped from $3,500 to $3,000. McCulloch's remained at $3,000 and Nicholson's at $2,000. Professor Wilde was dismissed and his professorship of ancient and modern languages split. The two new men who replaced him each received $1,200. Finally, the Board provided for a professor of mechanics at $2,000, a commandant and instructor of "drawing" at $1,000 each, and a clerk-librarian at $800. But no one would receive any allowance for quarters in the coming year.  

Professor McCulloch, then visiting his family in Virginia and Maryland, learned of the Board's action from its secretary, W. H. Goodale. Nevertheless, David repeated the information in a letter he wrote McCulloch on August 17, 1878. Noting that no one would receive "quarters allowance" after October 1, that the "new" men would receive

---

Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 4, 15, 1878.
only $1,000 to $2,000 in 1878, and that his own salary had
been reduced by $500, David remarked that McCulloch, too,
might be "asked" to accept less pay in the following year.
Considering the "general poverty of the state," David com-
mented, the request would not be "unreasonable." Nine
months later David's prediction proved accurate. Because
the University received only limited funds from the legis-
lature in 1879 and little generosity was expected from the
constitutional convention then in session, David asked the
Board in May, 1879, to notify the faculty of a probable pay
cut for the coming year. What Professor McCulloch thought
when he received the news is not recorded. But shortly
thereafter he must have been disturbed. When the Board
moved to "equalize salaries" during the summer, it decreased
David's pay from $3,000 to $2,500; the mathematics and
mechanics professor's salary went from $2,000 to $1,500;
the three lowest paid men stayed at the same level ($1,000
to $1,200), and the highest paid, Professor McCulloch,
dropped from $3,000 to $1,500. David was sure the cut in
McCulloch's salary and his own "agency" in bringing it
about explained the older man's hostility to his administra-
tion.
As long as Mr. McCulloch received $3,000 a yr; with house rent—for doing but one hour's work a day—who ever heard a word from him against . . . the University. That is all he did . . . 1877-78! Since then, he has done about 2 hours class work a day except Oct. \(\overline{1879}\) to Jany. last \(\overline{1880}\), when he was absent . . . for the sugar planters. What he did then, I don't know, as he has made no report . . . Still he has been paid every cent due him . . . 12

Another factor which contributed to the breach between David and Professor McCulloch was the older man's obvious disinterest in the more "practical" phases of the University's agricultural program. On August 1, 1878, he wrote David from Virginia that he was willing to serve the "Sugar Industry" and he would teach "Mechanics, Pure and Applied" if the University provided him with a "Shop."

But:

As for the agricultural Department, I have not regarded it as under my charge, except in so far as 'Agricultural Chemistry' is concerned; nor do I desire further responsibility for it. Indeed, the farm seems likely to be an 'Elephant,' which the Supervisors will arrange as they please, whatever others may think desirable.13

---

12David Boyd to R. S. McCulloch, August 17, 1878; David F. Boyd, note, March 6, 1880, on Excerpt of correspondence between D. F. Boyd and R. S. McCulloch, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1853-88, Box 4; Minutes of Board of Supervisors, May 9, 1879; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 333.

13R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, August 1, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
David, very much disturbed, wrote back two weeks later.
The University, he pointed out, was doing so little in the
"Agr. Dept." that people were beginning to complain. The
legislature would surely send a committee to investigate
and "break us up if we don't do better." Again, on Oc­
tober 22, 1878, David reminded McCulloch of the need to "do
something" in the Agricultural Department. If they did
not, they could expect "trouble" and they would deserve it.
"If in two years, whether it be our fault or not--we have
not even begun to do any essential work (in branches . . .
relating to Agriculture and the mechanical arts as pro­
vided in the law) then are we a failure, and official
sentence ought to be passed on us."¹⁴

Apparently Professor McCulloch did not think the
University should act without specific approval of the Board
of Supervisors and a special appropriation from the legis­
lation. David scoffed at such passivity. It was useless
to wait until the legislature voted funds for the necessary
equipment; it would not act "for years to come." Even the
Board could not be expected to provide much assistance. But

¹⁴David Boyd to R. S. McCulloch, October 22, 1878,
in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and
Related Papers, 1858-38, Box 4.
if McCulloch agreed, David would ask them for $500 to activate the department of "Agric. Chemistry." He urged the older man to reply at once. "Anything I can possibly do I will do, to put your Dept. on its feet. Only tell me what... Let us stop this stagnation--this do-nothing if possible." Still McCulloch hesitated. He replied to David on October 27, 1878, with a question. "What can we do if those vested with the authority neither empower nor permit?" As for the $500 David offered to request from the Board, McCulloch advised him to "let it alone" until he returned to Baton Rouge. Months later David scrawled a comment on McCulloch's letter of October 27: "We did talk fully over the above matter, but nothing came of it, notwithstanding my persistent wish and offer to do what I cld to set up his Dept." McCulloch's department was still not "set up" in 1880. He had the space, "five rooms, clean, neat and fit," by that time, but he still lacked the "necessary appliances." David did not know when, if ever, he would get them. But

15 Ibid.

16 R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, October 27, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5. The scrawled note was not dated.
of one thing he was certain: they were not complying with state and Federal law and the sooner they admitted it the better. In a letter to Professor McCulloch dated January 5, 1880, David declared:

For any and every omission here, . . . I hold myself responsible. That we are no school of applied sciences, tho' professing to be, let the fault be mine. I am tired making excuses. I shall admit that as an Agricul and Mech College, we are doing nothing—that in that regard we are a failure.

Then, in the bluntest terms, David told Professor McCulloch that if "they" did not "turn over a new leaf," he would ask the Board to abolish the "scientific chairs" altogether. 17

It is unlikely that David ever carried out his threat. In March, 1880, he remarked that the January 5 letter, like others written to McCulloch earlier, was meant as "a spur—to try and get him to do something" about the Agricultural Department. "But the truth is," David concluded, "Mr. McC. never wished or intended, if he could help it, to have to do with the farm; . . . I hold that all he wanted was his salary as big as possible, and his work as little as possible! And everybody knows that: that is

David's difficulties with Professor McCulloch in 1878 and 1879 were serious enough. But they seem almost trivial compared to the problems caused by the appointment of Lieutenant M. F. Jamar to the faculty. The trouble began long before Jamar arrived. In November, 1877, David asked General Sherman to have a Lieutenant Mumford of the Thirteenth Infantry assigned to the University as professor of military science. Sherman answered that if David wanted a particular man, he should apply through the governor to the Secretary of War. He also informed David that the existing law limited to thirty the number of officers available for such assignments. David applied formally for Lieutenant Mumford in January, 1878, only to learn that all thirty appointments had already been made. By July or August, however, Sherman thought the University could expect the detail of an officer.

In the spring and early summer of 1878, David continued to press for the appointment of Lieutenant Mumford. He asked Louisiana Senator William P. Kellogg to use his influence in Congress and he requested Sherman to appeal

18David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 14, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
personally to the Secretary of War. Meanwhile, the Board of Supervisors applied formally for the assignment of Lieutenant M. F. Jamar, also of the Thirteenth Infantry. Jamar, who had been stationed at the Baton Rouge garrison, counted several friends among the local politicians. David registered his disagreement by refusing to support the Board's request. He also wrote to General Sherman to intercede. But Sherman replied that the only "proper official action" he could take was to endorse the "general fitness" of any officer asked for and to state whether or not he could be spared from active duty. Sherman explained to David that "these College details" were purely political and arranged by a branch of the "War Office" located in his building, but "as absolutely distinct as though a hundred miles away." In general, senior officers received first consideration for college duty. However, the stated preference of the University Board for Jamar would probably "turn the scales" in his favor.19

General Sherman's prediction proved accurate. In

19William Sherman to David Boyd, November 23, 1877, January 15, April 29, August 4, 1878, in Boyd-Sherman Letters; David Boyd to W. T. Sherman, April 25, 1878, in Boyd (David F.) Letterbooks, 1877-78; W. T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, June 25, 1878, in Sherman (William T.) Letters, David F. Boyd Family Papers; Fleming, Louisiana State University,
April, 1879, Leon Jastremski announced to his readers that M. F. Jamar, recently promoted to first lieutenant, would soon be at the University as professor of "Tactics and Military Science." Jastremski did not think a better choice could have been made. "We take the greatest pleasure," he remarked, "in welcoming back in our midst this really clever gentleman."20 Tom Boyd's evaluation was a little less flattering. Commenting on Jamar, whose appointment relieved him of a distasteful duty, Tom remarked, "He is a rollicking, drinking, smart, smutty anecdote telling fellow of about 27 and an admirable drill master."21 David was more critical. He considered Jamar "no gentleman, and an unfit associate for the cadets." Worse still, he was convinced that Jamar secured his appointment by circulating false rumors about Lieutenant Mumford, the brother officer whose appointment David originally recommended.22

333; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 5, 15, 1878.

20 Louisiana Capitolian, April 12, 1879.

21 Tom Boyd Diary, September 14, 1879.

22 Ibid., September 12, 1880; G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, November 19, 1879, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters; 1854-85, Box 5
The conflict between David and Jamar became more serious in October, 1879, when Tom Boyd resigned his post as commandant and professor of drawing. Tom never enjoyed the duties associated with the position of commandant, especially after a disciplinary crisis arose in the spring of 1879. Several cadets were dismissed at the time and Vice-President Williams tried to have Tom removed, claiming that his unnecessary "harshness" was wrecking the school. But David and two alumni on the Board blocked Williams's efforts. By October, however, Tom found his duties so "disagreeable" and the vice-president's "continuous stricures" so unpleasant that he submitted his resignation.

David's antagonism for Lieutenant Jamar also contributed to the resignation. As commandant, Tom's duties required him to work closely with both David and Lieutenant Jamar. The arrangement was clearly unsatisfactory. David did not like his brother to hold a post so closely related to his own, and Lieutenant Jamar ultimately asked the Board to construct a "line of demarcation" between his department and Tom's. Because he did not want it said that he opposed Jamar in order to retain his brother as commandant, David encouraged Tom to resign. On October 17, 1879, Tom asked to be relieved of all duties, "thus clearing the decks for
David's fight with Jamar. 23

Now David's "fight with Jamar" commenced in earnest. The same session of the Board which accepted Tom Boyd's resignation "with regret" offered the vacant post of commandant to Lieutenant Jamar. When it appeared that Jamar might accept, David decided to protest to Governor Nicholls. Jamar, he wrote the governor, was not a "proper person" to place in immediate control of the cadets. He lacked a "refined sense of honor" and "delicacy of feeling." David would not trust his own son to Jamar's care; he had told that to the lieutenant and "given him my reasons." 24 Governor Nicholls was not sure whether David meant his letter to be "official" or not. An "official" complaint, he pointed out, would have to contain specific charges, "sustained by evidence." Jamar would also have to be given an opportunity to reply. The governor reminded David that the Board would not convene until December and nothing could be done until then. However, if David filed an official

23 Tom Boyd Diary, September 14, 1879, August 27, September 12, 1880.

24 David Boyd to Governor Francis T. Nicholls, October 27, 1879, copy, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1853-88, Box 4.
complaint at once, a copy could be sent to Lieutenant Jamar. That way the lieutenant would be prepared for an "examination" and there would be no delay at the December meeting.25

When the Board offered the post of commandant to Lieutenant Jamar, it stipulated that he "reside in the University and conform to all the requirements of the institution." He accepted the position conditionally on October 30, 1879. But if required to live in the building, he wanted quarters that would be suitable for a wife if he married. The request, Jamar told the Board, was "no more than fair." Many ladies had lived in the building in the past. Besides, since the departure of the deaf, the building had plenty of room.26

Meanwhile, David continued his campaign against the lieutenant. G. Mason Graham thought he was wasting his time. "If a person who is 'no gentleman, and an unfit associate for the cadets' is congenial to the tastes and sentiments of the majority of the Board . . ., Why! let them

25 Governor Francis T. Nicholls to David Boyd, November 6, 1879, ibid., Alpha File, Box 10.

26 W. H. Goodale, Secretary of the Board of Supervisors to David Boyd, November 1, 1879, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, February, 11, 12, 1880.
have him . . . you have sacrificed yourself too long for an unappreciative and thankless people . . . "27 Then Graham advised David not to consult General Sherman about Jamar unless Sherman asked about him first. But Graham himself asked the general for information about Jamar. Sherman answered that Jamar was a native of Maryland and a graduate of West Point. He had probably met him, but could not "recall him to mind." Sherman could not believe Jamar was what David called him—"not a gentleman," but if he proved "offensive," Sherman thought he could have him removed before his two years' assignment elapsed. The general was sure the Board would consider David's wishes ultimately. But meanwhile, "He should keep the matter inside the family—and should simply question the adaptability of Jamar to the office he holds and not attack his personal character. Every army officer must resent that." Sherman thought David should submit his objections to Jamar to the Board and abide "cheerfully" by its decision. "He shd not resign or make captious opposition, but crave time to vindicate his opinion—or satisfy him of honest error."28


28W. T. Sherman to G. Mason Graham, November 24,
When the Board met in February, 1880, Jamar asked to appear before it to present his arguments against accepting the quarters he had been assigned by David. They were the same Tom Boyd had occupied as commandant, but the lieutenant did not consider them satisfactory for his prospective bride. After some discussion, David's old enemy, E. H. Farrar, moved the permanent appointment of Jamar as commandant provided he observe all the laws of the institution and provided he live within a "radius of 100 yds." of the University building. But General Brent, David's former cavalry commander, moved to table Farrar's resolution and the entire subject. At that point Lieutenant Jamar withdrew his conditional acceptance of the post of commandant and asked for a definition of his duties as professor of military science. If he had to choose between marriage and the commandancy, he told the Board, he much preferred the

1879, in Sherman (William T.) Letters, David F. Boyd Family Papers, 1864-91. But David did not confine his complaints about Jamar to "the family." He wrote to William Sanford, then living in Virginia, about the lieutenant's character and he also discussed Jamar in letters to his friends, Samuel Lockett and John McAuley. David Boyd to W. L. Sanford, November 22, 1879, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; John McAuley to David Boyd, November 25, 1879; Samuel Lockett to David Boyd, January 3, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9.
former. Finally, the Board authorized David to ask for Lieutenant Jamar's recall by the War Department if at any time there was a "want of harmony" between himself and the lieutenant.29

Ostensibly, David had won the battle to keep Jamar from becoming commandant. It probably pleased him a great deal. Among his friends David had a well-deserved reputation for enjoying hard-fought conflicts. Former Vice-President Sanford's remark that David would be unhappy without "troubles," has already been noted. G. Mason Graham also commented on David's "delight in troubles" and his fondness for overcoming them. But Colonel Lockett said it best. Lockett had been asked to apply for the presidency of the University of Alabama and sought David's advice. David warned him of the hardships he could expect if he accepted such a job. But Lockett replied: "If I go there, I am not going to upturn things. I shall not stir up trouble if I can avoid it, just to see if I am not strong enough to come out first--best--in the struggle, which you know I have often told you, was a failing of yours. I shall consider my duty done if I . . . carry out the orders of . . .

29 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, February 11, 12, 14, 1880; Tom Boyd Diary, August 27, 1880.
the Board of Trustees. I am going to let them do all the fighting."

Far from letting others "do all the fighting," David was making new enemies inside and outside the University family. One of them was a prominent Baton Rouge grocer and businessman, William Garig. The University purchased most of its provisions from Garig's firm until October, 1879, when David decided to take his business elsewhere. The reason for David's decision is not clear, but the effect on his relations with Garig was. When Garig's firm, David and Garig, sought some explanation, David replied through a third party: "In my present way of considering Mr. Garig, I do not wish to have any further communication with him." A few months later Garig returned the compliment. He and his partner "mutually agreed" that they wanted nothing to do with David.31

Indirectly, David's fight with Garig was bound to


31 David Boyd to [David F.], December 11, 1879, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; David and Garig to David Boyd, April 30, [1880], ibid.
have repercussions. Like Lieutenant Jamar, Garig was a personal friend of Dr. Williams, vice-president of the University Board. He was also related to the Kleinpeters, a prominent family in East Baton Rouge. In 1880, one of the men Baton Rouge sent to the legislature was a Representative Kleinpeter. When several of David's enemies tried to enact a bill designed to reorganize the University, Kleinpeter helped to direct their efforts in the House.32

On January 10, 1880, Leon Jastremski's newspaper, the Louisiana Capitolian, dropped what Tom Boyd described as "a bombshell in our midst." Jastremski printed a blistering article which attacked David's administration of the University as "the most absolute autocracy now in existence." All authority was vested in a single individual. "Professors . . . have no more authority in shaping the educational tone and spirit of the institution than Gov. Nicholls has in regulating the affairs of France." The author thought the professors were unhappy. But the

32David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 25, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana House Journal, March 2, 1880, p. 227. David's relations with Vice-President Williams were already strained in 1879. As noted above, Dr. Williams tried to have Tom Boyd removed as commandant for unnecessary harshness but David blocked him in the Board of Supervisors.
president ignored their dissatisfaction. No matter how "able and well-meaning" President Boyd might be, he should realize that "twelve heads are better than one." In any case, when the community in which a school was located could not "point to it with pride," there must be some serious fault in its management. Mismanagement, the author declared, "may not arise from any criminal purpose." It could result from bad judgement. Then the writer proposed a series of changes which "the intelligence of Baton Rouge" ought to insist upon before the entire state "is disaffected:

(1) The military feature of the school should be limited to a study of military science and enough drill to provide physical training for the cadets. "It is surely a mistake to try to set up a West Point in Louisiana."
(2) Some means should be found to bring the students into closer contact with the "better class" of Baton Rouge society.
(3) The president must share policy making with the whole faculty.
(4) Regulations and disciplinary procedure should be spelled out and all "discretionary powers" whatever should be withdrawn.
(5) The Boarding department should be run by a hotel keeper, not the University authorities.
(6) A preparatory department or specific entrance requirements ought to be established. Otherwise the school would never "advance."

If the citizens of Baton Rouge could not convince the University administration to make the suggested changes, they
should at least "speak out." It was their duty to "compel, by thorough public ventilation a change not only of policy but also of [the school's] organic structure."³³

The article in the Capitolian was signed simply "Louisiana," but David could think of several persons who might have been its author. In late January he wrote his brother, then in New Orleans: "Jamar is a mean character, Garig a dog, Williams friend to both, & McCulloch afraid of losing his place. . . . Please say to Capt. Jastremski that I do consider the article in the Capitolian as personal/ly, as well as officially, reflecting on me. Hence I wish the names of all parties responsible therefore."³⁴ R. D. Haislip, a young assistant professor at the University, proved to be the author. A Louisiana native, Haislip held a Master's degree from Professor McCulloch's old school, Washington and Lee. In 1879 he applied at the University for a position in ancient languages, but someone else got the job. However, David was so anxious to hire him that he persuaded the Board to pay him $600 as assistant professor

³³Louisiana Capitolian, January 10, 1880; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880.

³⁴David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 25, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
of modern languages and instructor in English. He supplemented that amount with $400 from his own pocket.

According to Tom Boyd, there was "much surprise" among the faculty when Haislip's authorship of the "Louisiana" article became known. Professor McCulloch saw it in manuscript and Lieutenant Jamar took it to Leon Jastremski. But everyone else claimed no knowledge of it prior to publication. Tom Boyd was not so sure. The mathematics professor, J. W. Nicholson, had been "sleeping with" Haislip. Yet he professed to be "horrified" when the article appeared. He also declared he would "separate" from him, "but didn't," Tom noted in his diary.  

The Haislip "bombshell" was carefully timed to burst just before the legislature convened in New Orleans. David, who normally went to the city to lobby for the school, did not dare leave Baton Rouge and his several enemies in January, 1880. Instead, he sent his brother Tom whose resignation from the faculty had left him unemployed since the previous November. Besides overseeing the University appropriations bill in the legislature, David hoped

---

35 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 18, 1879; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880.
his brother could influence Governor Wiltz to make favorable appointments to the vacancies on the Board. He also wanted Tom to interview the officers of the Thirteenth Infantry, particularly Lieutenant Mumford. The Thirteenth was Jamar's old outfit, and David needed ammunition to be used against Jamar in February, 1880, when the Board would meet to consider his appointment as commandant. David thought Tom should see "Johnson" in the United States Customs House too. Mr. Johnson was in a position to let General Sherman and the Secretary of War know how David had jeopardized himself and the school because he had tried to prevent "my own Democratic people" from doing an injustice to a "Republican army officer". Jamar had to be recalled. "There will never be peace here, with Jamar here! He must go. And let our friends all unite in that purpose. Only how and when to get rid of him must be the question." 

Despite his obsession with the Jamar struggle, David sensed more trouble brewing. "I can feel it in the air, as well as in my bones," he wrote Tom on January 27,

---

36 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, January 24, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 25, 27, 28, 30, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
1880. He thought the state superintendent of public education, E. H. Fay, had become "prejudiced against us."

Because the University charter gave the superintendent ex-officio membership on the Board of Supervisors, Fay's attitude could be important. David already had enough enemies in that body. Dr. Williams, its vice-president, was frankly hostile. David knew he conferred regularly with Lieutenant Jamar and other Boyd enemies. Another antagonist, E. H. Farrar, was also busily attacking David and the school. David asked Tom to visit Farrar. "Talk calmly and kindly with . . . [him], tell him politely that it is impossible for him to know the real situation else his views would materially change." But if Farrar talked "violently and rudely" of David, he hoped Tom would "shut him up, if you have to slap his face!" It did not surprise David that people were beginning to complain about the school:

If I went out on the street, & hollered fire, I wd expect people to gather around my house, and holler fire too. And if Mr. Farrar and Mr. Williams etc. of the Board, and Mr. Haislip, McCulloch and Jamar of the Faculty, will go outside, and holler fire--cry down the University,--why the people must (or will, at any rate) take them at their word, and abuse the school
too! That is, the public clamor against our school comes from within.37

What David "felt in his bones" in late January surfaced in the Louisiana senate a few days later. On February 5, 1880, a bill "to reorganize the L. St. University & A & M" appeared in the upper chamber. Its sponsor was Senator W. W. Leake, chairman of the senate Committee on Public Education, and the same man with whom David had waged a public battle the year before during the constitutional convention. After its introduction Tom Boyd spent all his time trying to block, or at least stall, the passage of Senator Leake's measure. He sent David a summary of it as soon as he had a chance to read it. The bill which finally passed the senate on March 11, 1880, was a substitute, but it included the main elements of Leake's original measure. It also incorporated most of the changes suggested by Haislip in his "bombshell" article of January 10. Essentially the Leake bill would (1) change the school's name, (2) change the composition of the Board by requiring three of the fifteen members to be residents of Baton Rouge, but dropping the provision which required three alumni members;

37 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 25, 27, 1880, February 1, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1830-81, Box 1.
(3) repose the entire management and control of the University in the faculty; (4) give the faculty the power to nominate a president whom the Board would appoint; (5) require the president to be one of the department heads; (6) stipulate that a new president be nominated and appointed every four years; (7) establish "military discipline" but require it to be subordinate to the "literary" departments; (8) organize three departments: a preparatory department and two others which Tom could not recall, but one of which "struck me as ridiculous;" (9) repeal David's merger act of 1877, and finally, (10) make the new law effective on October 1, 1880.38

David's first reaction was characteristic. He would seek total war, not compromise or reconciliation.

I shall insist--now that these people up here have begun the fight--on everything being sifted to the bottom. Let the question of Union of the two schools be gone over again. Then, if it is thought best to separate the two, let the A. & M. College go to Chalmette . . . and ours back to Rapides. If Baton Rouge is so short-sighted as to make war on us, then let B. R. take the consequences--lose both schools.39

38 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, February 6, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Louisiana Senate Journal, Regular Session, 1880, p. 72, 203.

39 David Boyd to Thomas Boyd, February 6, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
But the war had to be postponed briefly so that David and the cadet corps could participate in Fete Day, or Mardi Gras, which occurred on February 10, 1880. The cadets returned to Baton Rouge next day. David, however, remained to attend the special session of the Board which lasted for the rest of the week. As already described, Lieutenant Jamar refused the post of commandant at the February session, and the Board authorized David to ask the War Department for his recall if the two could not work in harmony. Other topics dealt with by the Board included the Leake bill introduced only a few days earlier. General G. Mason Graham presented his colleagues with a detailed argument against it. He praised David's energy, perseverance, and zeal and declared that the school owed its very existence to the "self-sacrificing devotion of Col. Boyd." If the University were left alone, it might survive and prosper. But no consideration of "party," either personal or political, should be allowed to disturb its growth. Change of any kind was disturbing; political interference would spell disaster. Graham proceeded to summarize the institution's history. In twenty years, he pointed out, its name changed three times. From a "Seminary" it had become a University, "of which it does not possess one single attribute proper
and will be most fortunate if, in this vast country, it shall have earned the title in a hundred years to come." Then General Graham delivered a strong argument in favor of retaining the school's military character and its strong executive control. A "diffusion of power" among the faculty would be fatal to the institution. Therefore he urged his colleagues to "deprecate" that part of the Leake bill which, he felt, was not only unnecessary, but if enacted, would have a "baleful" effect on the University's future.

The Board Minutes do not record how each man voted, but a majority of those present supported a resolution opposing passage of the Leake bill as "unwise" and supporting the view expressed by General Graham.40

Whether a majority of the legislature felt the same way remained to be seen. Tom Boyd, who had been in New Orleans almost a month by mid-February, thought David ought to return to the city if only to answer some of the lawmakers' questions and to protect the appropriations bill which still reposed in committee. Besides, he had heard that someone named Atkins had introduced a resolution in

40David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 14, 1880, ibid.; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, February 11, 12, 13, 14, 1880.
the House to examine the University books. Atkins wanted to determine if the Agricultural fund had been "misapplied," that is, employed by the "literary" departments. David intended to go to New Orleans on February 23, but he had to change his plans. Affairs in Baton Rouge, he wrote Tom, were "a mess"; McCulloch, Haislip and Jamar were "in an ugly mood." The cadets, too, appeared to be demoralized. "I know the risk--possibly the loss of our appropriations, and more headway to Leake's bill; but if an outbreak shd occur here--while I might be away--that would effectually stop our progress before the Legislature."41

Part of the "mess" to which David referred was a memorial which Professor McCulloch was preparing to present to the legislature. McCulloch was so "embittered" against him and the Board that David expected a very "severe" and "disrespectful" document. The memorial certainly was severe. It charged that the University's existing charter was so "imperfectly" framed that it could not possibly carry out the purpose of the Federal government as intended in its laws establishing the seminary and agricultural funds.

41 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, February 19, 21, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 20, 22, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
Specifically, McCulloch charged, the charter deprived the professors of all authority. Instead, the president exercised "indefinite and unlimited" control over all the financial, educational and disciplinary affairs of the school. No man, "however great may be his ability," could discharge successfully such "mixed and incongruous duties."

The result, according to Professor McCulloch, was (1) a "financially encumbered, if not hopelessly insolvent" institution; (2) a haphazard system of instruction wherein classes were taught in a "most irregular" manner and graduation was "rendered simply impracticable;" (3) an unjust disciplinary system, administered by one man, from whose decision there was no appeal, and (4) an absence of clearly defined rules and regulations for the government of cadets. McCulloch declared that the "facts" he presented in his memorial were well known and that most of his colleagues supported his views. Therefore he urged the legislators to reorganize the University as proposed in the bill sponsored by Senator Leake's Committee on Public Education.42

A few days after his memorial appeared, Professor

---

42 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 22, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Richard S. McCulloch, Petition, February 28, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1875-86, Box 19.
McCulloch resigned from the University. He spent the rest of the legislative session in New Orleans where he labored diligently for the passage of the Leake reorganization bill. David wrote Tom that McCulloch's resignation caused "scarcely a ripple in the school." However, it was noted by Leon Jastremski in his newspaper. Jastremski claimed that he did not want to become involved in the "disagreements and complaints" existing among the University faculty. But if the charter was responsible for the discord and "faulty organization" of the school, he hoped the legislature would amend and correct it "to the extent . . . that the services of such talented gentlemen as Prof. McCulloch . . . may be permanently secured to the college." 43

Professor McCulloch's efforts to pass the Leake bill were supplemented by a petition which grocer William Garig circulated among the leading citizens of Baton Rouge. Charging that the University was "both financially and administratively sadly mismanaged," and that its existing organization failed to achieve the "ends for which it was created," the Garig petition urged passage of Leake's

43 Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 2, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana Capitolian, March 6, 1880.
reorganization bill. Ultimately, it secured fifty-four signatures. Among those who signed were the parish priest, the Episcopal rector, the editor of the town's other paper, the principal of the local private school, a leading physician and a district judge. Later David learned that many persons signed the document without reading it first. They were "tricked," David declared, "on the ruse" that he (David) favored the Leake bill. When they learned otherwise, they wrote the Baton Rouge senator, Dr. T. D. Buffington, to have their names removed from Garig's petition. "Garig is truly one big dog," David wrote his brother on February 29. And Haislip, McCulloch, Jamar and Dr. Williams were just as bad. None of them was honestly interested in reorganizing the school; they simply wanted to get rid of David. To "test their sincerity," David instructed Tom to get Senator Luckett of Rapides and "all our friends" to support a change in section one of Leake's bill, striking out Baton Rouge in favor of Alexandria as the school's permanent location. "Then see if Dr. Buffington and Co. have the same zeal in changing the University's organization."

—William Garig, Petition to the Legislature from the Citizens of Baton Rouge, February 26, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, Box 2; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 25, 28, March 4, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.
David's rebuttal to the Haislip article, the Leake bill, the McCulloch memorial and the Garig petition appeared in several forms. In the senate R. H. Luckett of Rapides led the debate against Leake's bill with ammunition fed to him by Tom Boyd and David himself. Leake's bill, David wrote Senator Luckett, would change the nature of the school. It would alter its "military character" and make it more a "civilian" college. That would not do in "the city." It might work if the school were still in Rapides, but the boyd would "get in trouble" in Baton Rouge.

Leake's bill also sought to end the president's exclusive power over discipline. Experience convinced David that a division of disciplinary authority between the president and the professors would not work either. As for McCulloch's ideas about discipline, they were "so wild," David told Luckett, that they should not be taken seriously. McCulloch's memorial charged David with exercising too much power. Yet, when the University regulations were revised, McCulloch argued that the president "shd have an absolute veto over any and every act of the Faculty!" Such a proposal David considered absurd. "A president to have absolute control over the conduct, discipline of his cadets, yes; but over the deliberations of a lot of
intelligent professors in their proper spheres—in all that pertains to the academic duties proper—... No!" Some persons, David told Luckett, were trying to drive a wedge between him and Professor J. W. Nicholson by "harping" upon Nicholson's expressed opinion that the faculty's power should be increased and the president's reduced. But David denied that any discord existed between himself and the self-taught mathematician. He and Nicholson "pulled perfectly together," even when they disagreed. Besides, Nicholson's experience before he came to the University was "limited." David thought him the greatest mathematician since Liebnitz or Newton. He was "the kindest person; forever playing the peace-maker." But he was so conciliatory sometimes that David feared he might be "tempted to sacrifice principle." David had told him as much. But even Nicholson, David informed Luckett, admitted that "when he ran his large academy, he took no advice from any, ran it himself, did all the discipline and his word was law." 45

Another section of Leake's bill sought to revise the membership of the Board of Supervisors. In providing a seat

45 David Boyd to Dr. R. L. Luckett, edited copy, February 25, March 6, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
for the president and three University alumni, David told Senator Luckett, the existing law merely followed "the best usage" in the colleges of the United States and Europe. As for Leake's suggestion that three Board members be appointed from Baton Rouge, David objected because it would make the University nothing more than "a tool of the locality, not a State school at all." Baton Rouge was the state capitol. It already had plenty of representation on the Board in the persons of the governor, the state superintendent of public education, the president of the faculty, and the vice-president of the Board of Supervisors. If any more evidence were needed, David suggested that Luckett cite another bill then pending before the legislature; it sought to reduce, not augment, the hold of Baton Rouge over the Asylum for the Blind.46

As received by Dr. Luckett, David's letters objecting to the Leake bill were fairly moderate in tone. Tom Boyd carefully deleted the more offensive remarks before forwarding them to the lawmaker. For example, in his original draft David objected to having three men appointed to the Board from Baton Rouge because "I assert without fear

46 David Boyd to Dr. R. L. Luckett, February 25, 1880, ibid.
of contradiction, that there are not 3 men to be found in all this town of 8000 souls who are eminently qualified, by virtue and intelligence, to be supervisors of this state University!" For five years Vice-President Williams rode by the school every day, yet never paid it a visit. "And if Dr. Buffington, the present senator, or Kleinpeter, Representative, have either of them put foot in the grounds in the last seven years," David was not aware of it.\(^{47}\) Even David realized his remarks were "very bitter." He authorized Tom to edit them if he thought them too "imprudent." But in David's opinion, the time for "mincing words" was past; "my best policy now is to fight with all my power.\(^{48}\)

David deluged the legislature with petitions of his own composing. One favored the "present system of discipline" because it trained the cadets in "manly conduct" and

\(^{47}\)Ibid.

\(^{48}\)David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 25, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1. David was not above scandal-mongering if it would save the University. He asked Tom to tell Senator Luckett "fully about Garig--his animus, his character etc. . . . Mention his coming to the Cath. (olic) Ladies Fair in B. R. in '73 with a negro strumpet on his arm, insisting that white ladies shd wait on him & her, was put out by Father Delacroix, and fined next day $25.00 by Mayor Schorten!" David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 7, 1880, ibid.
maintained good relations with the community. Another, signed by New Orleans residents who once attended the University, opposed the Leake bill because too much change was bad; it was an affront to the alumni to drop them from the Board, and because no man "worthy of the name" would serve as president if he could not exercise more power. Still other petitions against reorganization came from West Baton Rouge and Iberville. Then, to discount one of the charges made in both Garig's petition and the McCulloch memorial, a number of the University's principal creditors in Baton Rouge notified the lawmakers of their faith in the institution and their willingness to extend it additional credit. Finally, even the students and faculty became involved. The faculty informed the lawmakers that they did not "desire to influence legislation" in regard to the University except through the channels provided in the institution's regulations. In spite of reports to the contrary, they disclaimed any connection with any bill then before the legislature. The cadets, too, wanted to make their position clear. The legislature had been told that many boys intended to leave the University unless the president's powers were reduced. "Such a statement," the cadets' petition charged, "is wholly unfounded in fact." When all
else failed, David appealed personally to Lieutenant Governor McEnery. He asked that final action on the Leake bill be postponed in the senate until a joint committee of the legislature could have time to investigate the University. But the senators were adamant. On March 11, 1880, they voted twenty-one to ten to reorganize the school.

David's only hope was to kill Leake's bill in the house.49

With only minor variations in tactics, David continued his efforts to defeat the senate bill in the lower

49Citizens of Baton Rouge, Petitions Against Reorganizing University, February 28, March 4, 1880; Ex-cadets from New Orleans, Petition, March 1, 1880; Creditors of University, Petition, March 6, 1880; Resolution of University Faculty, March 5, 1880; Cadets of the University, Petition, March 4, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, Box 2; David Boyd to Lieutenant Governor S. D. McEnery, March 10, 1880, ibid., David F. Boyd Letters and Papers, 1858-88, Box 4; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, telegram, March 6, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana Senate Journal, Regular Session, March 1, 1880, p. 203. Besides the several petitions, David sent statements from the presidents, superintendents, and ex-cadets of various military schools to the deliberating senators. All supported his contention that the president should have exclusive control over discipline. And Charles Eliot of Harvard endorsed his policy of appointing alumni to the Board. It was still not enough to influence the upper house. J. T. Bringier, cadet, to David Boyd, March 4, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alphabetical File, Box 7; Francis Smith, Superintendent of Virginia Military Academy to David Boyd, March 6, 1880, ibid., Box 11; Hugh Thompson, Superintendent of Public Education in South Carolina, to Major John Preston, March 5, 1880, ibid., Box 12; Charles Eliot to David Boyd, March 4, 1880, ibid., Box 8.
chamber. Again Tom Boyd waged David's battles in the
lobbies, but this time he had help from Dr. Pendleton King,
professor of natural history at the University, and several
former cadets who lived in New Orleans. On March 14, 1880,
David outlined a course of action for Tom and his assis-
tants to pursue. First, they must appear before the house
education committee. "That comm. must be kept from report-
ing Leake bill favorably." Second, Tom must do everything
he could to delay matters. Such tactics, David declared,
were "perfectly permissable" in view of the "unscrupulous
opposition." He exhorted his brother to make no conces-
sions. The reorganization bill, David reminded Tom, was
directed against him personally by:

Garig--because I quit dealing with him in October
last. He then said he wld do all he cld to keep
cadets from coming here . . . McCulloch because his
salary was cut down. Haislip because after trying to
break McCulloch down in my estimation--saying he was
an impractical man, and asking me for McCulloch's
classes, and being refused--then he tries another way,
to get a full Professorship, by breaking down this
organization and me. Jamar--because he has been dis-
appointed in his hopes and aspirations--of getting
the Commandant's place. . . . I do not wish--nor can I
afford any compromise or concession. 50

50 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 14, 1880, in
Fleming (Walter l.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and
Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
Meanwhile the senate responded to David's suggestion that a joint committee of the legislature be chosen to investigate the University. David's plan now was to prevent the house Committee on Public Education, favorable to the Leake bill, from reporting to the house until the joint investigating committee could visit the school and make its report. In turn, Tom and King were to try to delay the investigating committee's visit to Baton Rouge until the weekend of Friday, April 2, 1880. The cadets had a hop scheduled that night, and the Board of Supervisors would convene the following Monday. If the committee came then, David thought, the school would appear in its best light, their enemies in Baton Rouge would not be as effective, and above all, they would gain valuable time. However, Tom must not let it appear that they were trying in any way to discourage an investigation. After all, David had asked for it.51

Tom and Professor King did their best, but as March drew to a close the house education committee seemed

51Tom Boyd to David Boyd, March 13, 1880, ibid., Alphabetical File, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 14, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1. The cadets advertised their hop as an "Autocracy Ball." It was a huge success.
determined to recommend passage of the senate bill. If it did, David's friends in the house would charge bad faith. There had been no investigation of the University, and a "fair one" could not possibly take place before the session closed. A filibuster could also prevent the house from taking action. But just in case, David urged Tom to "secure the Republican vote . . . it may turn the scales." 52

In the end the Louisiana Lottery, not the Republicans, gave David his victory. A measure affecting Lottery interests came before the house during the last few days of the session. It generated so much debate that the Leake bill, recommended for passage on March 29, failed to be called up before adjournment on April 10. 53

Pendleton King urged David to "be moderate" in his jubilation, but the latter had very little reason to celebrate. Even before the legislature adjourned, David learned from his friend General Brent that Governor Wiltz planned "wholesale" changes in the Board. "This," Tom Boyd

52 Dr. Pendleton King to David Boyd, March 25, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 25, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.

53 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 30, April 4, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana House Journal, Regular Session, March 29, 1880, pp. 359-60.
noted in his Diary, "was a new danger from a rather unexpected quarter." David could hardly have been completely surprised. He knew the governor and Lieutenant Jamar were friends. "I think he is a good officer," Wiltz wrote David in February, 1880, "and would like to have him remain in our state." Thus Board members like Brent, Graham, Egan, McCollum and the alumni who supported David in his battles against Jamar were likely candidates for removal. David argued that only members whose terms had expired could "legally" be replaced. But Governor Wiltz held that all terms ended when the new constitution took effect in January, 1880. Therefore he could name a completely new Board. In May, 1880, he announced his selections to the press. Besides himself, Superintendent of Public Education E. H. Fay, and David Boyd, ex-officio members, the new slate included Leon Jastremski of East Baton Rouge as vice-president, Dr. W. A. Robertson of St. Landry, T. L. Bayne, and John Dolhonde of Orleans, George S. Walton of Concordia, W. H. Pipes of East Feliciana, A. A. Gunby of Ouachita, F. W. Price of Jackson, R. T. Beauregard of

---

54 Pendleton King to David Boyd, April 8, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Governor Louis A. Wiltz to David Boyd, February 20, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 12.
A few days after Governor Wiltz appointed his new Board, David exercised a power granted to him by its predecessor. He asked the War Department to recall Lieutenant Jamar and replace him with another officer. He also asked General Sherman to do what he could to "effect the change." Sherman agreed, but the order instructing Lieutenant Jamar to rejoin his regiment in New Mexico did not reach Baton Rouge until June 27, 1880. Unfortunately for David, the first meeting of the Wiltz Board occurred the next day. In Tom Boyd's opinion, Jamar's recall had more to do with its subsequent decision to fire David "than any of the reasons afterwards alleged."  

Vice-President Leon Jastremski called the new Board to order at 12 o'clock Monday, June 28, 1880. Besides Jastremski and David, only Messrs. Fay, Walton, Dolhonde, Fay, Walton, Dolhonde,

55David Boyd to Tom Boyd, undated, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, May 18, 1880; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 341.

56Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; William T. Sherman to David Boyd, May 27, 1880, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
Graham and Gunby answered the roll. No test of strength occurred that day. The Board simply appointed two committees and charged them to report the next day on the University's past and current financial condition. A third committee to consider the "state of the college" was also created just before adjournment. David's opposition increased on Tuesday when W. H. Pipes arrived to take his seat.

Dolhonnde of Orleans moved that the Board request General Sherman "to revoke the order requiring Lieut. Jamar to join his regiment." Jastremski, Fay, Walton and Pipes supported Dolhonnde. David, Graham and Gunby voted "nay." After appointing more committees and inviting the faculty to attend a session of the Committee on the State of the College, the Board adjourned until Wednesday at 10 o'clock.57

By the time the Board convened for its third session, each side had added one vote. R. T. Beauregard of Plaquemines, a son of Louisiana's illustrious hero, P. G. T. Beauregard, gave the majority faction six votes and Will Strong of Winn Parish increased David's strength to four. The Committee on the State of the College, having met during the morning with the faculty, presented a resolution calling

---

57 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 28, 29, 1880; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, July 6, 1880.
for the appointment of a committee to prepare "a system of rules and regulations for the college." The Board accepted the resolution and adopted a report from the Committee on the Present Financial Condition of the College. It also granted David more time to prepare a detailed financial statement requested by the Permanent Committee on Finance. If necessary, he could submit it after the Board's final adjournment, but he was urged to act as quickly as possible. After some minor business the Board recessed until the following afternoon.

David still had four votes and his opponents six when the Board resumed at one p.m. on Thursday, July 1. But a change had clearly taken place. The official minutes, succinct as they are, reflect a quickened pace in the Board's deliberations and a more hostile attitude toward David on the part of the majority. The members began by inspecting the University building. When they reassembled they voted to expend $1,200 to set up a department of "practical" mechanics. They appropriated another $1,200 for an experimental farm to be conducted by an "experienced agriculturalist," and they adopted a financial report prepared by Jastremski, Dolhonde, Beauregard, and Fay, which labeled the existing system of making disbursements as "very bad"
and "not businesslike." Next, the members received a telegram forwarded to them by the acting governor, S. D. McEnery. Signed by the adjutant general of the United States, the message stated:

The Secretary of War directs me to inform you that Lieut. Jamar was relieved from duty at Louisiana University on application of its President, acting for Board of Supervisors of University, on recommendation of General Sherman, who desired Lieut. Jamar to accompany his regiment to the field.  

Finally, Colonel George Walton of Concordia presented a resolution which must have stunned David and his partisans. After accusing him of gross mismanagement, it called for a complete reorganization of the University, vacated every existing position, and urged the immediate election of a new president, secretary and treasurer. Professorships could be filled later when the Board met in August. David's friends tried to refer the motion to a subcommittee but they did not have the votes. Shortly thereafter the Board recessed until eight o'clock that evening.

---

58 R. C. Drum, Adjutant General of the United States, to S. D. McEnery, Acting Governor, telegram, June 29, 1880, printed in Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, July 6, 1880; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 1, 1880.

59 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 1, 1880.
When the Board resumed operations, it invited two professors, the acting commandant, three cadets and one ex-cadet to testify. According to undated notes made later, David asked for their presence in "order to ascertain the cause of the great falling off in cadets," which Walton's resolution attributed to his mismanagement. David thought he, too, would have an opportunity of being heard on the subject "but no such privilege was granted." Although he was asked some questions "incidentally," it was "not part of the majority's program" to let him offer a defense. In fact, David charged, a member told him later that the majority would have preferred him to be absent. Exactly what the witnesses said was not recorded, but it must have been absorbing. The session did not adjourn until one o'clock Friday morning. 60

Friday, July 2, 1880, was Commencement Day at the

60Ibid., night session, July 1, 1880; David Boyd notes, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1880, Box 2. The notes, obviously dictated by David, but written in Tom Boyd's hand, replied to an editorial by Editor Leon Jastremski in the Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, July 13, 1880, David often composed letters to editors which friends signed and submitted for publication. These notes may have been made for that purpose. However, no letter based on them seems to have been printed; at least, it did not appear in the Capitolian during July or August of 1880.
University. When the Board convened for its fifth and final session, everyone was present except David and G. Mason Graham. Graham was ill, and David, who had to prepare for Commencement ceremonies, was excused "on account of business." Walton called up his resolution to reorganize the University. Again Gunby and Strong sought to have it referred to a committee and again the majority voted them down. Then Gunby tried another tack. He moved that the resolution be tabled until August, when a "full meeting" could consider the proposal. That too was defeated by a strictly partisan vote. Meanwhile, a note arrived from G. Mason Graham. He explained his absence and protested against the Walton resolution. The majority acknowledged receipt of his note, but refused his request that its contents be "spread upon the minutes." At that point Gunby and Strong rose. The "character" of Walton's resolution and the circumstances under which it was being considered were "so extraordinary," they charged, that they "could not sanction same" by their presence. They withdrew, reserving the right to file a protest later with the secretary.

The remaining six members proceeded to adopt Walton's reorganization resolution, whereupon he proposed two more. First, he urged the governor to apply at once to
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the "proper authorities" for a cancellation of Lieutenant Jamar's orders. Next, he moved to condemn the action of Graham, Gunby and Strong. In refusing to act with the Board, Walton declared, they were "setting a dangerous precedent, one calculated to bring about discord and cause irreparable injury to this Institution." Finally, Dolhonde moved to elect a president, secretary and treasurer. W. H. Goodale kept his post as secretary. Harney Skolfield, whom Tom Boyd described as a "ring Demo. politician," replaced "old Col. Markham" as treasurer, and Samuel H. Lockett, one of David's closest friends, won unanimous election to the presidency. Only one thing could save David now, the University charter. Section eight of the merger law allowed as few as five members to transact University business. But such transactions had to be reviewed by at least eight members before they became binding. Therefore, by withdrawing from the final session on Friday, July 2, Graham, Gunby and Strong guaranteed David more time and a chance to be heard when the Board convened on August 4.

For the next four weeks the Board members and the

61 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 2, 1880; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, July 6, 1880; Louisiana Acts, 1877, p. 18-19; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880.
partisans of each faction filled the public prints with protests and petitions. Almost every issue of Leon Jastremski's *Tri-Weekly Capitolian* contained editorials and letters relative to the reorganization of the University and the removal of David Boyd. On July 13 Jastremski printed the letters of protest and explanation submitted by Gunby, Graham and Strong when they withdrew from the July 2 session of the Board. In general, they concurred on three points. First, the men who met in July composed a newly appointed Board meeting for the first time; they could not possibly learn enough about University affairs in five short sessions to act wisely. Second, to vacate all offices without notice and, more important, without providing those removed with an opportunity to be heard, was unprecedented and certainly unfair. When Gunby and Strong tried to delay action by referring Walton's proposal to committee or postponing it until the August meeting, they were voted down by the opposition. Worse still, Strong pointed out, "It was generally stated in arguments by the advocates of the resolution that its sole object was the displacement of Col. Boyd." Third, only a bare quorum participated in the actions which Gunby, Graham and Strong condemned in their letters of protest. It was unfair to the absent
members, as well as the alumni and friends of the institution, to act without warning and even worse to proceed immediately to the election of a new president. "I am satisfied," Will Strong concluded, "that they, the absent members, like myself, never dreamed of this change until the introduction of the resolution by Mr. Walton."  

Editor Jastremski proved more than equal to the task of defending the majority. The letters of Gunby, Graham and Strong were preceded by a lengthy introduction which, in the editor's words, "will not attempt to answer the complaints" of the minority. However, it did castigate them for "their refusal to submit to the action of the majority" and their "very unparliamentary course of breaking a full quorum." It also claimed that four days of listening to the minority's arguments, explanations from Colonel Boyd, and testimony from faculty and cadets convinced the majority of the University's "completely unsuccessful management" which only a "thorough re-organization" could correct. As for delaying action until August, Jastremski thought that "ample time" had been granted to David and those who considered him "indispensable" to  

---

62 Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, July 13, 1880.
present their arguments. Without "prejudice or favor" toward anyone, therefore, the majority proceeded to act at once.63

On July 20, 1880, Jastremski devoted the entire front page of his paper to the University struggle. Only five days earlier a group of alumni in New Orleans published a protest against the majority, calling on ex-cadets and people all over the state to correct the "gross injustice" done to "the man who signed our diplomas." They also reminded Governor Wiltz that the existing Board had only two "titled graduates" among its members whereas the charter required three. The protest must have stung Jastremski. After reprinting it, he devoted the rest of the page to his rebuttal. In publishing the Board's minutes on July 6, Vice-President Jastremski thought he had provided plenty of evidence to support the action taken by the majority on July 2. He and the other members who voted to reorganize the University and remove David had no desire "to expose in detail the many causes" which led to their action. Nor had they expected anyone to charge that they acted without sufficient grounds. But the alumni protest, from graduates of the "defunct" University, whose

63 Ibid.
"very name in this community is synonomous with stupendous failure," demanded a reply. It was not David or the state which maintained the protesting graduates when they were cadets; it was the trades people of Baton Rouge. They were still unpaid and, as far as Jastremski knew, no serious effort existed by the state or the alumni to come to their relief. Instead, the protesters turned "the voice of condemnation" upon the majority who sought to keep the school from "total ruin." Jastremski did not believe David capable of "doing a dishonest act," but he was convinced that he lacked those "peculiar qualifications" necessary to manage what was meant to be a "great free institution of learning."

The editor offered several specific reasons for his conviction. Six weeks elapsed between the time Governor Wiltz appointed the new Board and the date set for its first meeting. Yet in that time David failed to prepare a detailed financial statement, which he must have known he would be asked to supply. "This," commented Jastremski, "when the professors were unpaid for two months and by his own rough estimate some eight thousand dollars additional were due on the account of the maintenance fund." The editor also wanted to know why funds legally authorized only
for salaries had been spent for books, furniture and remodeling the building. The amount, over $5,000, would have paid the professor's salaries. Besides, of what use were repairs on the Asylum building if the Barracks property, as requested, was made available to the University by the United States government? Other evidence of bad financial practice included David's failure to hire a clerk for bookkeeping duties when the Board specifically ordered it in October, 1879. At the same meeting the Board insisted that in the future David extend no credit to cadets for uniforms, fees and board. Yet at the July meeting he presented a bill of $10,000 owed by cadets for the year 1879-80. "That too," Jastremski noted, "when the fact appears that over two-thirds of those who have entered the college during the year, have left it."

Nor were the six supervisors who voted for David's removal the only critics of his administration. Vice-President Jastremski pointed out that while some of the cadets interviewed "expressed satisfaction" with David's policies, others "were outspoken the other way." Cadet Gilmore of Shreveport, for example, thought David imposed the rules somewhat erratically. What went unnoticed one day might be punished severely next week. Every cadet
interviewed complained about the food, and some thought
David had too much power and exercised it arbitrarily.
Other complaints concerned the departure of Professors
McCulloch and Haislip, the recall of Lieutenant Jamar, the
absence from duty of other professors whom David sent to
New Orleans to work against the Leake bill, and David's
practice of consulting with the faculty "only when it
suited his pleasure." "In a word," Jastremski concluded,
"it was clearly shown to the Supervisors that he was the
ruler of everything." The "old" Board was partly to blame
for giving him so much power, but clearly he did not object
to assuming responsibility. For instance, when they author-
orized him to ask for Lieutenant Jamar's removal he subse-
quently did so without giving Jamar a trial and without
presenting, when asked, any charges against him to the
Board. "So much," Jastremski declared, "for the complaint
of the Alumni, that Col. Boyd was himself removed without a
hearing."

Editor Jastremski did not deny that David had
worked to "keep up" the University. But how had he done it?
He saved "the wreck of the old bankrupt University" by
"breaking up" the Agricultural and Mechanical College and
adding its "large" endowment to the University's
"insufficient one . . . without which . . . the University would undoubtedly have been among the things that were."

Since consolidation, nothing had been accomplished in the "agricultural and mechanical branches" to justify acquisition of the agricultural fund. The University was still "riddled with new liabilities" and steadily losing enrollment. What, Jastremski demanded, had become of the "great Free University" which Louisianians had expected to spread learning and "cultivation" throughout the commonwealth? Who could deny that so far such hopes were no more than a "delusive dream?"

Under the circumstances, Jastremski declared, "six practical men, having the interest of the State at heart," could come to only one conclusion: David Boyd, the "unfortunate General," had to be replaced. Furthermore, it had to be done at once so that confidence in the school's future could be restored. The protesting alumni seemed to forget that men were appointed to the Board "solely for the purpose of guarding the interests of the State, . . . not to consider the personal merits or claims of any individual." Therefore he noted "with sorrow" the acting governor's recent appointment to the Board of H. L. Edwards, the man whose name led the list of alumni protestors. Obviously
Edwards had "prejudged" the case; he could hardly be expected to act "without bias" when the Board reconsidered its action at the August meeting.64

The same issue of the Capitoline which carried the alumni protest and Jastremski's rebuttal also contained a defense of David by his friend William Seay, editor of the Shreveport Standard. Seay noted that the majority, after vacating all professorships, filled only one: David's. "It is difficult to discover," Seay sneered, "which is the most prominent feature of this small piece of business, its malignity or its stupidity." Because only six men acted, their work was "a nullity." Besides, no one but a group who had "bitten themselves mad" would replace David with his best friend. Lockett would "suffer his right hand to be palsied" before he would become a party to "such nefarious work."65

Finally, when a group of former cadets signed a petition disputing Vice-President Jastremski's account of the

---

64 Ibid., July 20, 1880. An article by Col. George Walton, making essentially the same points as Jastremski's, appeared in the Tri-Weekly Capitoline for July 24, 1880.

65 William Seay, Editor of Shreveport Standard, quoted in ibid., July 20, 1880.
University's financial condition, the *Capitolian*'s editor resorted to ridicule. Petitions were so commonplace, Jastremski remarked, that he knew of one intelligent man who put his signature to a document calling for his own hanging. Besides, the majority of those who signed the most recent petition were only "mere youths." Members of the Board were not likely to accept their evaluation of David's administration in preference to their own. In any case, if the Board was to be "dictated to" by ex-cadets and outsiders, the sooner it broke up and left the entire management of the University to the president, the better it would be for everybody, especially the president.  

While the newspaper war raged, David and his partisans were not idle. G. Mason Graham learned of a Supreme Court decision involving New Orleans flour inspectors which he thought might apply to the University Board. In that case the court held that appointments to vacancies which occurred prior to legislative adjournment had to be confirmed by the Senate in order to become effective. Therefore, if adoption of the new constitution gave Governor Wiltz the right to appoint a completely new University

Board, he should have named it and had it confirmed before the senate adjourned in April, 1880. But he did not act until the middle of May. The new Board was not confirmed, nor, if the flour inspector case were applicable, could its acts be considered legal.

Lieutenant Governor McEnery was acting for Governor Wiltz in July, 1880, when General Graham learned of the Supreme Court's decision. Graham wrote to him about it, asking him to invite the ten "ousted" members of the old Board to attend the Wiltz Board's meeting scheduled for August 4. Then he sent David a copy of his letter to the governor. If McEnery did not act, Graham told David, some of the old members ought to go to court. Meanwhile, they must do everything in their power to make sure all of their friends on the new Board attended the August meeting. Their six opponents would certainly be there and they would not let David vote. 67

Governor McEnery did not act, nor did all of David's friends attend the August meeting. However, several members of the old Board did institute a suit. Ironically,

one of them, W. B. Egan, was attorney general in the Wiltz administration and his brother, Dr. J. C. Egan, was a member of the new Board against which the suit was brought. Even more interesting, Attorney General Egan served as one of the attorneys for the old Board when the case went to court. And W. C. Goodale, appointed secretary by the new Board at its meeting in July, joined several others as counsel for the defense. One can only speculate as to what constituted a conflict of interest in the legal ethics of that day.68

The Board met as scheduled on August 4, 1880. As General Graham expected, the six who voted to remove David in July, Jastremski, Fay, Walton, Beauregard, Pipes, and Dolhonde, attended en masse. David's partisans did not. Graham, Gunby, Strong and Price participated but Dr. J. C. Egan and David himself did not appear. Two new men, named since the July meeting to replace two who had resigned, also took their seats. H. L. Edwards, an alumnus, joined David's faction, giving it a total of five votes, and E. C. Payne joined the opposition, increasing its strength to seven. Lieutenant Governor S. D. McEnery presided in the

68Dr. J. C. Egan to David Boyd, July 24, 1880, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 343.
absence of Governor Wiltz who was ill in Colorado.

McEnery showed the Board a letter from Attorney General W. B. Egan announcing his intention to seek an injunction against those members of the new Board whose appointments had not been confirmed by the senate. He sought to keep the new Board from acting in any way until the old Board could test its legality in the courts. Egan directed his assistant, Andrew Herron of Baton Rouge, to secure the injunction from Judge H. Newton Sherburne of the Seventeenth District Court, but Herron was too late. By the time he reached Sherburne, then twenty-five miles away from Baton Rouge, the Jastremski faction had already contacted him through A. C. Calhoun, a mathematics instructor at the University. Sherburne refused to grant the injunction, but before hearing of his decision, the Board, on motions by Jastremski and Walton, moved to employ counsel for defense against the old Board's pending suit and to bond itself in case Herron did return with the injunction. Thus the new Board could act while the question of its legality was still before the courts. To no one's surprise, both motions passed on strictly partisan votes.69

69 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, August 4, 1880; Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 343.
Other actions of the Board during its August meeting were equally predictable. After a few efforts to distinguish between the words "approve" and "ratify," the Board voted, again along partisan lines, to "ratify" the Walton resolution to reorganize the University. Other business included the appointment of several professors and the adoption of new regulations concerned with the boarding and lodging of cadets. The University presidency, which David would hold until October 1, 1880, also came before the Board. Colonel Samuel Lockett, chosen to fill it by unanimous vote in July, declined the honor "for personal and private considerations." The Board thereupon opened communications with William Preston Johnston, the son of General A. S. Johnston. A graduate of Yale University, William Preston Johnston served on Jefferson Davis's personal staff during the war. Later he taught English literature for several years at Washington College in Lexington, Virginia. In 1878 he published a biography of his famous father, which, together with Louisiana family connections, brought him to the University Board's attention in 1880. Meanwhile, Vice-President Jastremski moved that J. W. Nicholson, the mathematics professor, be notified to come at once to Baton Rouge. There he was to perform whatever
duties David found "too onerous" to perform himself.

Jastremski was clearly annoyed with David. For one thing, the ousted treasurer, William Markham, refused to surrender University books and papers to his replacement, Harney Skolfield. For another, David failed to furnish the Permanent Committee on Finance, of which Jastremski was chairman, the information it had been asking for since the previous July. On August 6, therefore, Jastremski presented a resolution which would have made J. W. Nicholson temporary president of the faculty. David had abandoned his responsibilities, Jastremski charged, by boycotting Board meetings, by failing to submit reports to the Finance Committee, and by questioning the Board's validity in the courts. David's friends blocked Jastremski's efforts to replace him as president. However, another proposal sponsored by the vice-president severely curtailed David's powers by awarding control over the University boarding department to a committee of the Board of Supervisors. After some additional haggling which followed partisan lines, the Board adjourned until October, 1880.70

70 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, August 4, 5, 6, October 4, 5, 1880; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, August 5, 10, October 5, 1880; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 381-82; Arthur Marvin Shaw, William Preston Johnston;
A few days after adjournment Jastremski commented on the Board session in his newspaper. Despite the "bitter denunciations" leveled against him and his colleagues in July, Jastremski declared, the course they charted then had been "duly sustained" by a vote of seven to five in August. He praised the majority for its "conscientious attention" to the school's interests, recounted what steps had been taken to reform the organization, fees and faculty of the institution, and announced that henceforth all fees would be payable in advance. All that remained, Jastremski concluded, was for the citizenry to give the new administration a "fair trial."  

In the most literal sense the new administration was already on trial. G. Mason Graham, W. B. Egan, T. L. Grimes, J. G. Deslattes, M. A. Strickland, J. L. Brent, R. A. Ryland, and David Boyd, all members of the old Board, brought suit against Jastremski and his colleagues on the new Board sometime during July, 1880. Their action, designed to test the new Board's legality, was still pending  

*A Transitional Figure of the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1943), 157, 161-62.  

in the Seventeenth District Court when Attorney General Egan sought his injunction in August. As already described, Judge H. Newton Sherburne refused to grant the injunction. Sometime later he also upheld the legality of the new Board, whereupon Graham and the other members of the old Board appealed to the Supreme Court. 72

Meanwhile, David still thought of himself as president of the University. Others disagreed. The St. Bernard Eagle, quoted in Leon Jastremski's paper on August 19, 1880, referred to David as "ex-pres. Boyd" and speculated about his successor. "It is rumored," remarked the Eagle, "that the Board will reassemble at an early date for the purpose of nominating a president ... and the name of R. S. McCulloch and the talented son of the revered Gen. Albert Sidney Johnson [sic] are prominently mentioned." 73 Speaking for itself, the Capitolian had a "preference" for R. S. McCulloch, but it would "be very gratified" if the Board decided instead on ex-Governor Francis T. Nicholls.

72 Tom Boyd Diary, September 29, 1880; Brief of appeal to the Supreme Court of Louisiana by G. Mason Graham, et al. versus Leon Jastremski, et al., undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1880-88, Box 20.

73 St. Bernard Eagle, undated, quoted in Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, August 19, 1880.
"This," declared Jastremski, "would be hailed with universal approbation."74

The Board convened on October 4, 1880, for its regular fall session. Only one man, H. L. Edwards, represented David's faction. The others present included Vice-President Leon Jastremski, Superintendent of Public Education E. H. Fay, and members Walton, Pipes, and Dolhonde. Governor Wiltz presided. Walton moved that the Board invite "Mr. D. F. Boyd" to appear before it in order that he might state his grievances, "with the view of having same removed if possible." The Board assured "Mr. Boyd" that his appearance would not constitute any recognition by him of the Board's legality. David accepted the invitation, but no meeting of minds seems to have occurred.

74Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, September 2, 1880. Considering that Nicholls represented a potential obstacle in Lieutenant Governor McEnery's political path to the governor's office, and that McEnery and Jastremski were bosom friends, the Capitolian's editor may have been trying to "kick Nicholls upstairs." McEnery, Wiltz and Burke made common cause in 1879 to lop one year off Nicholl's term which probably offended the latter. Wiltz died in 1881 and McEnery ran for governor in his own right in 1884. Four years later he sought the Democratic nomination again, but Nicholls put together a "reform" coalition which managed to defeat McEnery's bid in the party convention. However, to keep McEnery from using his strength against him in the general election, Nicholls had to promise the outgoing McEnery an appointment to the state Supreme Court. Hair, "Agrarian Protest in Louisiana," 200-206.
On the following day the Board authorized Vice-President Jastremski to take legal action against William Markham, the ex-treasurer, and A. W. Rountree, a member of the old Board. Both had refused to surrender their books to the new administration. As for David, another resolution declared:

Whereas Col. D. F. Boyd, the late Pres. of this institution is now functus officio out of office by resolution of this Board and not withstanding, refuses to recognize this Bd. . . . and neglects to turn over to said Board the property belonging to said institution, therefore be it resolved that the Vice Pres., Leon Jastremski is fully authorized to make an amicable demand upon Boyd for the rendition of his accounts as President and to demand the turn over of all property of the Institution and to further demand that Boyd cease & desist from obstructing the Bd. . . . And in the event of refusal by Boyd to accede in whole or in part, then Leon Jastremski is authorized to take any legal action necessary . . .

Besides authorizing legal action to compel recognition of its authority, the new Board elected a president to succeed David. On the first two ballots the Board gave three votes to William Preston Johnston, two to Dabney H.

---

75 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 5, 1880. Jastremski's power in the Board had increased by October, 1880. In the August session he tried to have his friend, Dr. L. F. Reynaud, named University surgeon and professor of anatomy. Instead, the Board retained the incumbent, Dr. J. W. Dupree, a friend of David's. But in October, Jastremski moved and the Board approved the temporary discontinuance of the professorship of anatomy and the salary that went with it.
Maury, and one to David Boyd. On the third, however, H. L. Edwards cast a blank ballot, and Johnston defeated Maury four to one. Notified by telegram, Johnston accepted the position at once. Tom Boyd and S. M. Robertson, whom David had nominated as "acting professors" in September, were also appointed to the faculty by the Board. A. A. Gunby registered shock when he learned they intended to serve the new administration. "I was much surprised," he wrote David, "at the course pursued by S. M. Robertson & T. D. Boyd in accepting positions from your destroyers. There is something in my constitution or environment that precludes me from shaking hands 'across & bloody chasm.'"76

David, however, was not a "vengeful" man. He advised Robertson and Tom to ask the new Board for jobs and although he declared his intention to act as president until prevented "by legal process," he did not balk when Vice-President Jastremski obtained a court order to accomplish that very end. On October 7, 1880, Judge H. N. Sherburne enjoined David from interfering in any way with

76Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, August 4, 5, 1880; David Boyd to Thomas Boyd, September 30, 1880, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; A. A. Gunby to D. F. Boyd, October 17, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
the Board of Supervisors and its management of the University. David acquiesced. Pending the outcome of the old Board's appeal to the Supreme Court, David did everything he could to encourage good order among the cadets and to organize the University's accounts in case the appeal proved unsuccessful. If he had not, Tom Boyd commented, few cadets would have been present to greet President Johnston when he arrived in November. 77

The Louisiana Supreme Court heard the old Board's appeal sometime during the winter of 1880-81. Instead of rendering a verdict, it dismissed the case on a technicality. Because the case involved a contest for public office to which "no salary or pecuniary perquisite" was attached, the Court refused to exercise jurisdiction. For David and his family, a "pecuniary interest" certainly was involved. They were so poor late in 1880 that David could not afford fare to New Orleans to hear the case argued. Then, as if his cup were not bitter enough, David learned from General Sherman that Lieutenant M. F. Jamar had been reassigned to

77Tom Boyd Diary, November 22, 1885; G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, October 4/7, 1880, in Fleming Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1873-90, Box 2; Judge H. N. Sherburne, Injunction against David Boyd, October 7, 1880, ibid.
the University at the request of Governor Wiltz and the Board of Supervisors. In January, 1881, Jamar arrived to resume his duties as instructor of military tactics. This time, however, he also became commandant, the post David fought so hard to deny him over a year before. In what amounted to a letter of condolence General Sherman exhorted David to leave Louisiana. He had hoped, when the war ended, that Louisiana would "shake off the shackles of party" and rise to the dignity of a "modern state." But it had not happened. Would David "still cling to the wreck and go down with it?" Sherman hoped not. "Look over the new census tables," he urged David, "and see where flows the strongest part of new life. Get into it [the current] and keep in it, and it may [yet] land you and yours in a better place. You can hardly get into a worse."78

78 Mary Bell Huff, "A Legal History of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College" (unpublished M. A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1935), 63; Tom Boyd Diary, November 22, 1885; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 344; David Boyd to J. D. Kenton, November 27, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; W. T. Sherman to David Boyd, telegram, November 23, 1880, ibid., Box 10; W. T. Sherman to D. F. Boyd, December 2, 1880, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.
The long and bitter struggle waged in the spring and summer of 1880 was by no means the first battle David had fought. But it was the most intense and it ended in his defeat. It also revealed in stark outlines some of the more striking aspects of his personality. First and foremost, David was a man incapable of guile, dissimulation, circumspection and even tact. If any quality in his character stood out above all others, it was his almost obsessive need to express what he regarded as the truth. This trait, coupled with his capacity for invective and sarcasm, managed to win him many enemies during his long career. But if he detected anything corrupt, dishonest or self-serving in the action of anyone, particularly if it might bring harm to the University, nothing could stop him from pointing it out. As Professor Nicholson put it years later, David was not an "artful planner." When he thought he was right, he forged ahead, "little thinking of or caring for the exposure of his plan to the enemy, and little calculating how much might be gained . . . by 'going around a mountain rather than through it.'"\footnote{Col. J. W. Nicholson, Remarks on the first anniversary of David Boyd's death, May 27, 1900, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 16.}
Under the circumstances it is just as well that David did not shrink from combat or controversy. He did issue and receive several challenges during the course of his career, although none ever went beyond the letter-writing stage. As for controversy, his friends thought he could not exist happily without it. Colonel Lockett once accused him of getting into battles just to see if he could win, and David himself thought he did his best work when under attack. But even when his fights were deadly serious, David did not bear a grudge. McCulloch and Jamar, for example, later became his friends, and at least one Board member who voted to fire him in 1880 later admitted his regret.80

Just as prominent in David's character as his devotion to the truth and his need to tell it was his highly developed sense of duty. Duty, David taught his students, was the most noble word in the language. It was the most valuable quality they could develop. If they learned nothing else in four years at the University, their education would be worth the cost. The boys did not always agree

80R. T. Beauregard to David Boyd, May 25, 1897, in Boyd (Thomas) Papers, 1897, Box 3.
while they were still undergraduates. But years later they appreciated David's training, and they loved and admired him for practising what he preached. The fact is that David set higher standards for himself than anyone else. His friends thought they were impossible. They remonstrated with him to leave the University when its survival seemed unlikely. But he would not "leave his post" until forced out as he was in 1880.

Other aspects of David's character which should be mentioned were his broadness of view, his inability to count costs and his impatience with those who would not or could not share his vision of what a University ought to be. As the merger law he composed indicates, David believed in educating the whole man: his mind, his body and his spirit. To that end he spent sizeable amounts on paintings, books, exhibits and experimental programs. David thought it was well worth the cost, but critics accused him of extravagance and bad judgment. None, however, could fault his honesty, whatever they thought of his administrative skills or his educational priorities.

David's inability to share power with his colleagues and to defer to his superiors is also worth noting. He was a strong personality who believed in strong executive
leadership in university organization. As a result, he made sure that his merger law incorporated provisions which limited professors to classroom teaching and allowed the president a free hand in shaping policy. No doubt General Sherman's ideas and David's own experience under an inactive Board convinced him that such a system worked best. But it is also true that David liked power for itself. He bragged about his willingness to assume the Board's responsibility when the institution's need seemed to require it, and he once refused to run a boarding school unless he could control it absolutely. By 1880, however, the Board was no longer inactive and many of David's colleagues had grown restive under one-man rule. Not only his enemies, but some of his friends, too, thought he should relinquish some of his powers to the rest of the faculty.

Finally, the very traits in David's character which enabled him to save the University after 1865 seemed to interfere with his ability to run it successfully in 1880. For fifteen years he battled doggedly and alone against every threat to the institution's existence. Nothing could distract him from his self-imposed mission. But by 1877 the major battles had been won. Native whites controlled the legislature; the agricultural fund guaranteed the
school a small but regular income, and David's proudest achievement, the act of merger, provided a legal foundation for the future development of a truly comprehensive University. What the school needed in 1880, therefore, was a competent manager, not a dedicated gladiator; someone who could operate within the meager budget and in harmony with an activist Board. Unfortunately, David could not accommodate to the changed conditions. He had run the University alone for so long that he could not accept a subordinate role gracefully. Worse, he mistrusted the motives of his critics, and he equated their efforts to check his authority with assaults on the institution itself. In sum, David identified so completely with the University that he could not distinguish between its existence and his own. Indeed, he had no existence separate from the University, and therein lies the tragedy. By 1880 the school could stand alone, but David could not. The rest of his life was mute testimony to that fact.
CHAPTER XI

EXILE

On February 5, 1881, David Boyd formally surrendered most of the University property in his possession to the Board's vice-president, Leon Jastremski. With Jastremski's consent he kept certain account books until they could be "properly balanced." Jastremski then asked Governor Wiltz to convene a special session of the Board because several matters, including David's claims against the University, required action by the entire membership. On February 25 the Board assembled in New Orleans. By that time its treasurer, Harney Skolfield, had examined David's accounts, but not everyone was prepared to act on the basis of his report. Two members moved that the report, as well as the books and vouchers on which it was based, be submitted to the Finance Committee. Another wanted the Board to hire an "expert" to examine all the documents, and H. L. Edwards, one of David's partisans, insisted that David hire an expert of his own. David gave the Board a personal explanation of his accounts
on February 26, but it, too, failed to satisfy the cautious majority. Finally, the entire question was postponed until the April meeting, and David received an invitation to re-submit his claims at that time.¹

During the next few weeks David had his books examined by two accountants, S. L. Guyol of St. John Parish and George Henderson of Baton Rouge. Guyol had served as David's clerk before 1877 and was familiar with the University's business as well as David's methods of making entries in its books. After spending a week checking all financial records kept by David between October, 1877, and July, 1880, Guyol advised G. Mason Graham that every cent received and disbursed was "accounted for properly." Only one minor discrepancy appeared and it could be corrected easily if General Graham would submit the outstanding voucher. Guyol thought David's books spoke for themselves. "An experienced bookkeeper," he commented to Graham, "would not have used the same terms . . . or gone so much into detail, but the entries are nonetheless correct and show the same results they would have if kept by someone else."²

¹Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, February 25, 26, 1881.
²S. L. Guyol to G. Mason Graham, April 2, 1881, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8.
David begged Guyol to be present in Baton Rouge when the Board convened in April, but Guyol did not attend because he could not leave his business. He did, however, offer David some "fool's advice" after apologizing for his boldness. Guyol thought David should have all his books and papers ready for the Board's perusal even if he had to work all night. He should also remove all his private correspondence from the University files.

Bundle up your things and leave that bldg. as soon as your acct's are turned over . . . Never sacrifice yourself, your family and your friends for another public institution. You'll never get any thanks for it, you'll lose your friends and most people will call you a fool. You have done more for the University than any man will ever do-- . . . and where are you today? Kicked out like a dog!"

When the Board met in regular session on April 6, 1881, its own expert, Treasurer Harney Skolfield, verified Accountant Guyol's findings in every respect: David's books balanced except for the small discrepancy which occurred due to G. Mason Graham's failure to submit a travel voucher. Skolfield's report also indicated that the University's two principle funds were heavily indebted to David. Between November, 1878, and October, 1880, he had advanced about

3S. L. Guyol to David Boyd, April 2, 1881, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
$3,047 of his own money to cover what the Endowment Fund owed in employee wages, postage, freight bills, travel expenses for professors, library books, and laboratory equipment. David also had a claim of nearly $2,100 against the Cadet Maintenance Fund. That amount reflected money paid from his own funds to satisfy various creditors of the University.

After studying Treasurer Skolfield's report, the Finance Committee advised the Board not to pay some $900 of David's $3,047 claim against the Endowment Fund. That much, they argued, had been spent in excess of what the Board authorized or on items not provided for by the Board. The committee also found David's claim against the Maintenance Fund to be excessive. It recommended a reduction of over $600 in the $2,100 amount and even more if the Board considered David's expenditures on postage and telegrams too large. The committee did recommend the return of several pieces of furniture claimed by David and they did agree to pay him over $1,000 in salary owed to him but withheld until he surrendered his books. However, they refused to assume responsibility for a $1,300 personal note which David negotiated to pay for an expensive painting of Lee and Jackson. Known as the Julio painting, it had been
commissioned some years before on the understanding that it would be paid for by "friends" of the University. But the "friends" subscribed less than a third of its cost. To "save" it for the University, David gave the artist's agent his personal note for $1,300. When the Board fired him, he could no longer meet the payments, and the executor of the artist's estate began clamoring for the painting. David explained his position in a letter to the Board:

I would gladly pay the notes and let the picture remain in the University, but that seems impossible. So my last chance to save the picture for the school is a faint hope that your honorable body can in some way satisfy the executor's claim.  

But the members of the Finance Committee were unimpressed. They urged the Board to return the painting whenever its owners appeared to claim it. A few months later David somehow managed to retire the note and donate the Julio painting to the University. This time the Board was more receptive. On July 4, 1881, they accepted the painting for the school "with thanks."

With only two exceptions, everything recommended by

---

4David Boyd to Board of Supervisors, copy, April 4, 1881, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, Box 3; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 4, 1881; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, April 5, 1881.
the Finance Committee in April was approved by the Board. The full membership voted to repay David what he had advanced from his own funds to pay ex-professor Haislip's salary. And they reimbursed him for what he spent to lease a washhouse near the University. David rented the washhouse with his own funds when he found out it was being used for immoral purposes. The Finance Committee charged he acted without proper authority, but a bare majority of the Board thought he had done so in a good cause.  

David was not happy with the Board's disposition of his affairs at its April meeting. On May 14, 1881, he sent a letter to the alumni and ex-cadets of the University in which he reviewed the main points in "the recent so-called reorganization of the University." Its sole object, David charged, was to get rid of him, "nothing more, nothing less." This could only be done after a new Board, "without proper warrant of law," had been appointed by the governor and sustained by a judiciary which acted "so as to forfeit the respect of honorable members of the bar." But the instigators, David charged, were Lieutenant Jamar and his friends, some of the professors whose salary had been

---

5Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 5, July 4, 1881; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, April 5, 1881.
reduced, and the "little clique or ring" that wanted to run Baton Rouge for its own political aggrandizement. They could not admit the "real" reasons for his removal; therefore, they resorted to a series of "pretexts." They blamed him for letting enrollment decline from 179 to seventy during his last year as president, but failed to mention an outbreak of typhoid and the activity of certain professors as contributing factors in that decline. "But if I was a failure with 70 cadets on my roll," David asked the alumni, "what are they, this new Board, who have today but 38 cadets . . . boarding . . . and 18 day scholars from Baton Rouge? If I was a failure, can they be a success?"

As for the charge that his accounts were not up to date when called for in July, 1880, David argued that until his removal he did the work of "three or four officers with the pay of only one." The new Board, he noted, divided up what he used to do among several persons and "the new president keeps not a Book, nor makes a figure of account." Finally, to the accusation that he violated instructions by extending credit to cadets,

---

6David Boyd to the Alumni and Ex-Cadets of the University, May 14, 1881, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Louisiana State University Official Papers, 1873-90, Box 2.
David responded that if he "operated otherwise," many cadets could not have stayed in school. Besides, he pointed out, the new Board was guilty of the same "crime." In spite of its own rule requiring payment in advance, it found it necessary to extend credit to cadets from the beginning of its tenure in October, 1880.7

Even more indicative of David's dissatisfaction with the Board's proceedings at its April meeting was a letter he sent to the editor of the New Orleans Democrat on April 27, 1881. Because the Board had not published Harney Skolfield's report on the condition of his accounts, David thought it advisable to send the Democrat a copy, along with the letters and reports of the two other "experts," George Henderson and S. L. Guyol, on the same topic. All three, he pointed out, found his accounts to be correct. David also sent the Democrat's editor summaries of the assets and liabilities of the Endowment and Cadet Maintenance Funds. Both, he noted, showed credit balances. This, too, was not clear in the Board's published account of its April meeting. David had not attended that meeting, but "unofficially," he learned that several objections had been

7 Ibid.
raised to repaying him all the money he had spent from his own pocket in behalf of the University. If the Board ever informed him "officially" of the reasons for its objections, he might "deem it worthwhile to show the public, if not the new Board," that its objections were "not well founded." Meanwhile, what the Board did print about his claims, he considered misleading. In David's words:

A singular fatality has attended the published proceedings of this new Board of Supervisors in nearly everything relating to me. If anything, it would seem, could be omitted, or committed to the disadvantage, detriment or injury of me, such disparagement or misrepresentation was almost sure to be.°

David's struggle to have his presidency of the University evaluated fairly continued for months after his letter to the New Orleans Democrat. But by the spring of 1881 he had more compelling challenges to confront. He was unemployed and his wife was expecting their seventh child. How long he could continue to pay the twenty-five dollars a month for their rented house was a serious question. G. Mason Graham, custodian of the old Seminary property in Rapides, offered to let the Boyds live in one of the unoccupied professor's cottages on the Seminary grounds. But

°David Boyd to Editor, New Orleans Democrat, May 15, 1881, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook, 147.
the Board's decision in April, 1881, to pay part of
David's claim against the University, and a sheriff's sale
of a house from a bankrupt estate the following June kept
the family in Baton Rouge. David, however, had to go else-
where to find a job.\(^9\)

For a while David considered taking some kind of
work not related to education. A Louisiana congressman of-
ferred him a position as clerk of a congressional committee
concerned with leaves and other improvements planned for
the Mississippi River. Colonel Lockett thought he might

\(^9\)G. Mason Graham to David F. Boyd, March 11, 1881,
in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters,
1854-85, Box 6; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, June 25,
1881; David Boyd, Account Book entry, June 25, 1881; Ettie
Boyd to Mamie (Mary C.) Wright, August 6, 1881, in Boyd
(David F.) Papers, Box 15. Ettie's mother and sister, Mary
Wright, lived with the Boyds in the University building un-
til the family moved to rented quarters in late 1879 or
early 1880. Then the Wrights apparently returned to Cheney-
ville. Mrs. Wright, Ettie's mother, died in the summer of
1881 and Ettie asked her sister to come back to Baton Rouge
to live with her and the children. David was about to go
to Virginia. On August 4, 1881, Ettie explained to Mary
that one of three payments had been made on the house David
bought at the Sheriff's sale in June, 1881. If they could
not pay the others when they became due, they might have to
give the place up or sell whatever interest Ettie still re-
tained in the Wright family estate. "Any way we will make
a close shave to keep independent," she told her sister.
"I live pretty well sometimes and pretty badly sometimes."
Ettie Boyd to Mary C. Wright, August 4, 1881, in Wright
(Jesse D.) Papers, David F. Boyd Family Papers, Box 1.
better apply for an engineering job on the same project, but General Sherman advised him to avoid government employment altogether. "Everyone," he told David, came to Washington looking for a job and then barely managed to "eke out" a living. Besides, even those who found good positions often lost them four years later.10

Sherman's advice must have convinced David. By June, 1881, he was again looking for employment in the only area he knew: education. The presidency of the University of West Virginia was vacant and David, who learned of it rather late, made a serious effort to get the job. He asked several prominent people for letters of recommendation including Governor Louis Wiltz of Louisiana, General Sherman, and John Eaton of the United States Bureau of Education. But the Board of Trustees of West Virginia chose to retain the acting president, and David decided not to seek a vacant professorship there although Sherman and Colonel Lockett both thought he should.11

10 E. W. Robertson, Congressman, to D. F. Boyd, telegram, December 16, 1880, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; Col. S. H. Lockett to David F. Boyd, May 9, 1881, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 9; W. T. Sherman to David F. Boyd, May 13, 1881, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.

11 R. G. Ferguson to D. F. Boyd, May 31, 1881; Governor Louis A. Wiltz to Governor H. M. Matthews of West Virginia, June 2, 1881; John Eaton to David Boyd, June 4,
Instead, David carried out plans first drafted in 1876. He returned to Virginia to run a boarding school for boys preparing to enter the University of Virginia. On May 22, 1881, F. H. Smith of the Virginia Military Institute, informed him of facilities available in Madison County, Virginia. The property, Locust Dale Academy, was owned by a Mrs. Gordon whose husband operated it until his death a few months earlier. Gordon, a Yankee, ran Locust Dale successfully for thirty years according to R. J. Hancock, David's ex-pupil who lived in Albemarle County. Hancock was sure David could succeed there too. He knew the school through a friend and offered to visit it for David in an effort to get the best possible terms.

Sometime early in July, 1881, David decided to rent Locust Dale. Hancock was delighted. He urged David to hire the two men then teaching at the school. Both, he understood, had "good reputations" and would no doubt be able to convince most of the Virginia boys to remain. The mathematics instructor, Larkin Willis, had been at Locust Dale for eight years. He was eager to stay and David hired him

1881, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8; W. T. Sherman to D. F. Boyd, June 2, 1881, in Boyd-Sherman Letters; Col. S. H. Lockett to D. F. Boyd, June 2, 1881, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
by telegram. A few weeks later David issued a "prospectus" indicating that the other teacher, Philip Major, would also remain. In addition, James W. Kern, a graduate of the University of Virginia, and J. T. Bringier, an "élève" of Virginia Military Academy, would join the Locust Dale staff. Bringier, a Louisianian, formerly attended Louisiana State University and served as commandant there after Lieutenant Jamar refused the post in February, 1880.12

Lieutenant Jamar, incidentally, whose recall to active duty David had obtained in June, 1880, and whose return to Baton Rouge the Board managed to arrange six months later, received orders to leave the University again in July, 1881. The orders arrived while the Board was in regular session. Only the day before, President William Preston Johnston had praised Jamar in the most extravagant terms as practically indispensable to the University's good order. His recall, Tom Boyd noted, caused "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. But this time," Tom Boyd insisted, "Col. Boyd had nothing whatever to do with the

12F. H. Smith to D. F. Boyd, May 22, 1881, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, June 8, 30, July 7, 1881, ibid., Box 15; Larkin Willis to D. F. Boyd, July 12, 1881, ibid., Box 10; Prospectus of Locust Dale Academy, Session of 1881-82, ibid., Printed Items, Box 19.
matter, though of course, it was attributed solely to him."13

In August, 1881, David left Baton Rouge for Virginia where he stayed until the fall of 1883. During the first year his school operated at Locust Dale in Madison County. The following year he moved to Greenwood, only a few miles away from the University at Charlottesville. Neither location proved to be very successful, partly because David seemed incapable of making his patrons pay cash. Only a week after he went to Virginia General G. Mason Graham wrote: "I have but one piece of advice to volunteer to you.

13Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 1, 2, 1881; Tom Boyd Diary, November 22, 1885. A few months later ex-professor Pendleton King heard about Jamar's return to regular duty. He asked Tom if it were due to the expiration of Jamar's three year assignment at the University or "for having 'too much corn bread put up in a jug?'" Jamar was a heavy drinker and, as David put it, the "best retailer of dirty jokes in the Army." Years later he was dismissed from the army for drunkenness and the misappropriation of funds according to LeRoy Stafford Boyd, David's son. LeRoy seems never to have forgiven Jamar for his part in David's difficulties, but David did. He tried, unsuccessfully, to have Jamar reinstated by the army. In 1897 Jamar wrote David a long letter to explain his disgrace and to thank him for his efforts in his behalf. He also sent David a small memento taken from the bier of General Sherman in whose honor guard he served when the general died in 1891. Pendleton King to Tom Boyd, September 4, 1881, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; David Boyd to Alumni, May 14, 1888, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook; M. Jamar to D. F. Boyd, February 18, 1897, ibid., Box 8.
Let it be a Mede and Persian law to you that you credit
no one, no matter who, or where from. If you once deviate
from this rule, yr. balance will always be on the wrong
side of the sheet."14 But Graham's advice had little ef-
fect. Even before he left Baton Rouge, David advertised in
several Louisiana papers that he would educate a number of
Louisiana boyd "free on their promise to pay." It was pre-
cisely this sort of "indulgence" which the University Board
charged against David when it fired him in 1880 and which
his successor, William Preston Johnston, claimed to have
stopped when he reported to the Board in July, 1881.15

Operating his boarding school on a credit basis was
one reason for David's failure in Virginia; another was his
failure to stay on the job. A survey of his correspondence
between August, 1881, when he went to Virginia, and August,
1883, when he finally left, reveals that he was absent some
248 days out of 737. Even generous allowances for Christ-
mas holidays and summer vacations can not account for such

14 G. Mason Graham to David F. Boyd, August 16, 1881,
in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters,
1854-85, Box 6.

15 Ernest Wyche to David Boyd, August 17, 1881, in
Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Minutes of the Board of
Supervisors, July 1, 1881.
a poor record. The school closed only two weeks at Christmas, and Locust Dale offered a summer session in 1882 although David did not stay in Virginia to supervise it. Ultimately, strangers, relatives, and even David's closest friends in Virginia made reproving comments about his frequent trips away from the state. David's brother, Charlie Boyd, heard rumors far away in Wytheville. "Persons in that region near David's school," he reported to David, "are remarking a good deal upon your numerous absences . . . and are using it in a detrimental way."\(^{16}\)

R. J. Hancock, who often loaned David money to meet his commitments, was considerably more frank. After excusing himself on the grounds of friendship for "writing plainly," he criticized David for his numerous excursions to Louisiana in search of prospective students. "You complain of your Virginia patronage . . . But all the summer of 1882 you were in the South. . . . And all this time . . . other schoolmasters were working for life in Va." Instead of "canvassing" personally for new pupils from "Charleston to Galveston," Hancock thought David ought to cultivate Virginians. Outside the state he might better rely on

\(^{16}\)C. R. Boyd to David Boyd, January 29, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
newspaper advertising. "A short card in all these papers will not cost half as much as your travelling expenses . . . and would meet the eyes of 100,000 people--Don't you see?" implored Hancock. 17

David was aware that his many absences would alienate Virginians. But he was so convinced of his inability to compete with other preparatory schools for "Va. patronage" that he continued his frequent recruiting trips to the Pelican state. "I wd starve depending on Va.," he wrote Tom Boyd. However, his Louisiana patronage seems to have cost more to promote than it ever brought in. On September 22, 1881, David opened Locust Dale with thirty-five students. Only eleven came from Louisiana. By October forty-three boys were enrolled, but one Louisiana mother who visited the school took her son back home. David was sure it would "hurt" him in future efforts to recruit Louisiana boys. There were fifty students by December, 1881, but after the holiday the number dropped to forty-one and in April, 1882, the instructor whom David left in charge

17R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, November 3, 1882, ibid., Box 72/. In a postscript Hancock gave David some additional good advice: "Lastly, do not imagine that you can board and educate everybody free--But make them all pay up or leave. H."
when he went to Louisiana for a month wrote him that they were "losing students." By the end of the session, there were only thirty-five boys enrolled and twelve were day students from the immediate vicinity. How many of the twenty-three boarders came from Louisiana is not clear.

During the summer of 1882, David went to Louisiana again to search for new students and to borrow money while Tom Boyd conducted the summer session for him at Locust Dale. Rent and operating costs at Locust Dale convinced David even before he went south that he would have to move his school for the coming year. Therefore, about September 10, 1882, before the summer school at Locust Dale even ended, David transferred faculty and student body some thirty miles away to other facilities at Greenwood in Albemarle County, Virginia. 18

Expenses at Greenwood were considerably lower than they had been at Locust Dale, and because the new building

---

18 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 30, September 5, 22, October 12, December 9, 1881, August 12, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, Box 1; J. T. Bringier to D. F. Boyd, January 9, April 7, 1882; R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, May 31, 1882; T. D. Boyd to D. F. Boyd, September 5, 8, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Locust Dale Academy Roll Book, 1881-82, ibid., Manuscript Volumes; Catalog, Locust Dale Academy, August 1881, ibid., Printed Pamphlets, Box 20; Prospectus for Greenwood, 1882-83, ibid., Box 19.
lay only twenty feet from a railroad, the school was
certainly less isolated. But neither feature contributed
anything to David's coffers. When Greenwood opened in regu-
lar session on October 2, 1882, with only twenty boarders and
two day students, David wrote his brother in Baton Rouge,
"I am really in a bad fix. My school has opened poorly."
Two months later nothing had changed and he was making plans
for another recruiting trip to Louisiana. On December 2,
1882, he wrote Tom Boyd:

My situation here is very critical—indeed desparate.
And that with the horrible condition of my family in
La. makes me nearly desparate. . . . I must--ought--to
go to La. this month to try and get me more boys; yet
I don't see how I am to go, or if I get there, how I
am to get back shd I fail to get some boys down there.
And every dollar I spend travelling is but so much
food and clothes taken from my family.19

David did go to Louisiana where he remained until
late January, 1883. But little resulted from the trip. By
mid-February he thought he might have to close the school
before the session ended. If so, he wrote Tom, he would be
"ruined forever as a school man." R. J. Hancock, who thought
David was "too sanguine" one day and "too blue and despon-
dent" the next, tried to comfort him with good advice.

19David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 8, November 16,
December 2, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
He urged David to be patient and to cut expenses "to the bone" by reducing his staff. It would also help if David "quit trying to give $2/3$ of his students credit . . . .

There is no use to think about going crazy," Hancock remarked. "A man can go there when he cannot go anywhere else."20

If what Hancock said were true, David should have gone mad at once. It was the only trip he could well afford. Yet in April, 1883, he planned one more visit to Louisiana to borrow more money and to "pick up a stray boy or two." He could not raise a penny in Virginia and he did not expect a single boy from that state when his school re-opened in the fall of 1883. "I wd. rather be in China than in Va. without money," he wrote Tom Boyd bitterly. "Virginians are the meanest people on earth; they don't like me and I don't like them."21

By May 3, 1883, David was back at Greenwood, more disheartened than ever. The only "stray boys" he managed

20R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, November 3, 1882, February 12, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 10, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.

21David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 15, 16, 25, March 1, 19, 22, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
to bring back from Louisiana were his own sons, Jack, Arthur, and Leigh. Ettie, her sister Mary, and the four youngest children remained at the "Baptist Church," David's nickname for his strictly-run household in Baton Rouge. How long they could stay there depended on the patience of the man who held David's note. The second of three installments, over $1,800, fell due in July, 1832, but David's creditor allowed him to defer payment, except for interest, for several months. When he finally pressed for the principle, David asked Tom Boyd to find a buyer for the property. In June, 1883, Tom succeeded and David agreed to sell at whatever price "3 disinterested parties" might agree it was worth. If possible, David would be in Baton Rouge by July 1 and could handle the sale himself. But he expected to be so poor by the end of the session, "without a dollar and with bills to pay," that he was not sure he could even "get away" from Greenwood. Even if he did, his children would have to stay at the school with his assistant, J. T. Bringier, or go to their grandparents' home in Wytheville. In any case too few boys would remain at Greenwood during July and August to justify a summer session, and many from Louisiana would probably not be back the next fall. Even David's friends in nearby Charlottesville could not cheer
him up. They invited him to attend the University's gala commencement celebration in 1883, but under the circumstances, he confided to Tom Boyd, he had "no heart to go."22

In addition to his frequent absences from Virginia and his apparent incapacity to operate on a cash basis, David was guilty of something else which practically guaranteed his failure at Locust Dale and Greenwood. He simply did not care as much about Virginia and his preparatory school as he did about Louisiana and the State University. Common sense dictated that he commit himself totally to the affairs of the former and leave the conduct of the latter to his successor, William Preston Johnston. But David never really left Louisiana in spirit. Even when he was physically present at Locust Dale or Greenwood, his primary interest was 1,000 miles away in Baton Rouge.

David had not been in Virginia for two weeks when he began speculating on the University's prospects for the coming season. A drought and poor crops during the summer, he predicted, would limit enrollment in October, 1881.

22 Morning Report, May 3, 1883, Greenwood Academy, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, MS volumes; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 8, 1882, March 1, June 7, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
Furthermore, President William Preston Johnston's absence from the University in July, August, and September was also a mistake. "It shows," David wrote Tom Boyd, "that he either cares nothing for it, or is of no account." David was equally critical of some of the staff. Sam Robertson, he thought, "cares nothing for the school," and Professor McCulloch would probably never again contribute much "of any consequence." "I think," he ended gloomily, "your craft the University is a leaky vessel."  

Tom's failure to reply at once sharpened David's curiosity. On October 12, 1881, he complained that he had not received one letter "from home" since his departure a month earlier and he urged his brother to "write me soon all you know of La. and the University." A postscript was more specific: "What did the Bd. do? Did you have a full meeting? I see Gov. Wiltz is dying. Do you know where General Graham is? Is the railroad finished from Cheneyville . . . to Alex? . . . Where is Mr. McCulloch and how is he?"  

23 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 22, 1881, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1.  

24 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 12, 1881, ibid.
A few days later letters from Tom and David's wife and clippings from Leon Jastremski's newspaper, the Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, satisfied some of David's curiosity. But they stirred more questions and speculations than they laid to rest. One clipping suggested the possibility that Governor McEnery would call a special legislative session. If so, David wanted to be present when it opened. "I want my whole stewardship at the University reviewed and passed on," he informed Tom Boyd. If there were no extra session, and hence no special appropriation by the legislature, he did not see how the University could operate without continuing to divert money from the Endowment fund to the Maintenance fund, something David never did. "The new Board's record . . . ," he declared, "is . . . $5000 of endowment spent for bread and meat, and scarcely a dollar for the Library or apparatus! Belly versus brains is their motto!" Under the circumstances, David thought, any investigation of the University ought to "embrace the new regime as well as the old."

25 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 14, 1881, ibid.
December, 1831. However, because several vacancies existed on the Board of Supervisors, Tom urged David to come to New Orleans as soon as possible. "You might," he explained to his brother, "have non-partisan appointees who would be disposed to examine your accounts with impartiality." But David preferred to wait until a resolution ordering a joint committee to investigate the University passed the legislature. It would "look better," he thought, if he did not appear until the committee called him to testify. Then no one could accuse him of "beginning the war" against his opponents, and he would have a better chance to get a "fair hearing." Meanwhile, David was not without resources. His friend, William Seay of Shreveport, won a special election to fill a vacancy caused by the death of the representative from Caddo Parish. David asked him to manage his efforts for a fair hearing by the special session. But Seay answered that they might better wait until the regular session in May if David expected him to do a thorough job of "unmasking" the opposition. Since David planned to visit Louisiana for Christmas, they could discuss

---

26 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, November 6, 1831, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
strategy when he arrived.27

Other Louisiana friends agreed with Seay, and after some hesitation, David accepted his suggestion. He would have several months, therefore, to gather and prepare a strong case which Seay could then present to an investigating committee. In amassing data and making it available to Seay, David expected to rely heavily on his brother, Tom Boyd. Tom was still a professor at the University in 1881, but how long his job would last was uncertain. President William Preston Johnston suspected him of disloyalty and in October, 1881, Tom told David that he hoped to sever his connection with "Johnston and Co." at the end of the session. David suggested that he look for another job immediately and in late January, 1882, he offered him a position at Locust Dale. If the "authorities" at Baton Rouge would release him, David wrote, he wanted Tom in Virginia as soon as possible.

Weeks passed and Tom did not reply. Finally, on February 27, 1882, Tom sent a long letter of explanation.

27David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 10, 24, 1881, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1880-81, Box 1; Louisiana Tri-Weekly Capitolian, December 1, 1881; William Seay to David Boyd, November 22, 1881, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Related Papers, 1858-88, Box 4.
He began with apologies for his "no accountness" in not answering. Then he declined the Locust Dale job for two reasons: first, he did not think his "teaching methods" would succeed in Virginia and second, he thought it was "high time" for him to take a wife. He had been in love with Miss Annie Fuqua for five years and on March 15, 1882, they expected to marry. As for his future, Tom planned to stay at the University until he found another job unless the Board fired him when it met in July. Then, as an afterthought, he informed David of the birth of his seventh child, a son. "His arrival was unexpected," Tom remarked, "but Dupree (Dr.) does not think he came into the world before his time. . . . I congratulate you on being Boy(e)d again."28

Tom's decision to stay in Baton Rouge obviously hurt David. He conceded that from Tom's standpoint it was probably best not to join him at Locust Dale. "But . . . I thought you wished to get away from the University--; hence my telegram & letter." He reminded Tom that his "staying"

28Tom Boyd to David Boyd, February 27, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, October 29, 1881, ibid., Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, December 4, 9, 1881, February 4, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, Box 1.
in Baton Rouge was causing comment to the disadvantage of them both:

The public generally consider you as either indifferent or against me, in my affairs with that Board; and the "Ring" at Baton Rouge consider it secretly as a patronizing act towards you & me; and outwardly, in public, they will no doubt claim that their conduct to me cannot be so bad, if my own brother is willing to serve them!

David continued that if anything occurred to "draw" him away from Locust Dale, he might turn the school over to Tom. He reminded his brother that he hoped to run for the post of superintendent of public education in Louisiana. In that event he would have to leave Virginia and he had planned to give Tom, rather than someone else, whatever advantage his labors at Locust Dale had produced. Then, for two pages, David reproved his brother for even considering marriage. There was nothing wrong with Miss Fuqua. David remembered her as a "fine girl." But unless Tom were an exception to "any male member of the Boyd family," he was going to make a "mighty poor husband" and it was "wrong" and terribly unjust" for him to marry anyone. "Show me a single one of all our family ... who have not made their wives anything else but contented & happy."29

29 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, March 6, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
Long before he learned of Tom Boyd's prospective marriage and his decision to stay at the University, David planned to visit Louisiana. The trip, scheduled to coincide with Ettie's expected confinement in late March, had been announced to "several parties" in Baton Rouge and New Orleans. Therefore, although he would miss his brother's wedding, and "altho' Ettie's part of the program has been played a little too soon," David did not cancel the journey. On March 22, 1882, he left Locust Dale to spend a month in the Pelican State. Later he wrote William Seay a long letter dealing with conditions at the University. The Treasurer's Report in April, he charged, indicated a debt of $12,000 which the management disguised by diverting money from the Endowment Fund to the Maintenance Fund. No new books or equipment had been purchased, and many on the Board were disgusted with President Johnston, who, besides his $2,500 salary, received free rent, free board, free servants, and free feed for his horses. At the April Board meeting everything but his salary had been stopped and Johnston was "unhappy." These and other "points" David wanted Seay to present to the legislature when it met in May, but Seay must be careful not to do anything to injure the school's interest. David expected to be back in Baton
Rouge by June, but he would go earlier if summoned by the legislature. Meanwhile, Seay could get all the material he needed for David's case from Tom Boyd or Sam Robertson, the University commandant and the representative to the legislature from East Baton Rouge.30

On the same day that David offered Tom Boyd's services to Seay, Tom made it clear that he did not intend to wage a "Jamar-Haislip type of conspiracy" against President Johnston in spite of great provocation. At a recent faculty meeting Johnston had been so hostile to Tom that he considered resigning immediately. But Sam Robertson and C. C. Bird, a powerful local politician, dissuaded him. The trouble stemmed from Johnston's conviction that Tom was "making war" on him in David's behalf. Tom denied it. As far as he was concerned, the "Boyd Fight" was a dead issue and as much as he loved David, he would rather see him "clerking in a store than being president of LSU." Two weeks later Tom made his position even plainer. He had seen Seay, who wanted help in preparing David's request for a legislative inquiry. But Tom refused to discuss "Univ. matters" with him. "I am determined," he wrote David, "to

30Ibid.; David Boyd to Judge Wm. A. Seay, April 27, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
do nothing that would savor of disloyalty to the Board while I am one of its employees."31

Then Tom offered his older brother a detailed and somewhat detached lecture on the possible harm his demand for an investigation might cause the University and David himself. David had called for an inquiry into his administration only, not that of his successor. He trusted that President Johnston's "weak points" would be "exposed" when the Treasurer's Report was made public. Tom disagreed:

Either give up your investigation, or go into it with gloves off and let Johnston & Co. take care of the school. Either you have been wronged enough to demand a searching investigation, or you have not. If the former be true (and there seems to be no question about it), then you should push the investigation come what will; provided there is anything to be gained by it. Whether as complete a vindication by the Legislature as a Committee report could give, will be worth the time and trouble necessary to secure it, is a question which you have doubtless decided.

As for the University, Tom warned David that he would be "credited" with any "adverse action" the legislature might take against the school. "All your professions of friendship for the school will be disbelieved and all your

31 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, April 27, 1882, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alphabetical File, Box 7; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, May 10, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
efforts to help it misconstrued."32 What David thought of Tom's remarks about the proposed investigation is not recorded. But he did concede that it was "perhaps best" for Tom to remain aloof from his "troubles with the Board" as long as Tom was employed by the University. Later, when Tom failed to write him for several weeks while the legislature was in session, David urged him not to "carry that aloofness too far!"33

Meanwhile David conducted his campaign for vindication through the mails. On May 16, 1882, he sent Seay a detailed list of "points" to be used in his defense when the legislative investigation finally began. Much of it repeated, with more detail, the arguments offered in his defense when the Walton-Jastremski faction of the Board removed him in July, 1880. What was new in the closely-written eight pages of "memoranda" David sent Seay was the explanation of the part local politics had played in his removal.

In David's words:

The real cause of the Board's action against me was

\[1^2\] The opposition outside the University of men like

32 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, May 10, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.

33 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, May 15, June 8, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
Jackson, Garig, etc., who wanted the business of supplying the University. They began their war in the Fall of /79. The opposition inside the Faculty of McCulloch, Jamar, etc. . . .

Now add to those two causes this third and you have the true secret of the Board's action: Thompson Bird & his special friends wanted to get control of the University funds & its management for political purposes. Young Bird (Charlie) came to me some time before the appointment of the new Board, but when it was expected that the Board would be changed, and asked me to vote for Harney/ Skolfield for Treasurer to replace Wm Markham. I told him I cd not do so, much as I like Skolfield and much as I wd like to do anything I cd in reason to oblige his faction. Young Bird had all he cd do to induce Jastremski to turn against me at the last moment. Walton came down to the meeting my friend; but finding Baton Rouge howling against me, he went to what he thought the strong side. After the meeting Charlie Bird was frank enough (he is the best one of all of them) to say openly to me in the hearing of others, 'Well, Col., if you had only done what I asked you to do, this wd not have been: You wd have been President yet!'

David was also highly critical of Governor McEnery, who, he charged, intentionally violated the merger law by naming one member too many from Orleans Parish to the Board of Supervisors. David personally informed McEnery that his appointment of H. C. Payne in July, 1880, was not legal. But McEnery named him anyway, David told Seay, so that Payne could be present at the "critical August /80 meeting for the express purpose of throwing the scales against
On May 19, 1882, Seay presented David's petition to the House of Representatives asking for an investigation of the "management and affairs of the La. St. Univ. and Ag. & Mech College" by a joint committee of the legislature. Nine days later he wrote David that a resolution to that effect had passed the house and a "stacked committee of course" had been named by the speaker. David's friend, Dr. R. L. Luckett of Rapides was "managing" in the senate and would, "of course," be one of two senators named to the committee. Seay also reported that the men most anxious to include President Johnston's administration in the investigation were the men who "put him in," specifically C. C. Bird of Baton Rouge. But the resolution that finally passed covered only the years of David's tenure, 1865-80. On July 6, 1882, the last day of the legislative session, the joint committee submitted its reports. Three members, William Seay of the house, R. L. Luckett of the senate, and one

34 David Boyd, Memoranda for William Seay, May 16, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.

35 House Journal, Regular Session, 1882, p. 84. "It would not take much to make him apologize to you and proceed against J. [Johnston]," Seay remarked to David. William Seay to David Boyd, May 28, 1882, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11.
other, signed the majority report which David composed in every particular. Two representatives, A. L. Atkin and W. Vincent, presented a statement for the minority. In less than ten paragraphs, they found David to be a "good and efficient professor, but . . . a poor financier." One newspaper labeled the investigation "thorough and searching" and "fair and impartial." But considering the circumstances, a remark Tom Boyd made to his brother in May seemed more appropos in July: only David could decide whether the "vindication" he received from the joint committee was worth the "time and trouble necessary to secure it."36

By the time the joint legislative committee issued its report, David had been in Louisiana for almost three weeks. R. J. Hancock, his former pupil, loaned him the money to get there. He also signed a $250-note for David, whose checks by the summer of 1882 were being protested in both Virginia and Louisiana. Meanwhile, Tom Boyd was at Locust Dale conducting a summer school for his brother.

When the University Board of Supervisors met in July, it

36 House Journal, Regular Session, 1882, pp. 566-74; David F. Boyd, MS of Majority Report, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Selected Papers, Box 27; Claiborne Guardian (Homer, La.), July 26, 1882; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, May 10, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
reelected the entire faculty, including Tom, for the following session. His salary, however, was less than he earned the first year he taught, and considering President Johnston's hostility for him, he hesitated to accept the appointment. Because David's school would move to Greenwood in the fall, Tom could stay at Locust Dale. But he was afraid he would "starve to death" with his brother only thirty miles away. Besides, he told David, he would hate to leave Baton Rouge. 37

Tom was still undecided late in the summer. By that time David had asked him to teach at Greenwood, and President Johnston, disclaiming any effort to force Tom out, had informed him of an opening at a Texas "normal" school. Tom's friends, however, advised him not to reject the University appointment. Milton Strickland, an alumnus then serving on the Board, declared, "The Johnson /sic/ party tried to supplant you altogether, but having failed in that, they will now in all probability vote to increase your salary." Then, rather dramatically, Strickland remarked,

37R. J. Hancock to D. F. Boyd, June 24, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, July 30, 1882, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, July 6, 1882.
"However disagreeable it may be, our friends must take the parts assigned them in the game we are playing to regain control of the University and her destinies."38 Another friend, Sam Robertson, agreed with Strickland. Tom should return to Baton Rouge and "leave the matter with your friends." Robertson had talked with Board members Leon Jastremski and Allan Thomas. They both thought the Board would grant Tom a raise and appoint him to a "more dignified Position" when it met in October. Jastremski had told him that President Johnston now realized he "could not afford to continue the fight" against Tom for reasons Johnston appreciated better than anyone else. "Nobody knows where Johnston is," Robertson told Tom. "He takes no interest whatever in the future of the University; Jastremski . . . is much disgusted with W. P. J.'s lack of interest in the welfare of the institution."39

Ultimately, Tom was convinced. On September 5, 1882, he wrote David, still in Baton Rouge, that he wished

38 Milton Strickland to Tom Boyd, July 10, 1882; William Preston Johnston to Tom Boyd, September 4, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, September 5, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.

39 S. M. Robertson to Tom Boyd, August 21, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
to withdraw his "final acceptance" of a position at Greenwood. If he returned to Baton Rouge, he explained, a "chance" existed for him to apply for the professorship of English, certainly a "more dignified Position" than the one he held in the preparatory department at $800 a year. Obviously Tom knew something in September which only a few others did. President William Preston Johnston held the University's chair of English in 1882, but even Board member G. Mason Graham was unaware, until Tom informed him, that Johnston planned to leave. Events were occurring with "Buonaparteian rapidity," Graham remarked, and he did not even have his "knapsack packed." General Graham and President Johnston's father had been good friends. He hoped, therefore, that the son would be "happy and successful in his "new aspiration." Since the previous April, Graham thought, President Johnston had not been "comfortable" in Baton Rouge. 40

Exactly what President Johnston's "new aspiration" was did not become public until early in 1883. By that

40 G. Mason Graham to Tom Boyd, September 15, 1882, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, G. Mason Graham Letters, 1854-85, Box 6. Johnston's lack of comfort may have been due to the Board's action in April, 1882. It stripped him of free quarters, free servants, free board and free food for his horses.
time Tom had returned to Baton Rouge where, as predicted, the Board voted him a promotion and substantial raise, and David, after spending Christmas in Louisiana, had returned to his school at Greenwood in Virginia. On January 13, 1883, the Baton Rouge Weekly Truth commented that "W. P. Johnston would be an admirable choice" to head Tulane University, then being organized in New Orleans. Other candidates being considered, noted the editor, were "Eliot of Harvard, White of Cornell and Potter of Yale." Two weeks later the same paper announced President Johnston's appointment and departure for New Orleans. J. W. Nicholson, senior professor at the University, would take Johnston's place as acting president until the Board could choose a permanent successor.41

When David learned of President Johnston's resignation, he again allowed himself to put first things second. He became so involved in the political machinations surrounding the selection of Johnston's successor that Greenwood, already in serious difficulty, was practically doomed to failure. Even he realized it. On February 10, 1883, he

41Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, January 13, 26, 1883; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 2, 1882; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 8, 1882, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
told Tom that Louisiana parents who owed him money for their sons' fees at Greenwood were using the possibility of his appointment to succeed President Johnston as a pretext not to pay him. The same thing hurt him in Virginia. Speculation that he would soon return to Louisiana was discouraging prospective patronage from that state. The situation became so critical that he even considered making a public statement denying any interest in the presidency of the University. "I cannot be positively ruined now for some possible future benefit!" But a month later he was still very absorbed with developments in Louisiana and still hoping to be recalled by the University. "I am playing my usual foolish game," he admitted to Tom, "risking the wrecking of my little business here for a mere matter of sentiment—to run a possible chance of having a place offered me, which I might decline if offered!"\footnote{David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 10, March 15, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.}

That the Board of Supervisors would actually reappoint David to the presidency in 1883 was just what he called it, "a possible chance." There were far too many political obstacles to overcome to make his selection probable. Tom Boyd outlined the hazards and speculated
shrewdly on the probable outcome in a series of revealing letters he wrote David between January 20, 1883, when Johnston resigned, and April 1, when the Board finally chose his successor. From the very beginning Tom expressed doubt that his brother would be elected. A ten-page letter he sent David on January 22 explained why. Because it describes so fully the various presidential candidates, Board members, and political powers in Baton Rouge, as well as their relationships with David and the price he would be asked to pay to be considered seriously for the presidency, that letter will be summarized here.

On the day President Johnston announced his intention to resign, J. W. Nicholson, professor of mathematics, invited Tom Boyd to his home. As senior professor and acting president of the University, Nicholson was the most likely candidate to succeed Johnston permanently. But he insisted to Tom that he did not want the job and intended to do all he could to secure it for David. He even wrote David a letter to that effect which he showed to Tom during the interview. Tom was skeptical. He thought Nicholson went a "little too far" when he denied ever wanting the presidency for himself, protesting that his trip to Baton Rouge in the summer of 1880 was made totally in David's
"interest."

A day or two later Nicholson told Tom that he had written a Board member of his disinterest in the presidency. He also claimed to be rather "thick" with Jastremski and responsible for the appointment of two members then serving on the Board. In addition he thought he could induce one other member, Superintendent of Public Education E. H. Fay, to cast his vote for David. "All this looked so like work for Nicholson himself," Tom remarked, "that I asked him . . . again whether he would accept the presidency if elected." Again he denied any ambition, but one "significant" remark disturbed Tom: Nicholson said he thought David could "beat him" in a contest for the job. That made Tom suspect that Nicholson found out David was going to be president and wanted a large part of the credit for bringing it about. "Can he be after posing in the role of Warwick, the Kingmaker?" Tom wondered.

Next, Tom speculated on the motives of several local politicians and the possible votes of various key Board members. "Everything seems to indicate that Jastremski will vote for you," Tom reported, but that would give David only six votes "against seven for someone else." However, if General Allan Thomas, a member of the Board,
also sought the job, Tom thought Jastremski and his friends would prefer David. The problem was Dr. J. W. Dupree and David's friendship with him. Dr. Dupree was the University physician and a bitter enemy of Leon Jastremski. The latter had tried to have Dupree removed in favor of Dr. L. F. Reynaud soon after David was fired, but Dupree had enough defenders on the Board to prevent it. More important, Dr. Dupree had defied Jastremski and several other local politicians more than a year earlier by supporting someone they opposed in a congressional contest. On Saturday night, January 20, 1883, Tom met Major Thompson Bird, his lawyer son, Charlie Bird, Leon Jastremski's brother John, and several other Baton Rouge politicians in a local tobacco shop. "Major Bird," Tom reported, "rather intimated that he would do all he could for you if it wasn't {sic} for Dupree." Later, Sam Robertson, the representative from East Baton Rouge and commandant at the University, indicated that Major Bird would support David anyhow, but that he merely wanted to get Tom to commit David to "a line of policy adverse to Dr. Dupree." The next night Tom, who must have smoked a great deal, was back in the tobacco shop. In its "back room" he met the two Jastremski's, Andrew Jackson, a local merchant whom David had considered his enemy since
1879, and various others. In a loud voice Jackson declared, "There is one man that I think ought to be the next President of the University and that is Col. Boyd." He promised Tom he would do everything in his power to get David elected. Tom thanked Jackson, but questioned his sincerity:

Whether all this means that these men are really working for you and merely want to influence you beforehand against Dupree; or that they are nominally working for you in order to secure your good will, while in reality determined to beat you with some one who will aid them in venting their spleen upon Dupree, I leave you to judge.

Then, perhaps because he knew David's prodigious letter-writing ability and his inability to be cautious and circumspect, particularly with his adversaries, Tom begged David to "let all your communications with parties here until April be of the Yea and nay kind." David would have to thank Nicholson for his letter of support, but he should choose his words with great care. "And above all, don't write a line to Dupree! It would be better if all means of communication between you and B. R. were shut off." 43

David agreed in most respects with Tom's appraisal of his chances for the presidency and the political scene in Baton Rouge. "I do not expect the place to be offered

---

43 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, January 22, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 2/4.
to me," he wrote on January 29. As for Nicholson's motives, "Knowing him as well as I do, I think he is playing for the presidency." By David's reckoning, Jastremski, Fay and one other would support Nicholson on the first ballot; President Johnston's friends on the Board, five men, would vote for General Thomas, and the remaining five members would cast votes for him. On succeeding ballots Nicholson would pick up almost all of the Thomas vote while David could not expect to pull more than a total of six. Only Major Bird could defeat Nicholson by influencing Jastremski and one other Nicholson vote to go for David on the first ballot. But David simply could not believe that the "alleged support" for him in the Board actually existed. It was made up of essentially the same men who forced him out in 1880. David was sure, therefore, that "This Board as now organized will never have me back. Nicholson or some unknown man will be elected."44 As for the possibility of Major Bird or his son, Charlie, using their influence with Jastremski to support David instead of Nicholson, David was sure that Nicholson, as acting president, had already promised Jastremski his vote on the Board to oust Dr.

44 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 27, 29, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
Dupree. That would be enough for the Birds whose main object was "beating Dupree." "It is not reasonable from any standpoint--," David declared to his brother, "those people supporting me; and I don't believe they will." In any event, he intended to stand by Dr. Dupree "to the last."

The Birds made one more effort. They asked Tom to induce David's friends on the Board to join Jastremski in his fight against the doctor. If he agreed David's election to the presidency would be assured. Tom refused, probably giving "the death blow to your chances," he wrote his brother on February 10, 1883. David replied that Tom had done the right thing.

The Birds do not & cannot rise to a proper sense of dignity & duty in the matter. The idea of suggesting that one cannot become Presdt. of a school, unless he and his friends consent to throw out, (by way of bargain) some poor devil of a medical doctor, is on a par with what they did with me in 1880, because I wd not then turn against poor old Mr. Markham /the Board's treasurer/. As for Nicholson, David's contempt for him was growing. On

45 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 31, 1883, ibid.
46 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, February 10, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7/2; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 15, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
February 15, he labeled him "simply unfit to be presdt. of anything . . . He has simply sold himself, turned against poor Dupree, to get the presidency." Ten days later: "I feel certain that he is playing a double part. . . . I think we ought to tell him so. . . . The fellow played me false in 1880; I don't think I ought to let him do so in 1883."47

Tom thought it would be a serious mistake for David to write Nicholson that "we see thro' his game." He argued that it did no good to tell a man you had caught him in a lie. It merely made him your enemy, a commodity David already possessed in abundance. Besides, anything David said to Nicholson of a disparaging character would be interpreted as jealousy. Then Tom urged David not to make another trip to Louisiana before the Board met on April 2, despite his pressing need for money. His visit would certainly be misunderstood by everyone. David could borrow as much through the mail or through Tom as he could in person. "Then why ruin your chance of election to the Presidency by such a"
step?," he asked his brother.  

By March 29, 1883, Tom had clearly decided that David could not be elected. "With Jastremski and McEnery dead against you," he wrote David, "it would require the very ablest political engineering to elect you, and no one on your side possesses the skill to manage it." And later, in the same letter, "I have little doubt that he Nicholson will be the next President." Tom promised not to let David's name be "presented" unless his election were certain. But the whole issue became moot on March 31. In a postscript to his letter of the 29th Tom noted, "Nicholson has come out and consented (?) to accept the Presidency if tendered ... and everybody has come to the conclusion that he will get it."  

On April 3, 1883, after a brief executive session, the Board of Supervisors accepted Leon Jastremski's resolution that J. W. Nicholson be elected president by acclamation. A few days later David reached Baton Rouge from Virginia. If he had occasion to congratulate the University's new president he left no record of it in his papers. Nor is there any evidence of a meeting with Dr. Dupree.  

---

48 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, March 3, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box II. 

49 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, March 29, 1883, ibid.
But three months later, in July, 1883, Leon Jastremski's newspaper revealed the "little Doctor's" fate. With only two members dissenting, the Board elected the editor's friend, Dr. L. F. Reynaud as University surgeon in Dupree's place. President J. W. Nicholson voted with the majority. 50

David's April visit to Baton Rouge lasted a month. As already described, he returned to Greenwood in May, 1883, with no new students, hopelessly in debt and seriously in doubt as to whether he would be able to finish the session. He did not have enough students to operate a summer school and he was afraid many of his "La. cadets" would not return in the fall. Only two developments seemed to offer any way out of his difficulties. Tom Boyd found a buyer for the house David could not afford to keep in Baton Rouge, and an old friend in Alabama informed him that the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College at Auburn was looking for a new president. The friend, Professor W. LeRoy Broun, was leaving the job for a new position in Texas. If David were interested, Broun wanted him to send

50 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 3, 1883; Baton Rouge Capitolian-Advocate, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Newspapers, Box 17.
the names of several persons with whom the Board of Trustees might correspond. The election to the presidency, Broun thought, would take place on June 27, 1883, during commencement. Then Broun told David something about the school and the town. Auburn was a "small village" of about 1,000 people, "very quiet." The Board of Trustees and the people wanted to make the college a "genuine" science center which it had not been up to that time. "I had proposed many chgs," Broun wrote, "all of which I leave to my successor."  

---

51 W. Leroy Broun to David F. Boyd, May 25, 1883, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 7; W. Leroy Broun to David Boyd, May 30, 1883, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, June 7, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1. Professor Broun's friendship with David was more than ten years old in 1883. Broun had been a professor at the University of Georgia and Vanderbilt before coming to Auburn in 1882. David tried to induce him to accept the presidency of Louisiana State University in 1877, but at the time the school's funds were enjoined and he did not care to gamble that the injunction would be overcome. Broun was considered an authority on "scientific and technical education" as proposed by the Morrill Act which created the Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges. He opposed "teaching boys to plow;" instead he held that the "principles and theory" must be taught first and the "application" could come later. David used Broun's ideas and his published expressions extensively in his fight to merge the University with the Agricultural and Mechanical College in Louisiana. In 1874 Broun wrote David, "I should be gratified to learn that the state of La. had exhibited the wisdom of making, as we have done in Georgia, and in a majority of the states, the 'college of
David sent Broun a few names to whom the Auburn Trustees might write for references. He also told Broun that he was not a "candidate" for the job. But if appointed to it, he would accept. Immediately a flood of inquiring letters went out from the Alabama school. President Nicholson wrote a glowing tribute for David which he showed to Tom Boyd before mailing. When Tom told him about the Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, a department of the State University." Ironically, the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, of which Broun became president in 1882, was the first southern "A & M" College established separately from a state University. And in 1883 he left Alabama for the University of Texas, a state which also saw fit to create an "A & M College" separate and distinct from its state-supported "literary" institution. His departure from Auburn, according to David's son, LeRoy Stafford Boyd, arose out of the failure of the Auburn authorities to accept his proposals for reorganizing the curriculum. David, however, tried to implement those proposals, thereby guaranteeing himself an unpleasant year in Alabama. In 1884 Professor Broun was recalled from Texas to Auburn where he spent the balance of his academic career as president of the institution. Incidentally, Broun supposedly left the University of Georgia, where he first earned a reputation as an expert in "scientific education" because he replied publicly to an article on cyclones written by Alexander H. Stephens, the former vice-president of the Confederacy. As LeRoy Stafford Boyd related the story, Stephens "knew nothing about cyclones," but was a trustee of the University. Charles Wesley Edwards, Auburn Starts a Second Century, Pamphlet (Auburn, Alabama, 1958), 9; W. LeRoy Broun to David Boyd, November 20, 1874, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alphabetical File, Box 7; LeRoy Stafford Boyd, "Recollections of the Early History of Nu Chapter of Kappa Delta Fraternity at the Alabama Polytechnic Institute," Typescript in LeRoy Stafford Boyd MS Collection, Department of Archives, Auburn, University, hereinafter cited as
the inquiry, David replied that if the Auburn trustees asked Nicholson about him, they would also contact Governor McEnery, Superintendent of Public Education E. H. Fay, and Leon Jastremski. He hoped they would. He wanted the Trustees to know "all they can" before they took any action. David thought Nicholson might very well write a second letter to Alabama which would "neutralize" the first. On the other hand, David remarked, "If that crowd thought by praising me, they wd. send me off to Ala. and forever be rid of me, they might write favorably."52

David did not really believe he had a chance to win the Auburn post. In view of all the people in Louisiana who felt "unkindly" toward him and considering the "Ala. Dragnet system of inquiry," he had to expect that some severely critical letters would be sent to the Trustees. "No, I do not expect the appointment," he wrote his brother in mid-June, "and am working away here getting

"Recollections," L. S. Boyd MS, Auburn University.

52 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, June 8, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1; D. T. Merrick, Alabama Trustee, to Dr. J. W. Dupree, June 4, 1883; J. W. Dupree to David Boyd, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 4.
ready for next year . . . "53 David was too pessimistic.

On June 28, 1883, after considerable debate, the Board of Trustees of the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College elected him to its presidency for a term of one year. All appointments were for one year only because the Board also enacted a sweeping reorganization plan designed to change the school from its "semi-literary character to a more decided course of scientific and industrial training." Very probably, therefore, some of the "literary" staff would not be rehired when the next session ended. 54

David was in Baton Rouge on June 29, 1883, when he learned of his election by the Alabama Board of Trustees. After selling his house he left for Auburn where he spent ten days and then continued to Virginia. His affairs there, he wrote his brother, were in horrible shape. There was no chance to sub-let Greenwood for the coming year or to sell

53David Boyd to Tom Boyd, June 18, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.

54O. D. Smith, professor of mathematics at Auburn, to J. W. Nicholson, telegram, June 28, 1883, ibid.; R. M. Lusher, to David Boyd, June 29, 1883, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; Record of the Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, June 25, 27, 28, 1883, Department of Archives, Auburn University, hereinafter cited as Proceedings of the Board of Trustees, Auburn University; David F. Boyd, Advertisement for Agricultural and Mechanical
the furniture without suffering a great loss. To make matters worse he would get no pay at Auburn until January 1, 1884. If he could see any way to avoid losing $1,000 or $1,200 at Greenwood he would not mind the "late pay" at Auburn. "I fear when I take hold down there I may be so annoyed, and bedeviled, with my affairs here and in La. that I can do no good in Ala." Because he could do very little

---

577

College of Alabama, 1883-84, in Official Correspondence of the President, undated, Department of Archives, Auburn University. On June 30, and August 7, 1883, the Montgomery Daily Advertiser hailed the action of the Board of Trustees in "aiming" toward science by hiring a professor of agriculture and acquiring 250 acres for an experimental farm. The paper also noted the Board's decision to build "workshops." As a "polytechnic" school, the editor assured his readers, the A & M College would not be competing with the University at Tuscaloosa. The A & M "teaches matters practically," he explained, "and agriculture & civil engineering are specialties."

55 Wm. LeRoy Broun to David Boyd, telegram, June 30, 1883, in Official Correspondence of President D. F. Boyd, Archives, Auburn University; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, July 6, 20, 1883; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 8, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1. David might have added Maryland to the list of states in which he had sizable debts. In April, 1882, David's lawyer friend, Richard M. Venable, told David that after repeated efforts to secure a settlement with the owners of St. Clements, they still considered him liable to pay the $1,000 rent he contracted for in 1877. The owner's agent thought the settlement fair because David's decision not to go there came so late in the year that the place could not be rented and its reputation as a school had suffered as a result. R. M. Venable to David Boyd, April 28, 1882, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15.
to solve his problems in Virginia either, David returned to Auburn briefly in mid-August and then went to Baton Rouge for the rest of the month. He had to be back in Auburn to stay by September 1, although he did not think he would move his family there that fall. He changed his mind later, but exactly when Ettie Boyd, her sister and the seven children arrived in Auburn is not clear. They were certainly there by October 8, 1883, however, when a letter David sent to Tom Boyd closed, "We are all well and send best love to you and yours."

A little more than six weeks later tragedy struck the Boyd family. Arthur Boyd, David and Ettie's twelve-year-old son, was accidentally shot and killed by his younger brother, Rex (David French Boyd, Jr.). Seven-year-old Rex and his ten-year-old brother Leigh had been playing with a shotgun used earlier in the day by their oldest brother Jack. When the gun discharged, the shot hit Arthur in the face and head, killing him instantly. Five days later David was still so distraught that he could not bring himself to describe "the particulars" to Tom. He sent him

56 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 8, 11, October 8, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
a newspaper clipping instead. Ettie was "heartbroken,"

David told his brother.

The shock upon her was dreadful. She happened to look out her window just as it was done, and saw it with her own eyes! And then she ran screaming down the street--for me! We are all in terrible fix--awful condition; . . . My business alone is nearly driving me crazy; and what I am to do--off here among strangers--under such circumstances--at such a time, without means, God only knows.57

David's reference to God was ironic. Many devout Alabamans thought he was an atheist and some had done all they could to deny him the presidency of the Agricultural and Mechanical College. They based their efforts on information received from William Goodale, a Baton Rouge lawyer, secretary to the University Board of Supervisors, and a prominent Methodist layman. Goodale (and others, David suspected) supplied Alabama "church people" with the idea that David was not "sound" on religion. "That was the cause of the Board's hesitation from Monday [June 25] to Thursday [June 28] to elect me," David explained to his

57Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, November 27, 1883; Montgomery Daily Advertiser, November 27, 1883; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, November 30, 1883; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 29, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
brother in mid-August.58 Even before then a brief visit to Auburn in July convinced David that he could expect trouble from "church people." He remarked to his brother:

Our Ala. school is encrusted all over thick with Methodism, and all its concomitants--ignorance, prejudice, narrowness & bigotry; and with Goodale's send off, God only knows how I will get along there. I went to the Methodist church there on Sunday; and, some of the 'Bretheren and sistren' seemed to look at me as if I were a wild beast.59

---

58 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 11, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1. In a diary entry for January 15, 1876, Tom Boyd recorded his reaction to William Goodale whom he labeled a "zealous master mason" and "sanctimonious Methodist elder." Tom had gone to a Baton Rouge home to get one of David's children after a party. He was invited to "join the men," among them Elder Goodale, whom he found engaged in a contest to relate the most off-color anecdotes. If men like Goodale represented the art of conversation, Tom remarked, he hoped he would never become a "fine talker." Tom Boyd Diary, January 15, 1876.

59 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 8, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1. In 1872 the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College was established in buildings donated by the East Alabama Male College, a Methodist institution chartered in 1856. But in giving up their building the Methodists did not give up the strong influence they exercised in the college and the community. According to LeRoy Stafford Boyd, Methodists tried to run the college and did run the town well into the twentieth century. In the 1890's a local minister scheduled a special prayer meeting whenever a dance took place in Auburn. During David's brief tenure only one ball took place. Held at Commencement in June, 1884, the dance was a "great innovation and gave the Methodists a great pain." Baptists were probably pained too, and one of them may have been David's wife. She was very strict and in 1897, she inaugurated a series of "socials" at her home for the Baptist Young People's Union. "The evening was spent very pleasantly,"
David was not exaggerating. By late August the whispering campaign against him had grown to such proportions that a local newspaper tried to defend him. To the charge that David was not a "believer" the editor replied, "This we believe is false." Colonel Boyd might not be a church member, but neither was Jesus; and no one, the editor commented, would complain seriously about His religion. But some of the paper's readers were not convinced. By October local Methodists had stepped up their attacks, and David was becoming a notorious character. Describing the "venomous" charges against him to Tom Boyd, David reported:

One of them said at Opelika the other day: 'The college first had for its president a Methodist minister; then a Baptist preacher, next an Episcopalian, and now it has the devil!' And today, at a farmer's club held here I was told that at the Methodist Conference held in North Alabama, some time since, I was openly attacked on the score of irreligion on the floor of the body! . . . . But I have not opened my mouth and don't propose to do so.  

Newspapers kept the war alive for months. "Is he an Atheist?" asked the Monroe Journal on November 6, 1883.

---

noted the local editor. "There were games, music and delicious refreshments." Nothing, it will be noticed, is said about dancing. "Recollections," L. S. Boyd MS, Auburn University; Opelika (Alabama) Post, June 25, 1897.

---

60 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 6, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1; Opelika (Alabama) Times, August 24, 1883.
It decided he probably was since he offered no defense against the allegation. Various Louisiana friends tried to answer for him by sending letters to prominent Alabamans, ministers and laymen, attesting to his moral character. David appreciated their efforts, but doubted that anything they said would do him much good. The "religious crusade" would drive him out of Auburn very soon, and the college itself was so "badly organized" that "trouble (internal)" might break out at any moment. Under the circumstances, he decided to resign and go back to Greenwood. With all the "hue and cry" against him in Alabama, he wrote Tom Boyd in October, 1883, he could never hope to get another college job anywhere.61

Actually David had already resigned when he informed his brother of his intentions. Besides the "religious crusade," restrictions limiting his authority seem to have prompted the action. Early in September he asked F. M. Reese, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, precisely when

61Monroe (Monroeville, Alabama) Journal, November 6, 1883; Robert L. Stuart to David Boyd, October 4, 1883, in David F. Boyd, Personal Correspondence, Department of Archives, Auburn University; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 11, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1.
his tenure began and what his powers and responsibilities entailed. Reese replied that he took it for granted.

David's term began when ex-President Broun's ended, on June 28, 1883. "As to the duties of your office," he continued, "I can only refer you to the Rules and Regulations adopted by the Board . . . at their regular session in June."62

The response did not satisfy David. He thought he had a mandate to proceed with the reorganization plan suggested by ex-President W. LeRoy Broun and endorsed by the Board of Trustees in June, 1883. This would require a significant reduction in the number of "semi-literary" courses offered by the college and a concentration on "Science and its applications." It would also mean that only the Bachelor of Science degree would be granted in the future. But the rules and regulations, David found out, required him to share certain decision-making powers with the faculty. The "semi-literary" professors naturally opposed any plans he had to "administer" them out of employment and they formed what David later called a "junta," partly inside and partly outside the college, to force him out of the presidency.

62 David Boyd to Board of Trustees, September 23, 1883; F. M. Reece to D. F. Boyd, September 13, 1883, in Official Correspondence of the President, Auburn University.
"It is the old story," he wrote his brother, "those who have controlled the school here for years, do not like any questions asked or criticism made."63

The fact that his resignation was on file did not keep David from making suggestions to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. In October, 1883, he asked the committee to "define" his duties. Other officers, particularly the college treasurer, seemed to be carrying out duties normally reserved to a college president. The disciplinary system also needed reorganization. In David's words:

The discipline . . . under existing rules and regulations is in a very dangerous and precarious condition. I find a military institute under a faculty government which is a contradiction in terms and almost a nullity in practical effect. . . . You have military requirements enough to harass your boys and raise a row but not enough military honor in the hands of your president to put down a row. You hold him

---

63 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, November 8, 1883, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-83, Box 1; Wm. LeRoy Broun, Report to the Board of Trustees, June 27, 1883, in Proceedings of the Board of Trustees, Auburn University; David F. Boyd, Card to advertise the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, November 10, 1883, in Official Correspondence of the President, Auburn University; David Boyd, General Orders No. 1, Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, September 26, 1883, ibid.; "Recollections," L. S. Boyd MS, Auburn University. LeRoy Stafford Boyd declared that "all questions" had to be submitted to the faculty, resulting in a very "stormy session" in 1883-84.
responsible for the discipline . . .; yet you give him very little authority. . . . The whole thing needs overhauling . . . and it cannot be done too soon.64

David predicted a breakdown in the "control and restraint" of the cadets if the regulations were not revised at once. He proved to be a prophet. Early in December a group of cadets met without authorization in the college chapel to protest some disciplinary action of the authorities. David responded by restricting their privileges on Saturday and Sunday nights. Some of the cadets then appealed to the faculty, who addressed a petition to David requesting him to rescind the restriction. The students had assured the petitioners that they meant no "disrespect" for the authorities when they held their meeting and that "no conspiracy to undermine the college rules existed or was intended." On December 19, 1883, the Board of Trustees met in Auburn to investigate the crisis. Not satisfied with the results, David sent a letter to the Board the next day. He felt that "all the facts" had not

64David Boyd, Report to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, typescript, October 15, 1883, Department of Archives, Auburn University. For good measure David informed the committee, "You have no library." Wm. LeRoy Broun reported a total of 1,400 volumes in June, 1883, but David declared there were not seventy-five of "general literature."
been elicited and that his duty to himself required him to identify the two members of the staff who gave the cadets "improper advice of an insubordinate nature" when the crisis occurred. Their aim, he charged, was to keep him, the president, "in ignorance of the mutinous attitude of the cadets." Of the men named, one was the treasurer, whose office David thought encroached on his own. The other was the professor of mathematics. Both, David charged, tried to keep the commandant from informing him about the cadets' "mutinous" conduct.®5

What action (if any) the Board of Trustees took in December, 1883, is not clear. But it was not enough to satisfy David. His resignation, on file since the previous September, was explained verbally to the Board in December and in writing just before he left Alabama in June, 1884.

David Boyd to the Board of Trustees, December 20, 1883; Faculty Petition to David F. Boyd, December 12, 1883, in Official Correspondence of the President, Auburn University. Just before David left Alabama in 1884, a letter to the Montgomery Daily Advertiser by a graduating senior remarked that "the idea that a President is to be a moral policeman to knock down and drag out boys is fortunately well-nigh spent." The author suggested the mathematics professor would be a good replacement for David. Montgomery Daily Advertiser, June 1, 1884.
He regretted that it was necessary for him to withdraw from the institution and he wished it well. But it was impossible for him to do "proper or successful work" under the existing system. "There is a bright future here," he concluded, "for some one with a proper charter in his hands, and with proper authority to carry it out." 66

When he wrote those words, David himself was looking forward to a brighter future. On April 7, 1884, the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to recall him as president. After a year in office J. W. Nicholson wanted to return to the classroom and the writing of textbooks. He announced his intention informally on March 1 to the president and vice-president of the Board of Supervisors. As soon as they learned of it,

66 David F. Boyd, Report to the Board of Trustees, typescript, June 23, 1884, Auburn University. In his commencement address delivered on June 25, 1884, David was considerably less formal. The trouble with the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, he declared, was that no one could agree on what it should be: "Agricultural, military Inst., arts coll/age/." The result was a hodgepodge. The rules and regulations, true to no educational system, were nothing but a "mongrel mess." "In fact," he told his young listeners, "this college now may well be called an educational junk shop!" Local newspapers failed to print David's remarks, but a group of citizens asked for a copy of the speech. They wanted to publish it, "believing its circulation would benefit the cause of education." David F. Boyd, Commencement Address June 25, 1884, in Official Correspondence of the President, Auburn University; E. W.
David's friends began to organize their campaign to bring him back to Baton Rouge. For his mental health the chance to return to Louisiana came none too soon. The year he spent in Alabama was probably the most miserable of his career up to that time. Besides terrific debt and religious bigotry he had to endure the tragedy of his son Arthur's accidental death and the active opposition of some of his colleagues. He did not like the school's organization and he could not develop the sort of enthusiasm for it which always attended his efforts in Louisiana. A letter he wrote late in January, 1884, reveals the degree of his depression.

I am tired of this place, and, I think, of such state school work . . . I do not feel that interest in the school, or in Alabama that I shd. feel, to be in charge of one of her State schools. I know no one in the State hardly, and don't care to know the people. That alone unfits me to be here, and I think I had better get away. 67

News of President Nicholson's intention to resign

Solomon to David F. Boyd, June 26, 1884, in Personal Correspondence of the President, Auburn University.

67 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 27, 1884; G. Mason Graham to Thomas Boyd, March 23, 1884; Max Feazel to Tom Boyd, March 23, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 7, 1884; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, April 11, 1884.
improved David's morale immensely. When General G. Mason Graham and others informed him of their efforts in his behalf, David's formerly depressed letters assumed an entirely new character. To his brother Tom he sent special thanks for "what may come to pass." But above all he wanted to make sure that all the University people acted together. They must "avoid a snarl" so that when the legislature met in May, there would be no "family quarrel" like the one in 1880 which caused an uproar in the press and the General Assembly. The University needed friends and "not a single enemy." It was very important, therefore, not to offend Professor McCulloch (reemployed in 1882) and his friends lest they "attack" the school in the coming legislature and defeat its appropriations bill. The University was certainly inadequate, David pointed out, in the "chemical and physical depts." It needed several thousands to catch up with other universities, and its vulnerability in those particular areas might well bring down legislative wrath and a drive to reorganize the school. Then David outlined the challenge which faced the school in the immediate future:

Education for the people is not now what it was 100 years ago; no, nor what it was even 25 years ago. Then Literary education was a luxury; now scientific
education is a necessity! And yr. faculty and Supervisors must fall into line, and go forward; or must be mustered out.

The Board of Supervisors notified David officially of his election late in the afternoon of April 7, 1884. Nicholson's resignation would not take effect until the following October, but David's telegram of acceptance ignored that detail. Making no effort to conceal his enthusiasm or his eagerness to return to Baton Rouge, he replied at once:

Presidency of the University accepted with thanks for the honor. Will do my best for La. again. Post me thoroughly on situation and the policy of the Board before the Legislature, and the plans for next year. No time to lose now, we must push things vigorously. D. Boyd.

As Tom Boyd once remarked about his brother, David was not a "vengeful" man. He proved that when he urged the cadets not to leave the University after his removal in 1880. He proved it again in the spring of 1884 when he tried to save Professor McCulloch's a job after the Board of Supervisors

68 General G. Mason Graham to Thomas Boyd, March 23, 1884; Max Feazel to Tom Boyd, March 28, 1884; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, April 2, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.

69 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 7, 1884.
and President Nicholson acted to force the elderly chemist to resign. Nevertheless David was human; it must have afforded him particular satisfaction to be recalled to the University in 1884 with the votes of men like Vice-President Leon Jastremski and Governor McEnery, both of whom voted to fire him three years before. General G. Mason Graham was certainly pleased. The original draft of a telegram he asked Tom Boyd to send David read:

Unanimously elected President eight members present. Nominated by Favrot [an antagonist in 1883 when Nicholson was elected], seconded by Jastremski and the Governor. We all hope you will accept. Wish you could have witnessed the torrent of recantation.

G. Mason Graham . . .

70G. Mason Graham to David Boyd, telegram draft, April 9, 1884; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, April 9, 14, 1884, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Tom Boyd Diary, November 22, 1885. As discussed in Chapter 10, Professor Richard McCulloch was one of David's principal antagonists in the spring of 1880 when the legislature was considering the Leake bill. He resigned from the faculty on March 1, 1880, to devote full time to lobbying for that measure. David's successor, William Preston Johnston, was McCulloch's personal friend, and McCulloch returned to the University during his administration. President Nicholson, however, was no friend of McCulloch's, and the latter treated Nicholson with what Tom Boyd described as "silent contempt." Nicholson, a Granger in the 1870's and always very astute politically, supported "practical education," whereas McCulloch was a theoretician. In October, 1883, Nicholson reported the results of a visit he made to the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College. The work done there by the professors in soil and mineral analysis for the farmers of the state impressed him and he asked the Board to "confer with Professor McCulloch about a similar program at L.S.U.
Other friends also considered David's reappointment to be a victory over his "political enemies" and an "apology" for the "past mistake." One staunch partisan hoped Louisiana had learned a lesson after having experienced the presidencies of William Preston Johnston and J. W. Nicholson. "I hope," wrote David's former student and erstwhile assistant at Greenwood, "that our only university may yet be turned from a political machine and a nursery for children, into a place of learning of which this state . . . may well be proud." But David himself was not vindictive.

"We want no drones or grumblers, but active, cheerful competent workers, prompted by a desire to accomplish maximum results with minimum means," Nicholson remarked somewhat pointedly. Subsequent reports to the Board were more direct and finally, at the same meeting of the Board which recalled David, the too-theoretical Professor McCulloch's chair of chemistry, was merged with that of agriculture. He planned to resign in June, 1884. Meanwhile, he and David had resumed their friendship and David wanted McCulloch to stay on as professor of "natural philosophy." But Tom advised against it. Everyone, including Tom himself, objected to McCulloch being retained in any capacity. Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 1, 1883, January 4, 1884; R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, February 27, March 13, April 1, June 9, 1884, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, April 19, 1884; M. A. Strickland to David Boyd, April 28, 1884; Thomas Boyd to David Boyd, April 9, 14, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, May 7, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.

71 J. T. Bringier to David Boyd, April 10, 1884; P. Lane to David Boyd, April 8, 1884, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
He asked Tom to thank everybody for their "kindness" to him. Louisiana was the only state which could have convinced him not to return to Virginia and he hoped he had made the right decision. "I go back with no resentments for the past, but with good will towards all, and with hope for the future. Let us all bury the hatchet and (the smokers) smoke the pipe of peace; and all go to work and do our best. We have plenty to do . . . ." 72

72 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, April 9, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.
CHAPTER XII

BITTER HOMECOMING

A few days after learning of his reappointment to the presidency of the University David wrote Tom Boyd from Auburn about his plans for the coming summer and fall. In late June, 1884, when his official connection with the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College ended, he would go to Baton Rouge for a few days to attend commencement and the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors. Then he would go to Greenwood in Virginia to sell or "get rid" of the furniture he left there in 1883 and finally, he would return to Louisiana to "canvass" the state for the coming session of the University. Ettie, Miss Mary Wright and the children would remain in their rented house in Auburn until after the first frost. Then he would move them all to Baton Rouge.1

Circumstances forced David to change his plans.

1David Boyd to Tom Boyd, April 9, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.,) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.
After a brief visit to Baton Rouge to attend commencement, he returned to Auburn. But his affairs were too tangled to settle quickly, and the serious illness of his mother, Minerva French Boyd, required him to visit Wytheville sometime during July. By the time he reached Louisiana to begin his "canvass" it was already August 10, and the transfer of his family from Auburn to Baton Rouge had to be delayed. Ettie Boyd did not seem particularly dismayed. On August 4, 1884, she told Tom Boyd that "We talk a good deal about leaving here in Dec., but I will not feel sure of it, until we can secure a house in Baton Rouge." Because the house they occupied in Auburn could not be rented by the month, she thought it might be advisable to keep it another year, "with the hope of sub-renting . . . if we do get off to B. R." The children were healthier in Auburn than they had ever been in Louisiana, and she enjoyed her garden. Besides, it was cheaper to live in Auburn, and the prospect of occupying temporary quarters in the University building, not to mention the expense of moving, did not attract her at all.  

2Ettie Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 4, 1884, ibid.; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, June 29, 1884. In closing Ettie noted that her letter sounded as if they expected to stay in Alabama. That is exactly what she, her
When he finally got to Louisiana in August, David went at once to Minden, where the Louisiana Educational Association was holding its first state convention. David addressed the delegates on the subject of "industrial and technical education." To be of any value, he told his audience, education had to catch the "spirit of the age" and they were living in a practical age. Mankind was absorbed with material things and only a "material education" could fit modern youth for life. "In this fast practical age," he declared, "literary education is a luxury; scientific education is a necessity." The situation pained him sister, and the children did. One of the houses they rented in Auburn belonged to William C. Stubbs, professor of agriculture and chemistry at the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College. In August, 1885, he left Auburn for Louisiana State University where he became professor of agriculture and proceeded to establish agricultural experiment stations. Two years later he offered Ettie Boyd and Miss Mary Wright the first opportunity to buy his house on terms he had already discussed with David. They accepted Stubbs's offer and by 1888, Ettie, who was giving piano lessons in Auburn to support her children and keep them in school, had no plans to go to Baton Rouge. David himself soon left the University to run a military school in Kentucky. Ultimately, Ettie supplemented her income by renting rooms to students attending the college. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 418-19; William Stubbs to D. F. Boyd, August 8, 1885, in Personal Correspondence of D. F. Boyd, Department of Archives, Auburn University; William C. Stubbs to D. F. Boyd, August 11, 1887, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8; Rex Boyd (son) to David F. Boyd, March 14, 1888, ibid., Box 7; Ettie Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 9, 1888, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.
somewhat because he began his career teaching the ancient languages. But the world was "crying out" for knowledge about the "material forces" of nature and educators who did not respond failed to do their duty. Besides, the study of science was not without a certain beauty. To those who doubted, he suggested the contemplation of a snowflake's perfect symmetry, the majesty of the heavens and the forces, directed by God, which imposed order on the universe. The response was gratifying. A Shreveport paper pronounced it the "speech of the occasion," and David himself wrote his brother that he could not "complain of the Newspaper reports from Minden."  

From Minden David went to Shreveport. He stayed there longer than planned, but thought his efforts would provide several new cadets for the University in October. After Shreveport his itinerary called for a tour through Bossier and Claiborne Parishes where he would join Professor Nicholson. They would both go to Monroe; then David would return to Shreveport, travel down the Red River to

---

3Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, August 15, 1884; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, August 22, 29, 1884; David F. Boyd, speech delivered at Minden, Louisiana, August 13, 1884, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 13; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 20, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.
Alexandria, and head for Opelousas and southwestern Louisiana. Nicholson would cover the eastern half of the state. Finally, David expected to go through New Orleans enroute to Auburn where he planned to spend a few days with his family before returning to Baton Rouge in late September. In general David kept to the route and schedule he outlined to Tom on August 20, 1884. But as time passed, he grew increasingly worried about the University's prospects for the coming session. His personal finances were, as usual, in utter chaos, and the unlikelihood that he could borrow enough to pay his traveling expenses made him think seriously of abandoning his recruiting efforts and returning to Alabama. On August 28 he wrote Tom that he had "no business now in public position." He could not devote his whole attention to it and he was so poor that people had lost respect for him. "A man in debt; and getting old, with a large young family, and with pay barely sufficient for his & their support, with no chance to lay by anything, is a pitiable, & worthless object indeed."^4

By September 1 he was "much tempted to quit B. R. (& the L. S. U.) for good," and go back to Virginia or some

---

^4 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, August 20, 28, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1884-96, Box 2.
other "quiet place." Harney Skolfield, the Board's treasurer, sent him some money on September 7, which cheered him, but the very next day he learned that a check he wrote before leaving Alabama had not been honored in New Orleans. Such things were crushing his spirit and killing his self-respect. He wanted to go away, anywhere, to escape the shame of not meeting his obligations. "I feel today that I wd prefer never to see Baton Rouge or N. O. again," he told his brother. He did not know what he would do, some "humbler business" perhaps, but the University had gotten him into his difficulties; if he stayed with it any longer things would only get worse.5

A two-day visit in Alexandria with old friends seemed to revive David's spirits. For the rest of the trip he said nothing more in his letters to Tom about quitting. However, he doubted if they would get many students from Rapides that year. People there accused the University of lax discipline and neglect of the sick, David reported. Meals had to be improved, too, or they should give up the "Boarding Dept." By the time David reached Washington, Louisiana, another serious complaint had been lodged against

5David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 1, 2, 7, 8, 1884, ibid.
the school. Critics there thought the University was "mixed up with . . . state (ring) politics," which was not surprising considering that the commandant, San Robertson, presided over the recent Democratic convention. Sam must "quit playing politician" or he would ruin the school. Under the circumstances, David wondered how valuable he could be to the University. "Professors and employees running a political machine," he fumed to Tom, "it is no place for me."\(^6\)

David went to Auburn to visit his family on September 23, 1884. Five days later he was back in Baton Rouge in time to report to the Board of Supervisors at their regular fall meeting. His trip convinced him, he told the Board, that "loose discipline" was the main complaint most people had against the University. David thought the charge arose out of the fact that cadets did not always behave properly while wearing the uniform off campus. To partially correct the situation he asked that students living in town wear civilian dress when not on duty. When the Board took no action on that suggestion, David attacked the problem from another angle. He instituted a very strict

\(^6\)David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 10, 13, 14, 15, ibid.
military regimen which restricted cadets living and boarding on campus to the University grounds except for one hour a week. Even so the effect was limited because increasing numbers of students chose to live, or at least board, off campus to avoid the relatively expensive and inferior meals provided by the University.  

Even before he completed his canvassing tour in 1884, David knew the "table fare" at the University would have to be improved. If the "quartermaster," Mr. L. Jadot, did not do better, David had written his brother in September, they would have to "abandon" the "Boarding Dept." But David seems to have abandoned Jadot instead. Late in October Leon Jastremski's paper, the Daily Capitolian-Advocate, reported Jadot's resignation, and another local paper noted that "A misunderstanding with Col. Boyd is the rumored cause." Jadot's connection with the University began when Leon Jastremski and the Wiltz-appointed Board reorganized the school in the summer of 1880. Like Jastremski, Commandant Sam Robertson, and Board Treasurer Harney Skolfield, Jadot was a power in "regular" Democratic political circles.

---

7 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, September 29, 1884; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, October 7, 1884; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, November 14, 1884; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 412-14.
in Baton Rouge. If a dispute with David really did bring about his resignation, David's relationship with Leon Jastremski and Governor McEnery was probably not improved as a result.8

Besides "loose discipline" and a poor boarding department, two other problems confronted David when he returned to the University in 1884. One concerned the school's curriculum and the other the quality of its students. In April, 1885, David made recommendations on both subjects in his Report to the Board of Supervisors. The bulk of the students, he pointed out, were very young and ill-prepared to do college work. As long as the entrance requirements remained so undemanding, the school could not claim to be a college. The Board should decide, David thought, whether it was running a University or merely a preparatory school. A second, more serious criticism, concerned the fact that although they styled themselves an

8David Boyd to Tom Boyd, September 13, 14, 1884, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1882-96, Box 2; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, October 22, 1884; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, October 24, 1884. In 1884 Baton Rouge Democrats were at loggerheads and their fight had enabled Republicans to win control of local offices in the previous election. Jastremski, however, was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee and Jadot spoke for the "regulars" in the First Ward of Baton Rouge. At David's suggestion the Boarding department was done away with in 1886. Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 6, July 29, 1886.
"Agricultural College," they did not teach agriculture, "at least nothing like practical agriculture." David urged the Board to establish a chair of agriculture and fill it with what "our people" would call a "live" man. Other southern universities had done so and were very popular with "agricultural" people as a result.9

In June, 1885, David was more specific. With the concurrence of his staff he recommended to the Board that it raise the entrance requirements and abolish the "Preparatory Department." He also repeated his request for a professorship of agriculture:

This is . . . necessary, even if other (comparatively unimportant) professorships have to be abolished. It places an agricultural college badly on the defensive to have no professor of agriculture, and an active, able man in this chair would do much good for the school and the people.10

This time the Board acted. It raised the entrance age to fifteen, abolished the preparatory department and set up a "sub-freshman" class to provide remedial work for those students whose pre-college training proved inadequate. The Board also named a committee to confer with the Sugar

---

9Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 6, 1885.

10Ibid., June 29, 30, 1885; Baton Rouge Daily-Capitolian Advocate, July 1, 1885.
Planters' Association about cooperative action to operate and support a sugar experiment station and a professorship of agriculture at the University. David and two Board members were authorized to act with the sugar planters to hire someone for the joint position, but in the end David selected the candidate and the others approved his choice. On August 5, 1885, the Capitolian-Advocate was "pleased" to announce that Professor William C. Stubbs, State Chemist of Alabama and a professor at the Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, had accepted the "joint proposition of the Bd. of Supervisors and the La. Sugar Planters' Association." Stubbs would become professor of agriculture at the University and director of the sugar experiment station set up independently by the planters in 1884.\footnote{Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 30, 1885; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, August 5, 1885. David first asked the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors to appoint both William Stubbs and W. LeRoy Broun, Jr., to the University before he left Alabama in 1884. Stubbs was elected professor of agriculture and chemistry in June, 1884, but declined. The Board then named Broun as professor of agricultural and general chemistry, and Richard McCulloch, who formerly held that post, became professor of physics and civil engineering. Under Broun's supervision and with a special appropriation from the legislature the University acquired a chemistry laboratory. By the spring of 1885 David was still trying to bring Professor Stubbs to Louisiana. He arranged for Stubbs to address the Sugar Planters' Association in May, 1885. Impressed, the}
Not everyone was satisfied with David's efforts to make the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College live up to its name. The state Grange, for example, proposed the separation of the Agricultural and Mechanical College from the University at its convention in December, 1884. In December, 1885, it repeated the suggestion, charging that "the agricultural department of said institution is a most lamentable failure." Six months later its president, Daniel Morgan, felt the same way, but by that time Professor Stubbs was teaching agriculture at the University and conducting two experiment stations: one for sugar culture at Kenner, Louisiana, and the other for "general agriculture" in Baton Rouge. In addition the school boasted a well-appointed chemistry department under W. LeRoy Broun, Jr., and a shop for "practical" instruction.

planters used their influence with the Board of Supervisors and by July the Board was ready to act. Stubbs formally accepted a joint appointment from the planters and the University in August, 1885. Besides running the sugar experiment station, he set up a general agricultural experiment station in Baton Rouge in February, 1886, and began teaching regular courses in agriculture at the University the month before. Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 30, 1884; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 418-20; W. C. Stubbs to David Boyd, May 5, 1885, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; W. C. Stubbs to David Boyd, June 15, 1885, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 11.
in mechanics. "This is no longer an Agricultural College with agriculture left out," David could report to the Board of Supervisors in 1886.12

Sometime during the summer of 1885 Governor S. D. McEnery appointed David Boyd State Commissioner of the North, Central and South American Exposition scheduled to open in New Orleans on November 10, 1885. The "American" Exposition, as it was usually called, grew out of the World Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition held the

12Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, December 11, 1884, January 22, July 16, 1886; Baton Rouge Daily Capitilian-Advocate, January 27, 31, December 21, 1885, February 1, 2, 4, 1886; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 6, 1886. It is worth noting that David exchanged letters with Daniel Morgan, Master of the State Grange, in December, 1884, on the subject of separating the University and the Agricultural and Mechanical College. In his letter, which he made public, David endorsed the Granger position and said his own recent experience at L.S.U. and Alabama had convinced him that he erred in 1876-77 when he fought so hard to merge the schools. But considering the sentiments expressed elsewhere in David's writings, both before and after the letter to Morgan, and in view of the fact that he released it to the press, the writer is convinced that David was trying to pressure the Board of Supervisors into action, not to encourage the Grangers. The Board seems to have gotten the message. By July, 1885, they authorized a chair of agriculture and by February, 1886, Louisiana had two experiment stations, operated by a University professor and affording "practical" experience for University students and a "worthwhile" service to the planters and farmers of Louisiana. David's letter to Morgan, written in November, 1884, appeared in the Baton Rouge Weekly Truth on December 26, 1884.
previous year in the Crescent City. Opened on December 16, 1884, the World Exposition was a financial failure almost immediately. In spite of repeated efforts by editors like Leon Jastremski to herd his readers through the turnstiles, the public stayed away in such numbers that the promoters had to appeal to Congress "for another half million" to keep their enterprise afloat. Congress responded in March by granting some $330,000 and the World Exposition managed to operate until June, 1885. Nevertheless, many observers thought it had been good for Louisiana. For one thing, it brought capitalists to New Orleans from all over the country. Surely, one paper commented, their visits must have convinced them what a rich field the "backward South" offered for investment. As for Louisiana, it needed "new blood" in its sagging industries. "The South needs monied men," concluded the editor, "and the Exposition served to attract them."13

Such sentiments probably explain why Bourbon politicians like Governor S. D. McEnery and Leon Jastremski

13David Boyd to Wm. C. Stubbs, August 9, 1885, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; Pamphlet announcing the North, Central and South American Exposition for 1885-86, September 1, 1885, ibid., Printed Items, 1875-86, Box 19; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, December 17, 1884, January 2, 6, 10, May 16, 1885; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, June 5, 1885.
were willing to encourage the directors of the World
Exposition to continue operations for a second year. Under
a new title, the North, Central, and South American Exposi-
tion, it opened on the old site on November 10, 1885. Very
quickly, the "American" Exposition proved to be a bigger
financial fiasco than its predecessor. For David it was a
disaster. As State Commissioner, it was his job to provide
Louisiana with an exhibit worthy of the Pelican state.
Several faculty members from the University could provide
him with assistance, and the directors of the Exposition
promised him $2,000 for necessary expenses. But in David's
opinion $10,000 would not be enough to do Louisiana justice.
Therefore, in a printed folder he appealed to every parish
for contributions to supplement the $2,000. He also urged
every craft and industry in the state to cooperate with the
University in preparing Louisiana's exhibit. "There will
be no separate colored department," David's brochure an-
nounced. "All are citizens of Louisiana alike; and all
alike are welcome within the Louisiana space." ¹⁴

¹⁴ David Boyd, Pamphlet announcing the North, Central
and South American Exposition for 1885-86, September 1, 1885,
in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1875-86, Box 19;
Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 5, 1885; Baton
Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, October 28, November 23,
called for him to address the Louisiana Educational Association convention at Monroe in August, a visit with his family in Auburn, Alabama, and a trip to Washington, D. C., to help secure the United States Barracks at Baton Rouge as a permanent home for the University. He fulfilled his obligation in Monroe with a speech on "The Educational Value of Discipline," but he did not go to Auburn or Washington. Instead, Ettie Boyd and one of their children visited him briefly in New Orleans and the Washington trip was cancelled altogether. The rest of his time was spent in New Orleans with Professors W. LeRoy Broun, Jr., and William C. Stubbs, who worked reverishly with him to prepare Louisiana's exhibit for the Exposition. However, he and Professor Broun did leave the city in late September to visit various geological formations in north Louisiana. Broun stayed in the northern part of the state for several days, but David returned to Baton Rouge by October 3, 1885, to be present for the opening of the University and the Board meeting two days later.15

1885; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, March 19, 1885.

15David Boyd to W. C. Stubbs, August 9, 1885, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, September 18, 1885, ibid., Box 5; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, August 21, October 2, 9, 1885; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, April 7, 1885.
In his report to the Board David explained how he had spent most of the summer and indicated that he would "necessarily" be away from the University for much of the coming session. But with Professor Nicholson in charge, he did not think his duties at the Exposition would interfere with the operation of the school. Still, there were some things for which the Board should be prepared. Because they had raised admissions standards and abolished the Preparatory Department, they must not expect more than 100 students to enroll during the year. And if only fifty boarded at the school, they could not hope to meet expenses in the "Boarding Dept." He regretted to call attention to such a "disagreeable" matter, but duty compelled him to warn the Board that there was "danger ahead."

In his newspaper, Leon Jastremski gave no indication that he shared David's concern for the University's financial future. "The affairs of the institution being found in a very satisfactory condition," he reported, there was nothing but "routine business" for the Board to transact. However, the unpublished minutes of the Board's October proceedings do show that the members were anxious to minimize unnecessary expenses. Acting on his own authority, David had spent $300 for a "valuable herbarium" to add to the
University's "museum." As chairman of the Finance Committee, Leon Jastremski refused to approve David's action. He thought the entire Board ought to consider such expenditures, not merely his committee. With only one dissent the Board sustained David's purchase of the herbarium, but then they resolved that "hereafter such expenditures be made only by the executive committee." Leon Jastremski, it should be noted, chaired that committee too.16

That relations between David and Jastremski were deteriorating late in 1885 is clear from the December minutes of the Board of Supervisors. David spent almost the entire period from October 5, when the session opened, until December 7, when the Board met, in New Orleans attending to his duties as State Commissioner of the Exposition. The difficulties he encountered were so great, he told the Board, that his constant presence in the Crescent City was "absolutely necessary." Obviously Jastremski did not agree. He noted verbally that the Finance Committee could not supply the Board with a formal report. It had not met since the previous October, he explained, due to the "continued

16 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 5, 6, 1885; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, October 7, 1885.
absence of the President of the Faculty." Then, when Alumni member Milton Strickland moved that David be granted three months salary in advance to defray the heavy expense of living in New Orleans, Jastremski joined another member, H. M. Favrot, in opposing the motion. A few days later his newspaper provided some amplification. The Strickland motion carried, Jastremski noted, but it stimulated a lengthy argument during which it became clear that "some Board members" favored withholding salary from professors who had "recently been absent from duty." The result was Board approval for a proposal offered by Leon Jastremski: "Resolved, that it is the sense of this Board that whenever a member of the faculty shall absent himself on his private business he shall not be allowed pay during such absences." 17

Apparently Leon Jastremski did not accept Milton Strickland's statement that David was "at present employed in a dual capacity" as president of the University and State Commissioner of the Exposition. He was being paid to perform the duties of the former, Jastremski believed, and

17 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, December 7, 8, 1885; Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, December 10, 1885.
that he clearly could not do when absent from Baton Rouge. Neither could the several younger professors whom David had called out of the classroom to help him in New Orleans. At least two of them, W. LeRoy Broun, Jr., and Leonard Sewell, realized it. On November 11, 1885, Broun wrote David from Baton Rouge after the two left New Orleans without David's knowledge. "I would have told you of our going," Broun explained, "but honestly I was afraid you would keep . . . us." For days Broun had had little to do in the Crescent City. He was anxious to work and he knew his classes at the University were not being taught. If David wanted anything analyzed, he could mail it to Baton Rouge and Broun would do it gladly. But he begged not to be summoned to New Orleans any more. Or, if David would return to the University, Broun would gladly "take charge" in New Orleans. At least it would give David a rest. "But to come down there and do a negroes' work, while my classes are suffering here, and I doing no good, excuse me--" Then, pleadingly, he begged David to come to Baton Rouge for his own good. "Come please if it is only for a day, once a week . . . Come up please and let yourself be seen by the students
and people of the town."^{18}

David was certainly not enjoying himself in New Orleans. Even before the Exposition opened on November 10, 1885, he had had to ask Treasurer Harney Skolfield to send him his salary in advance. Skolfield was David's friend and agreed to forward most of David's pay for November, but he did not dare do more than that. "You understand my position here," he apologized to David, "... and I feel that you would not have me do something wrong."^{19} As already explained, Milton Strickland managed to obtain David's pay through February, 1886, when the Board met the previous December, but the money did little to make his life more pleasant. On January 20, 1886, he wrote Tom Boyd that he had tried to "get away to Baton Rouge, but with no luck." If possible, he would leave New Orleans the next day to spend the weekend at the University. But whatever he did or wherever he went no longer seemed important. "I am doing no good," he told Tom, "making no progress--altho' I have never worked so hard--nor suffered so much in all my life as

---

^{18}Baton Rouge Daily Capitolian-Advocate, December 10, 1885; W. LeRoy Broun, Jr., to David Boyd, November 11, 1885, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 4.

^{19}Harney Skolfield to David Boyd, November 3, 1885, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10.
recently. My life is now a hell on earth. Death wd be a great relief."²⁰ Two days later he was still in New Orleans, still despondent and still planning to go to Baton Rouge the "next day." But now he had reached a decision:

It is my intention to resign on Feb. 1st, to take effect immediately. Somehow, I hope to get the money to refund the Feb. pay already paid me. My return to La. was an error. The Exposition has probably only hastened the denouement /\ the end! I feel grateful to you, and to my friends generally, for yr. interest in me, and in my welfare. I only wish now to get away from La.--where to God only knows. I shall try and stay here in N. O. . . . till the close of the Exposition. But that looks like . . . an impossibility--for I have not a dollar in the world. But the future must take care of itself.²¹

David did not write his letter of resignation until April 5, 1886, and it was not presented to the Board until the following June. His "private affairs," he explained to Governor McEnery, were in such bad condition as to make him "unfit" to discharge his duties properly. Therefore he begged to be relieved as early as possible. The reason offered was sound enough, but it was probably not the only one for David's resignation. By the late fall and winter

²⁰David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 20, 1886, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers 1886-89, Box 2.

²¹David Boyd to Tom Boyd, January 22, 1886, ibid.
of 1885-86, he was under fire from several quarters for his prolonged absence from the University. Since the previous August he had not spent more than a few days in Baton Rouge and many of the local citizens clearly resented it. W. LeRoy Broun's letter of November, 1885, urging him to let himself be seen more often by the students and the townspeople of Baton Rouge has already been noted. So has the attitude of Leon Jastremski whose paper reported pointedly in late February, 1886, the "pleasure of meeting Col. Boyd this morning, who came up last night and returned to New Orleans this morning." But the most telling criticism may have been that of O. P. Skolfield, an irate parent who complained directly to Governor McEnery. Following the intermediate examinations in February, 1886, Skolfield's son and eleven other cadets had been asked to "withdraw" from the University for academic reasons. Out of a possible 100 points young Skolfield scored only forty-four; his professors, the father learned, labeled him a "drag" on his class. But, demanded Skolfield, were not the professors also at fault for "so much absence" which was "so well known?" "Those who sit in judgement," he declared, "... should first pluck the mote from their own eyes before they
seek to find it elsewhere."\textsuperscript{22}

Besides extreme poverty and criticism for his long absence from Baton Rouge, a feeling that the state and the University did not appreciate his drudgery at the Exposition may have caused David to resign in June, 1886. It must have hurt when a Baton Rouge paper described the entire Exposition as "rather dull," but singled out David's contribution, the Louisiana exhibit, for special criticism. From New Orleans, the paper's correspondent reported:

\begin{quote}
I guess you think I wasted my time here, but after I had seen Louisiana's exhibit, which seemed to be principally alligators, I felt as if I needed a little rest to recover from the effects of such a representation of our State. There were big alligators, middle-sized alligators, and little alligators. Also a figure of a negro man ploughing up the ground with alligators attached to his plow.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

After the Exposition closed, the Board of Supervisors may have added to David's sense of injury. The members were reluctant to accept the Louisiana Exhibit for the

\textsuperscript{22} P. Skofield to Governor S. D. McEnery, undated, incorporated in Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 6, 1886; David Boyd to Governor S. D. McEnery, April 5, 1886, incorporated in \textit{ibid.}, June 28, 1886; Baton Rouge \textit{Daily Capitolian-Advocate}, February 25, 1886. Skofield's letter to McEnery must have been written in February, 1886. A letter from Leon Jastremski to David protesting the University action is dated March 1, 1886. Leon Jastremski to David Boyd, March 1, 1886, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.

\textsuperscript{23} Baton Rouge \textit{Weekly Truth}, March 19, 1886.
University, even as a gift, because it would cost the school $500 to ship it from New Orleans. Considering that David spent some $2,000 of his own money to produce it and to acquire other exhibits which he gave to the University, the Board's attitude must have struck him as particularly ungrateful.\textsuperscript{24}

The Board of Supervisors considered David's resignation on June 28, 1886, but for some reason, perhaps the lack of a quorum, did not act on it until several days later. The delay allowed David's friends on the Board and among his ex-students enough time to organize a modest campaign begging him not to leave the University. It proved effective. On July 9, the Board reconvened and approved a motion that "Col. Boyd be requested to reconsider and withdraw his resignation." Governor McEnery appointed a committee to confer with David and shortly thereafter he agreed

\textsuperscript{24}Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 6, 7, July 30, 1886; Fleming, \textit{Louisiana State University}, 425-26. A letter from David's former enemy, Professor R. S. McCulloch, seems to support the premise that David resigned in the summer of 1886 because his hard work for the school and the state were not appreciated by the Board. McCulloch, away from Baton Rouge for the summer, knew David had submitted his resignation, but did not know what action the Board finally took. He hoped they rejected it and that they and the state would reimburse David for the large debt he incurred for "public benefit and not for personal ends or wants." R. S. McCulloch to David Boyd, August 5, 1886, in
to remain as president "at the Bd's. request."^25

Whether David intended his June, 1886, resignation seriously or merely as a test of his strength in the Board is not clear from the records that remain. He certainly had plenty of sound reasons to resign, but he also had a history of subjecting his administration to votes of confidence, somewhat like a British prime minister. If that is what he was doing in this instance, the results must have pleased him. If not, his decision to stay on merely prolonged his agony. In any case, the next time he resigned no committee of the Board would visit him in an effort to change his mind.

Two questions which later gave rise to David's final resignation as president of the University came before the Board of Supervisors at a third meeting held during the summer of 1886. One concerned a drastic economy program and the other involved the University's acquisition of the United States Barracks property as a permanent domicile. On July 29 Governor McEnery summoned the Board into special

---

^25 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 28, 29, July 9, 1886; Henry Favrot to David Boyd, June 30, 1886, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 7.
session to consider the University's precarious financial condition. Charles J. Leeds, chairman of the Committee on the State of the College, reported that the University's limited income made it an absolute necessity for his committee to recommend abolition of the chair of ancient languages and assumption by the president of the chair of English literature. This would save $3,000 in professors' salaries, but it would also put Tom Boyd, who taught English, out of employment. Board member Joseph Spearing reacted vehemently. "I consider that the services of any professor could better be dispensed with than . . . those of Prof. T. D. Boyd," Spearing declared. He thought expenses might better be reduced by combining certain professorships and reducing salaries. After two days of discussion the Board agreed. Everyone except David, who would get $1,900 instead of $2,500 as president and professor of civil engineering, was cut to $1,425. In addition the Board approved Spearing's motion that no expenditure be made except for absolutely necessary repairs and that no expense of any sort be incurred without first receiving the approval of the Executive Committee. As vice-president of the Board,
Leon Jastremski was chairman of that committee.²⁶

Besides the Spearing resolution against unauthorized expenditures, Board action concerning the United States Barracks property in Baton Rouge also contributed to David's final resignation as president of the University. On July 29, 1886, the Board formally accepted the Barracks from the United States government as the University's new home. It also authorized David to take actual possession of the buildings as soon as the deed transferring the property to Louisiana became effective. Acquisition of the property had not been easy. David first tried to get it for the University after fire destroyed the Seminary building in 1869. But at that time the Federal government still needed the Barracks to house troops stationed in the Southern states. Later, when troops were finally withdrawn, local interests began arguing over the disposition of the property. Some, like David, thought it would make a good

²⁶ W. H. Goodale to David Boyd, July 29, 1886, in Boyd (David F.) papers, Box 7; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 29, 30, 1886. In a letter to Tom Boyd Professor J. W. Nicholson complained that the salary reduction looked like a personal attack on him because his pay cut was larger than anyone else's. He thought he had a right to "have expected different and better treatment" from David. That David "allowed" the reduction, Nicholson believed, was evidence of an "unkind and ungrateful" feeling toward him. Two days later Nicholson talked with David who
home for the University. Others wanted it to house the State Asylum for the Blind. Still others, like Mayor Leon Jastremski and the Baton Rouge City Council, thought the property should be sold to the highest bidder. In 1882 Baton Rouge became the state capitol and the town needed room to expand. It would be foolish and unjust, Jastremski declared in his paper, to block development northward along the river by allowing any state institution to occupy the property. Besides, neither the Asylum for the Blind nor the University could afford to maintain the Barracks "in creditable order." The government would not donate the property outright, he pointed out. What would happen to either state institution if Washington should ever reclaim the installation?

Meanwhile, various congressmen and senators from

explained fully what took place at the Board meeting and, in a second letter to Tom, asked him to ignore what had been said in the first. Meanwhile Tom replied to the first letter, rebuking Nicholson for his attack on David and pointing out that it was necessary to cut expenses by $4,000. David himself took a reduction from $2,500 to $1,900 and the only reason Nicholson's pay dropped so much more than the others was that he had been paid so much more thanks to David and his friends on the Board. It was a "frailty of human nature," Tom told Nicholson, "to forget the favors people have done one, and accuse them, instead, of ingratitude." J. W. Nicholson to Thomas Boyd, August 17, 19, 1886; Tom Boyd to J. W. Nicholson, August 21, 1886, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.
Louisiana presented bills to Congress concerning disposition of the property, and the legislature asked Congress to donate it to the state for educational purposes. In December, 1884, Senator R. H. Gibson of Louisiana introduced a measure which would transfer the Barracks property to Louisiana for use by the University with the proviso that it be insured, maintained, and returned to the Federal government if it ever ceased to be used for educational purposes. Jastremski praised Senator Gibson and supported his bill in 1884. It did not pass, but two years later a very similar measure offered by Congressman A. B. Irion of Avoyelles Parish, did receive congressional approval. This time Jastremski opposed the transfer. The government should donate the property to Louisiana unconditionally, he declared, or not at all. The cost to maintain the buildings "if used only for educational purposes" would render them a "burden" to the state. The editor's stand may have been influenced by Governor McEnery. In his message to the legislature in May, 1886, McEnery called the donation of the Barracks property to Louisiana a "Trojan gift." The United States government, he charged, would prove to be an "Indian giver." It would let Louisiana use and maintain the installation and then demand its return at some future date.
Later, when a delegation of Baton Rouge citizens remonstrated with him, McEnery denied any intention to influence legislative acceptance of the Federal property. His only interest, he insisted, was to indicate his own position against obligating the state in any way to carry out the terms of the congressional proposal.

The lawmakers took McEnery at his word. Ignoring his warning that it would cost $100,000 to put the Barracks property in good condition, they voted to accept the Federal government's conditional donation and on July 29, 1886, the Board of Supervisors formally received the Barracks as the University's new home. But actual possession, as mentioned above, had to wait until the act of transfer became effective. After minor delays Governor McEnery's secretary gave David permission to occupy the property and by the first week in September, 1886, he had taken rooms in one of the Barracks buildings. His eagerness to move the rest of the school into its new home accounted for his last, and final, resignation as president of the University.27

27Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, September 29, 1884, June 29, July 29, September 5, 1886; E. W. Robertson to David Boyd, December 14, 1881, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 10; Baton Rouge Daily Capitilian-Advocate, February 4, 8, 9, 18, June 30, 1882, September 18, 20, December 29, 1884; Baton Rouge Weekly
Because the Board of Supervisors had no funds to pay moving costs, it appealed to the people of Baton Rouge for whatever assistance they could provide. The response was gratifying. At a citizens meeting, leading businessmen offered to furnish wagons, free of charge, to transport University property from the Asylum building to the Barracks. In addition they agreed to raise $1,000 to be loaned to the city without interest. The city would then grant that amount to the University and the following year, when the city budget was prepared, it would provide for repayment to the public spirited businessmen. The Board thanked the townspeople and waited for the wagons and money to appear. But two weeks passed and nothing happened. On September 18, 1886, the Executive Committee notified the mayor that the school could not open in its new home if the promised aid were not received soon. Three days later the mayor replied that the expected "cooperation" had not materialized and he could not take any further action on his own authority. Under the circumstances, the Executive Committee

Truth, April 30, May 11, June 25, September 3, 1886; S. B. no. 2474, December 19, 1884, 48 Cong., 2 Sess., in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook; E. W. Halsey, Secretary to Governor McEnery, to David Boyd, August 17, 1886, ibid., Box 4; Fleming, Louisiana State University, 429-32. Actually the cost to repair the buildings came closer to $10,000.
decided, it could do nothing until the next legislature met. At that time it would apply for a special appropriation to move the University. 28

David was a member of the Executive Committee, along with H. M. Favrot, Superintendent of Public Education Warren Easton, and vice-president of the Board, Leon Jastremski. He signed the Executive Committee report which declared the school had to stay in its old quarters. But on his own authority he somehow arranged to have the Barracks buildings cleaned and the most essential repair work done during the month of September. He also managed to have everything except the chemistry laboratory, the library, the museum and the "mechanical" workshop moved to the new location. Every class except the "chemical class" could be conducted at the Barracks, he told the Board when it met on October 4. And, "unless ordered not to, and in accordance with orders given Sept. 7, 1886," he expected to open the 1886-87 session at the "U. S. Military Garrison" on October 5. 29

Apparently no one "ordered" David not to open the

__________

28 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 29, September 5, 6, 7, October 4, 1886; Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, September 10, 1886.

29 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, October 4,
session at the Barracks in October. But obviously his unilateral decision to move the University in defiance of the Executive Committee's September 18, 1886, injunction, offended certain members of the Board. To make matters worse, he bragged about it at a special Board meeting held on November 8, 1886. The University had moved, he declared in his Report, "in spite of a Resolution not to." Then he presented the Board with a financial statement. He had "already" spent $1,800 to clean up and move the school. But that figure was not "necessarily a debt agst. the University." It was incurred for the "best interests" of the school; and, if the Board could pay it somehow, he thought it would be "altogether best to do so." The Board adopted a motion to that effect, but then an unidentified member secured passage of another motion to have Joseph Spearing's resolution against any unauthorized expenditure, adopted in July, 1886, published in Leon Jastremski's newspaper. It was that action which caused David to resign the presidency for the last time on November 11, 1886.  

Believing that the Board meant to "reprove ... .

1886.

him publicly," he dashed off a letter of resignation to Governor McEnery who endorsed it and referred it to the Executive Committee. Exactly what the letter said is not clear, but David later claimed he wrote it while "under a sense of wrong done me." On December 6, 1886, the committee accepted David's resignation and, at McEnery's suggestion, it chose a president pro tempore to replace him. The man selected was David's brother, Thomas D. Boyd. Governor McEnery was delighted. "I hope," he wrote Tom in an undated note, "your temporary appointment may result in your receiving the position permanently."31

How David reacted when he learned the identity of his successor is not recorded. But many agreed with Governor McEnery that Tom would make an excellent president. His "fine executive ability, broad views and discreet judgement," remarked the Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, convinced his "many warm friends" that Tom would administer the school with honor to himself and great advantage to the institution. Then, as an afterthought, the paper added: "It is probable that Col. D. F. Boyd will be tendered a

31 Ibid., April 4, 1887; Governor Samuel McEnery to Thomas Boyd, undated; Harney Skolfield to Gov. S. D. McEnery, December 7, 1886, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.
professorship at the University." The editor was right.

The minutes of the Executive Committee for January 4, 1887, reveal that David, "having reconsidered . . . his resignation" insofar as his professorship was concerned, would be retained by the University in the chair of civil engineering. His salary was fixed at $1,425 per year and it would be paid from December 4, 1886, the day his resignation as president took effect.32

By April, 1887, when the Board of Supervisors met for its regular spring session, Tom Boyd had served as president for four months and David had "reconsidered" his letter of resignation once again. In fact, he must have done little else from the time he stepped down as president early in December. A letter sent to Governor McEnery on April 4, 1887, reveals a great deal about his state of mind in the intervening period. Marked "confidential" and delivered to the governor just before the Board convened, the letter stated:

With your approval, and only with the consent and withdrawal of my brother from candidacy for the permanent presidency of the University, I wd ask

32Baton Rouge Weekly Truth, December 10, 1886; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 4, 1887.
the permission of the Board of Supervisors to retract my resignation... I think such a course wd be best for all parties concerned. But I will do nothing without your knowledge and Thos. D. Boyd, who also now has interests and feelings to be considered. Besides, he has made you an admirable president, and is well worthy of the honor of the permanent appointment.

David had not discussed "this matter" with his brother.

Therefore he asked Governor McEnery to refer "this private letter" to Tom for his information and whatever action he might choose to take after consultation with the governor. David also told McEnery that he did not think he should remain at the University if the only post he could expect to hold were that of professor of civil engineering. "There is as the classes have been arranged, little or nothing for me to do," he explained, and he did not want to be a burden to the institution:

This, together with a wish to save wounded pride, and to give the Board an opportunity to relieve its sting, causes me to ask with the approval and assistance of your excellency and my brother, ... to have the past undone.33

McEnery honored David's request immediately. With a covering note he sent David's confidential letter to Tom Boyd, remarking that Tom already had his (McEnery's)

---

33David Boyd to Governor S. D. McEnery, April 4, 1887, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.
endorsement for permanent appointment to the presidency. However, if Tom saw "fit and proper" to withdraw in favor of his brother, the governor would not oppose David's application to the Board to retract his resignation. It must have been a painful decision for Tom to make. He certainly wanted the job and the Board wanted him to have it, but David's latest attempt "to have the past undone" made him step aside. In a letter to E. L. Stephens written in 1896, when he finally did become president of the University, Tom declared: "Strange irony of fate that ten years ago when it was my highest ambition to hold the presidency of the State University, the glittering prize slipped through my fingers, and that now, when I do not want it, it should be offered to me!"

34 Governor S. D. McEnery to Thomas Boyd, April 4, 1887; Unsigned note in Tom Boyd's handwriting, July 2, 1888, ibid.

35 Tom Boyd to E. L. Stephens, July 13, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1896. Another line in the same letter is also revealing. When he was a student, Tom told Stephens, he used to "wonder" that "with such equipments and such a faculty," the school had failed to accomplish "grand" results. "The reason assigned on all sides," Tom recalled, "was that it lacked a head, a president to harmonize and unify and concentrate all the forces that work in and around the school." Twenty-five years later, when Tom was president of the Louisiana State Normal School at Natchitoches, the University still needed a president who could "harmonize and unify" all the forces that "work in
When the Board convened on April 4, 1887, its first act was to consider David's application to have his letter of resignation set aside. In it David stipulated that his request was made on one condition: that the "rights and interests of ... Prof. Thos. D. Boyd be in no wise injured" by any action to reinstate him. "Prof. Boyd has made the University a most admirable and able presiding officer," David declared, "and it would be but simply his due to make him the permanent president." Member H. M. Favrot agreed. He moved to elect Tom Boyd permanent president immediately, but another member managed to postpone action until the following day. At that session Leon Jastremski's motion to appoint Tom permanently passed without opposition. Tom thanked the members but "owing to the peculiar circumstances under which he was placed" had to decline the honor. Warren Easton, the superintendent of

and around the school." J. W. Nicholson held the University presidency between 1887 and 1896, but apparently his administration too, failed to provide the necessary harmony. As Tom explained to Stephens in the 1896 letter, he finally agreed to leave Nachitoches for Baton Rouge "to bring order out of chaos." For a full discussion of Tom Boyd's success at Nachitoches see Wilkerson, *Thomas Duckett Boyd*, Chapters 6-7.

36 David Boyd to Gov. S. D. McEnery, April 4, 1887, in Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 4, 1887.
public education, then moved that Tom remain as president pro tempore until the end of the session. Again Tom declined, declaring that under no circumstances would he be a candidate for a position that David wanted. At that point the Board's deliberations were interrupted by the sudden illness of H. M. Favrot, and Leon Jastremski moved that the election of a president be postponed until the regular meeting in July, 1887. After authorizing the Executive Committee to appoint a president pro tempore for the rest of the session, the Board adjourned without acting on David's request to withdraw his resignation.37

When the Board assembled in July, there were at least half a dozen applicants for the vacant presidency. But again the members chose to postpone election of a permanent president and again they failed to act on David's application to withdraw his resignation. Meanwhile, the Board's personnel was changing. H. M. Favrot, who died

37Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd, 88-89; Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 4, 5, 1887. On April 8, 1887, Leon Jastremski notified Tom Boyd that the Executive Committee would meet the following week to choose a president pro tempore to replace him. Meanwhile, the "senior professor" would automatically assume the president pro tempore's duties if Tom notified him by letter that he had relinquished the position. J. W. Nicholson was the senior professor. Leon Jastremski to Thomas Boyd, April 8, 1887, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1886-89, Box 2.
without regaining consciousness after the April meeting, had been replaced by General Joseph Brent, David's old cavalry commander, and Judge F. H. Farrar, another of David's friends, submitted his resignation following the meeting in July. By October, 1887, there were additional changes in the Board's composition, but still no effort was made to elect a permanent president. Nor did the Board consider David's request to withdraw his resignation. However, it did give him something to occupy his time by re-establishing the chair of ancient languages and assigning him to fill it until a permanent replacement could be employed. The Board may even have acted at David's suggestion. Months earlier, when he first asked to be restored to the presidency, David complained that his duties as professor of civil engineering did not give him enough to do.\textsuperscript{38}

The next regular session of the Board took place in December, 1887, but only a provisional quorum, seven members, appeared at the meeting. Therefore, every action taken would have to be ratified at the next session in

\textsuperscript{38}Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 4, July 4, 5, October 3, 1887; Robert C. Wickliffe (former governor), to David Boyd, July 7, 1887, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
April, 1888. Once more the members present avoided the election of a permanent president, by voting to postpone the issue until July, 1888. The heated contest for control of the Democratic party, then about to convene to select a ticket for the coming state election, probably influenced the Board's action. Former Governor Francis T. Nicholls was challenging incumbent S. D. McEnery for the gubernatorial nomination, and whoever won would have to face Henry Clay Warmoth in the general election scheduled for the spring of 1888. A University president selected by a Board of McEnery appointees might prove unacceptable if either Nicholls or Warmoth finally became governor. 39

In any case the Board was so divided even before the next gubernatorial administration began that it could not settle any question relative to the presidency when it met in April, 1888. One member, Joseph Spearing, moved to ratify the December meeting's provisional action to postpone selection of a permanent president until July. A second part of the same motion sought to answer David's year-old request to withdraw his resignation. In Spearing's words:

39 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, December 5, 1887; McGinty, History of Louisiana, 233. Nicholls won the intraparty contest against McEnery and then proceeded to defeat Warmoth by a sizable majority.
It is the sense of this Board considering the length of time which has unavoidably elapsed before the Board could reply and the further fact that filling the Presidency . . . at this time might be considered improper and discourteous to the incoming State Administration, that no action be taken on his request at this meeting and that in coming to this decision the Board means no reflection on Col. Boyd personally or officially. 40

Immediately another member offered a substitute motion to block the Spearing proposal. The substitute failed by a six to six tie and Spearing's motion lost by precisely the same vote. Finally, an effort by one of David's friends to elect a president immediately also went down to defeat because of the same tie vote. Governor McEnery's ballot could have broken the deadlock, but he chose to stay away from the meeting. Necessarily, the presidential election held over until July and David's application to withdraw his resignation continued to go unanswered. 41

Meanwhile Governor Francis T. Nicholls took office and, with the advice of his attorney general, made several new appointments to the University Board. One major change put Baton Rouge businessman William Garig in Leon Jastremski's place as vice-president and another declared

40 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, April 2, 1888.

41 Ibid.
two other members (who usually supported David) ineligible because one had won an elective office and the other failed to have his oath of office recorded. By July, however, David could hardly have entertained any hopes of regaining the presidency. Even if he had, the following motion adopted on July 3, 1888, would have laid them to rest:

Whereas Col. D. F. Boyd's letter . . . requesting withdrawal of his resignation . . . could not be acted on in April, 1887 (due to the sudden illness of H. M. Favrot); and since then . . . by unavoidable circumstance the Board has had to postpone an answer . . . ; therefore be it resolved: That since more than a year has elapsed since Boyd's resignation was tendered and accepted, during which time the school has been ably conducted by 2 other men, we do not deem it expedient to assent to the withdrawal of Boyd's resignation.42

In other action taken the same day Tom Boyd resigned to become president of Louisiana State Normal School at Natchitoches, the Board named a three-man committee to find a person "suitable for Pres.," and it empowered the same committee to fill any "other vacancies in the faculty which now exist or that may hereafter exist." The committee,

composed of Governor Nicholls, Vice-President Garig, and S. McC. Lawrason, reported to the Board at a special meeting on July 28, 1888. After an executive session and a dinner recess, the members elected J. W. Nicholson permanent president of the University. They also adopted Vice-President Garig's motion to vacate all professorships. The chairs (or departments) were then reorganized and at least two men, Professors R. S. McCulloch and Leonard Sewell, the librarian, lost their jobs. Two others, W. H. Magruder (Latin and English), and Charles Chollet (modern languages and Greek), were added to the staff. Since October, 1887, David had been teaching ancient languages in addition to civil engineering which the Board now assigned to J. H. Randolph, the professor of mechanics. But the reorganization would not affect David personally. He had already submitted his resignation as professor of civil engineering on July 27, 1888, the day before the Board convened for the special session.43

In a letter to Governor Francis T. Nicholls David

43 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, July 3, 28, 1888. Besides extending a vote of thanks to Vice-President Garig for his "efficient work" in reorganizing the University, the Board voted to deposit University funds in his bank, the First National of Baton Rouge. Fleming, Louisiana State University, 467-68.
explained that his "pecuniary obligations" made it necessary for him to find a position which would bring him more than the "meagre salary" he received from the University. For years he had served the school on "virtually no pay," and if it still needed him he would do so again. But "no such necessity" existed in 1888 and David trusted it never would again. Nevertheless, it hurt him to leave after so many years.

For twenty-nine years, almost continuously, have I served the Institution. I would not be human, could I leave it now without feelings of regret . . . [illegible]. For me to turn my back on the University and go away is much like a mother of a family leaving her old home and her children forever! But such is my fate. It is God's will. Let it be so.

But may God ever protect the University, and give it prosperity, is the prayer of Your obedient servant, David F. Boyd.  

Draft of a letter from David Boyd to Governor Francis T. Nicholls, July 27, 1888, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, David F. Boyd Letters and Papers, 1858-88, Box 4. The lines "But such is my fate. It is God's will. Let it be so." probably did not appear in the letter David finally sent to Governor Nicholls. They were crossed out of his draft.
CHAPTER XIII

"STRUGGLE AND SUFFERING . . . PRIVATION AND PAIN . . ."

Weeks before he resigned his professorship at Louisiana State University, David knew he would be spending the next few years superintending a military academy at Farmdale, Kentucky. In March, 1888, he opened negotiations to lease the Kentucky Military Institute "for a term of years" and in mid-July he announced his association with the school in a printed circular and a Kentucky newspaper. Founded in 1845 and chartered by the state two years later, the Kentucky Military Institute was located six miles south of the state capital, Frankfort, on the turnpike to Harrodsburg. Like so many schools of its type, it closed during the Civil War when professors and students resigned en masse to enter military service. After the war it resumed operations, continuing with diminishing success until 1887 when it closed for one session.Apparently David learned of its availability from ex-Confederate General Simon Buckner who
was governor of Kentucky in 1888.¹

In a prospectus published during his second year in Kentucky, David described the faculty, curriculum and discipline of the Institute. Besides the superintendent who taught "natural philosophy" and civil engineering, there were six faculty members on the staff in 1889-90. Two vacancies existed but David hoped to fill the one in "military tactics" with a United States officer. Degrees awarded included the bachelor of arts, the bachelor of science, the master of arts, and a "certificate" in civil engineering. For younger cadets there was a preparatory class, but, David emphasized, "This school is a college . . ." As for its relationship to the state, the Institute operated under a state charter. The governor appointed its Board of Supervisors, but "private parties" owned the school and only David, the superintendent, was responsible for "the management of its affairs." David made the point even clearer in a "special notice" to parents at the end of his brochure. Cadets had to enroll for the entire session, he pointed out,

¹Crutcher and Starks, Mens' & Boys' Outfitters, to David Boyd, March 18, 1888, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 6; Circular, July 21, 1888, ibid., Printed pamphlets, 1890-99, Box 21; Western Argus (Frankfort, Kentucky), July 12, September 2, 1888; Barksdale Hamlett, "History of Education in Kentucky," Department of Education Bulletin, VII
and they would be charged accordingly. Once entered, their parents would have no control over them "while at the Institute." Nor should parents try to prolong their sons' furloughs or cause them to violate school regulations in any way. "Parents or guardians who may not assent to the above conditions . . . ," David declared, "are requested not to enter their sons or wards as cadets." 2

In spite of the stern warning, forty-six cadets attended the Institute in 1889-90. Over forty enrolled in the summer session in 1891 and by October, 1891, the school's morning report claimed a student body of fifty-six. On the surface the Kentucky Military Institute seemed to be doing well. Old friends like General Sherman and Professor Schele de Vere at the University of Virginia were glad to hear it. They congratulated David, wishing him good luck and "continued success." Other signs, however, indicated that David was heading for financial trouble. In January, 1891, he bought two shares of stock in the "KMI Corp.," apparently to show his faith in the Institute's future. But he could not

---

2Prospectus for Kentucky Military Institute, 1889-90, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Pamphlets, 1890-99, Box 21.
raise the necessary cash so he left the stock with the seller as collateral, along with his note to be retired in six months. Later that year a printer and a brewer in nearby Frankfort sent him dunning letters, and he transferred the school's account from one druggist to another when the first made repeated demands that he settle his bill. Telegrams, notes, and cancelled checks drawn on Tom Boyd's bank account offer additional evidence of David's financial instability between 1888 and 1893. The telegrams, which Tom seems to have answered positively in every instance, usually requested loans ranging in size from fifty to seventy-five dollars. Quite urgent in tone, they frequently asked Tom to deposit money in a Frankfort bank in time to cover checks David had already written to some of his numerous creditors. ³

By 1893, his last year as superintendent of the Kentucky Military Institute, David was certainly in serious

³Morning Report for Kentucky Military Institute, 1891, ibid., MS Volumes; L. B. McBrayer to David Boyd, January 6, 1891; David Boyd to W. S. Favrieur, secretary of the Kentucky Military Institute Corporation, undated, ibid., Box 6; Numerous overdue bills to David Boyd, July 1, 1888-January 1, 1892, ibid., Box 8; Wm. T. Sherman to David Boyd, September 15, 1890, in Boyd-Sherman Letters; Professor Schele de Vere to David Boyd, December 4, 1890, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alpha File, Box 8; Telegrams, cancelled checks, requests for loans to Tom Boyd, 1888-93, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1890-93, Box 2.
financial difficulty. His father, Thomas Jefferson Boyd, died on February 16 and David probably went to Wytheville for the funeral although nothing in his papers confirms the trip. What is clear, however, is the fact that he borrowed over $500 from someone in New Orleans to retire a debt owed by the Boyd family in Virginia. To secure the loan he ordered some four hundred books in his personal library (then stored in Baton Rouge) shipped to his creditor. If the money were not repaid within a year, the creditor could sell the books and apply what they brought against David's debt. Ultimately that is what happened, not only to his library, but also to the only other valuable possession David still owned in 1893. Years earlier he purchased some furniture which once belonged to Bernardo de Galvez, Spanish governor of Louisiana between 1777 and 1785. David left the furniture in the Asylum building when the University moved to the Barracks in 1886. It was still there when he went to Kentucky although ex-Governor Samuel McEnery advised him to remove it in 1892 before someone on the Asylum Board claimed it as the property of that institution. But David did nothing until 1893, when a group of ladies in charge of the Louisiana exhibit at the Columbian Exposition asked permission to ship the furniture to Chicago at their expense. According to Leroy Boyd, they
did not pay the freight charges and David had to assume the debt. When the Exposition closed David put the Galvez furniture in storage, and it was still there in 1907 as security for a $200-debt David never managed to repay before his death.

More telling than unpaid bills and appeals for loans as an indication of David's plight in 1893 were the entries he made in the morning reports during his last semester at the Kentucky Military Institute. On February 1, 1893, only David and one other instructor appeared on the faculty roster. A matron and a chaplain completed the staff which, considering the number of cadets enrolled (ten), must have been more than adequate. On May 20 a boy was expelled for insubordination and two more were dropped the next day for "continued absence w/o leave." The last formal entry appeared

---

4 Copy of Thomas Jefferson Boyd's obituary from Wytheville (Virginia) Dispatch, February 24, 1893, in Boyd (Thomas) Papers, 1890-93, Box 2; David Boyd to H. L. Favrot, February 20, 1893, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5; David Boyd to Dr. John Jastremski, February 20, 1893, ibid., Box 12; S. D. McEnery to David Boyd, June 3, 1892, ibid., Box 9; T. A. Faries to David Boyd, April 20, 1893, ibid., Box 5. On the back of the Faries letter to his father, Leroy Boyd recorded the history of the Galvez furniture after it left Baton Rouge for Chicago and its whereabouts in 1907. David and the man to whom he owed the $200 were both dead by then, but the creditor's widow was still living and the furniture was still in storage in Chicago. What finally became of it is not clear.
a month later. "On June 15, 1893, 7:30 o'clock A.M. session closed. By publication of Gen. Orders #1 Superintendent's office." Then, in a penciled scrawl, David added "closed forever."

The school closed in June, but David was still on the grounds in August, 1893. At the time he thought the owners planned to sell the property to a local doctor for use as a "sanitarium." As for himself, he hoped to open a "select private school" in Frankfort, Lexington, or Louisville that fall. Instead he went to Germantown, Ohio, a small town about thirty miles north of Cincinnati, where he spent a year on the staff of a military academy. Exactly what he did there is not clear. In fact, Tom Boyd did not know he had been there at all until a year after David's death. In 1900 Tom sent a newspaper summary of David's career to Ettie Boyd, who informed her brother-in-law of the editor's omission.

---

5Morning Reports of the Kentucky Military Institute, February 1, to June 15, 1893, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Manuscript Volumes. Actually, the Kentucky Military Institute did not "close forever." In 1896 Colonel C. W. Fowler became superintendent and moved the school to Lyndon, Kentucky, ten miles east of Louisville. It was still operating in 1914. Hamlett, "History of Education in Kentucky," 304.

6David Boyd to LeRoy Stafford Boyd, August 8, 1893, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 27; Ettie Boyd to Tom Boyd, May 4, 1900, ibid., Box 16. In 1896 a friend of David's wrote a letter of recommendation for him which stated that David taught Latin and mathematics at the "Miami Military
David's whereabouts after he left Germantown are somewhat easier to establish. Early in September, 1894 Colonel J. Sumner Rogers, Superintendent of the Michigan Military Academy, contacted him in Frankfort, Kentucky. David had just joined the Academy staff as instructor of Latin and English. In addition he would serve as the school's "Southern representative" or recruiter of new cadets. To that end Rogers sent him a number of circulars advertising the Academy, and a letter of introduction which he could use in his search for potential cadets. Rogers himself planned to "canvass" Chicago during September. David, he thought, might better concentrate on the territory encompassed by Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis and Indianapolis. In addition, any sons of ex-Confederate colleagues David could secure would be welcomed cordially. "Their sons will receive the same treatment . . . at this Academy," Rogers promised, "as the sons of Union soldiers."

---

7 J. Sumner Rogers to David Boyd, September 3, 1894, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8. David may have learned about the Michigan Military Academy originally from General Sherman who delivered a commencement address there in June, 1879.
Besides Superintendent Rogers and David, the Michigan Military Academy staff included "four well-trained military men" and an "academic school" of ten instructors. A prospectus David published in October, 1894, described the "academic" staff as "graduates" of Harvard, Yale, the University of Virginia and other leading institutions. The physical plant was equally impressive. Located twenty-six miles northwest of Detroit on Orchard Lake, and consisting of "all new brick buildings" with the "finest plumbing that money can buy," the Michigan Military Academy occupied an "ideal" site. Furthermore its "broad, liberal ... spirit" and its "isolation" would keep its students free of any "demoralizing influences."  

However inviting the intellectual and physical environment was at Orchard Lake, Tom Boyd found his brother's

Wm. Sherman to David Boyd, June 15, 1879, in Boyd-Sherman Letters.

8Prospectus of the Michigan Military Academy, October 1, 1894, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items, 1890-99, Box 19. The intellectual atmosphere may have been pure at Orchard Lake, but in June, 1896, one of David's friends at the Academy informed him of "eleven cases of veneral [sic] disease in the school this year ... the matter concealed from parents for fear the boys would be called home." H. E. Cook (secretary to the superintendent at Michigan Military Academy) to David Boyd, June 27, 1896, ibid., Box 19/7.
financial arrangements with Colonel Rogers decidedly unattractive. David accepted the job on a commission basis. He was to receive twenty-five percent of the $450 fee of each student he recruited. But he did not join the school until September, 1894, too late to secure many cadets that session, and his various trips through Indiana, Ohio, and Missouri during the following winter proved equally unproductive. As a result, he had to borrow heavily from his more solvent brother. At first he did so without asking Tom's permission. He merely issued a "sight draft" on Tom's bank and notified him of it later. Not surprisingly Tom objected:

I have never failed to honor your drafts, and shall honor this one . . . ., but it does seem to me not unreasonable that your friends should ask you to use some less disagreeable method of calling upon them for loans. . . . I shall cash no more sight drafts, unless they have been drawn with my full knowledge and consent.

Tom hoped David's connection with the Michigan Military Academy would be profitable, but he advised him to register with a "Teacher's agency" to find a salaried position. Meanwhile, he would help David to the best of his ability. 

---

9 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, September 5, 1894, in Boyd (Thomas D) Letterbooks, 1893-94, Volume V; David Boyd to Harney Skolfield, May 29, 1895, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1895, Box 2. In his letter to Skolfield David credited his "old army overcoat" with keeping him free from cold and illness during the winter of 1894-95.
Later Tom seems to have lost patience with his brother:

When David telegraphed for more cash, Tom sent it "against my better judgement." If he thought David were using the money on himself, he would give him his "last cent." But he was certain David was spending it to "advance" the school.
The Michigan Military Academy meant nothing to Tom; neither should it to David unless it paid him "a living" for his work.

He urged his brother to quit "bldg up someone else's business," and to think of his own interests, even if he had to "get out of education."10

By the end of the school year David was looking for another job. But it was still in "education" and, as matters developed, on terms even less satisfactory than those David had at Orchard Lake. On May 28, 1895, Colonel A. F. Fleet of the Missouri Military Academy responded to David's letter of application for employment. Superintendent Fleet made no secret of the fact that he wanted David's services at the lowest possible figure. He asked how many children David had and how much salary he thought he needed "to exist." The Missouri Military Academy had not done well in recent years,

10 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, undated, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1894-95, VI.
Fleet explained, and he had to be careful not to "overstaff" the institution. On June 30 he offered David the entire $350-fees of the first two boys he might recruit, and twenty per cent or $70 of the fees from any additional cadets secured from states other than Missouri, Illinois, Texas, Kansas, or Iowa. David could teach if he wanted to, but during the first year he could expect no "additional pay" for his work.

David accepted Fleet's offer by telegram. Then he borrowed enough money from Tom to make a brief visit to his family in Alabama. In late July he visited the Academy at Mexico, and by August he was back in Kentucky looking for students around Louisville and Frankfort. However, few people had ever heard of the school that far away from Missouri, and Colonel Fleet made it clear that he did not intend to spend any money on advertising. Neither would he advance David any funds for expenses. His agreement with David, he declared, had been made on the grounds that David was well-known in Kentucky. As for expense money, wrote Colonel Fleet: "If I had understood at the start that there was any uncertainty about your having money to carry on a vigorous campaign, I can say frankly that this would have ended the matter . . . I
have not the money to spare for it."^{11}

By mid-September, after trips to Chicago and Louis­ville, David had to report to Colonel Fleet that he had not secured a single cadet for the Missouri Military Academy. Their agreement called for him to serve the school for a year. But if Fleet thought he could be relieved without "injustice" to the school, David wanted to be notified to that effect as soon as possible. Colonel Fleet agreed and a week later David resumed his association with the Michigan Military Academy at Orchard Lake. He stayed around Louisville until, early October. Then, on the advice of Colonel Rogers, the Michigan superintendent, he shifted his base of operations to Cincinnati. From there he could recruit boys in neighboring towns and cities like Hamilton and Dayton which Rogers thought much more promising than Louisville.^{12}

In spite of his poverty David seems to have enjoyed

---

^{11}A. F. Fleet to David Boyd, May 28, June 30, July 2, 4, August 26, 1895; J. A. Fleet (son of A. F. Fleet) to David Boyd, August 8, 1895, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 12; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, August 12, 1895, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1895, VII.

^{12}David Boyd to Colonel A. F. Fleet, copy, September 14, 1895; A. F. Fleet to David Boyd, September 16, 1895; H. E. Cook to David Boyd, September 21, October 7, 1895; J. Sum­ner Rogers to David Boyd, September 21, 1895, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 12.
his stay in Cincinnati during the fall and winter of 1895-96. He did not enroll more than six or seven cadets in the Academy, but in the course of his recruiting efforts he did form a number of warm friendships with congenial people in the community. In addition he began contributing articles to at least two Cincinnati newspapers. Based largely on his reminiscences of Generals Sherman, Johnston, and other heroic figures in the Civil War, they were very well-received by readers of the Sunday supplements and, to a limited extent, they augmented his very meager income. One reader, president of the "Venetian Marble and Mosaic Art Company" of Detroit, was so pleased with David's "stories" in the Cincinnati Inquirer that he offered to publish them in book form. The volume never materialized, but he and David did become good friends. Speaking generally of his Michigan and Ohio acquaintances in one of his letters to Ettie Boyd, David remarked:

The more I see of northern people, the better I like them. Morally, they are as good as we are South; and in taking care of their families, they are far our superiors. Their industry and economy in all classes, is something marvelous to a Southerner.  

David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, January 4, 1896, ibid., Scrapbook; H. E. Cook to David Boyd, November 29, December 28, 1895, ibid., Box 12; A. L. Bresler to David Boyd, January 8, 1896, ibid., Box 16. Bresler, the Venetian Marble and Mosaic Company executive, was considering an offer from Cuba to command a brigade of Venezuelan and Columbian
Late in January, 1896, Colonel Rogers of the Michigan Military Academy reminded David that a note for $300 which he negotiated the previous November would be due in February. Rogers (who was David's co-signer) did not think the bank would extend the loan unless the interest and at least part of the principal were paid. "Can not you arrange to take care of this?" he asked. David responded to the colonel's pressure. Early in February he left Cincinnati for Orchard Lake to placate his banker and to spend some time in residence at the Academy. What he found there disturbed him very much. One of the cadets he had recruited was seriously ill, and another, the son of his best friend in Cincinnati, was so desperately unhappy that his father was thinking seriously of removing him from school. David reported his misgivings to the father, Thomas T. Heath, soon after he arrived at

volunteers against the Spanish in 1896. If he accepted the offer he wanted David to join him as his "chief of staff." Someone in the Boyd family finally did participate in the Cuban War against Spain two years later. David's son, D. F. Boyd Jr., was an ensign aboard the Maine when it blew up in Havana harbor. He escaped injury and, in August, 1899, informed "General" Bresler of his father's death the previous May. Bresler had contacted Ensign Boyd in an effort to find David. By that time he (Bresler) was president of the "Cuban Land and Steamship Company" in New York and, "seeing a chance" to do something for his old friend, had tried to locate him through his son. A. L. Bresler to Ensign David Boyd Jr., September 1, 1899, ibid., Scrapbook.
Orchard Lake. But Heath was not surprised. David's letter merely confirmed what he already knew "by spiritual instinct and intuition:" that the Michigan Military Academy, "a nest of drunken, lying, thieving, fagging, hazing brutes," was no place for an "inexperienced boy." If he could talk with David for twenty minutes, he could decide immediately what to do about his son. Heath did not expect David to stay at Orchard Lake either. "I wish I could hope for peace to you," he wrote David, "but I cannot . . . feel that you will be very happy there for evidently your ways are not their ways." 14

Heath was right. David was not happy at Orchard Lake and by late February, 1896, he was back in Cincinnati looking for a job. At one point he even considered selling insurance. The Bay State Beneficiary Association, to whom he applied during the spring, informed him it would be "glad to sign him on" at fifty per cent of whatever he sold. But David did not pursue the offer. Meanwhile, Ettie Boyd was also trying to find her husband a job. She asked Tom Boyd to use his political influence in David's behalf, but he was

reluctant for several reasons. "As he has always been a non-partizan \[\text{sig}\] in politics," Tom replied, "it would be no easy matter to get him a good position at Washington and I am pretty sure he would not accept a minor clerkship."

Tom did not want to discourage Ettie. But he did not want to get his brother any job unless he were sure David would take it and that he could hold it. "In this matter," Tom explained, "I had sad experience . . . in connection with his going to Auburn and his return to the University in 1884."

Besides, only a year earlier David refused a school principalship Tom secured for him at Greensburg, Louisiana. The salary was not large, Tom admitted, but "Success in a small position gives better leverage by which to rise to higher things than the reputation of year after year of failure."

By the late spring and early summer of 1896, David's circumstances were desperate. He wrote Colonel A. F. Fleet of Missouri Military Academy asking for any kind of work, but Fleet replied that he could not help him. A letter to an old friend in Knoxville, Tennessee, about a position at the
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J. W. Simcock to David Boyd, February 26, 1896; D. B. Barnes to David Boyd, April 16, 1896, ibid., Box 12; Tom Boyd to Ettie Boyd, March 26, 1896; Tom Boyd to LeRoy Stafford Boyd, March 26, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1896, VIII. Tom told LeRoy Boyd essentially the same thing he told his mother.
University elicited a similar answer. However, the friend, John Paulett, who published an historical magazine, thought David could earn something if he wrote a book of reminiscences entitled something like "Recollections of Three Men: Sherman, Johnston and Stuart." Paulett might even "join" David in publishing it. But, he warned, "You would have to be careful not to say too much in praise of Sherman! He may have been misunderstood by the Southern people, but it is certain that he has not been forgiven by many."

Even before Paulett's suggestion that he write a book, David had been preparing numerous articles based on his wartime experiences and personal recollections of famous men. Several of them appeared in the spring of 1896 in newspapers and service publications like the Army and Navy Journal. David's most ambitious literary effort in 1896, however, was the manuscript he prepared on the boyhood of J. E. B. Stuart. Designed for the edification of youth and dedicated to the children of his old friends and schoolmates in Virginia,

16 A. L. Bresler to David Boyd, April 30, 1896; Colonel J. Sumner Rogers to David Boyd, May 7, 1896, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; David Boyd to Colonel J. Sumner Rogers, May 8, 1896; A. F. Fleet to David Boyd, June 3, 1896; John W. Paulett To David F. Boyd, June 3, 1896, ibid., Box 12.
David's narrative traced Stuart's life from the time he and Stuart first met in Wytheville in 1845. They attended the same school for several years and later, when Stuart went off to college, the two exchanged numerous letters. As depicted by David, Stuart was a carefree, frolicsome boy who loved to dance and sing "negro songs" and Methodist hymns with equal abandon. Stuart's widow did not care for David's portrait of her husband. When David sent his manuscript to her in April, 1896, she returned it with several suggestions for revision. For one thing, she found it too sophisticated and too full of digression for its intended audience. For another, there were several expressions and anecdotes in it which "grated" upon her ear. She was aware of General Stuart's "shortcomings," but she did not feel that they should be dealt with in a book. Certain passages, she told David, she could "never read to her grandchildren & have them think about him [Stuart]" in the way she desired. To call him "Jim", for example, was "undignified." As for references to Stuart's dancing and singing "negro songs and Methodist hymns," David must be mistaken. Not only had she never known him to dance, but he was not even a Methodist. Finally, she promised to send David a children's biography of Robert E. Lee which she considered more "appropriate" than David's
David's manuscript for use in the schools. David wrote a gracious reply to Mrs. Stuart, but her determination that only her husband's "finer, higher traits" should be dealt with by any biographer seems to have discouraged him from trying to publish his manuscript. 17

For a fleeting moment in the spring and summer of 1896, David may have entertained a faint hope that he would be recalled to the presidency of Louisiana State University. A serious student uprising occurred there in April because of the allegedly undeserved promotion of two cadets to officer rank by President Nicholson. Some seventy other cadets threatened to resign their commissions or refuse appointments in the future unless Nicholson rescinded the "unearned" promotions by a specified hour. But Nicholson refused the cadets' demand on the ground that to honor it would be destructive of discipline. The cadets resigned, Nicholson gave

17 David Boyd, MS, "Reviving the Rank of Lieutenant General," undated, ibid., Box 13; Army and Navy Journal to David Boyd, April 30, 1896, ibid., Box 12; David F. Boyd, MS "General W. T. Sherman: His Life in the South Before the War and his Relations with Prominent Southern Men," undated; David Boyd, MS, "Boyhood of JEB Stuart," undated; Mrs. J. E. B. Stuart to David Boyd, April 28, 1896, ibid., Box 8; Flora Stuart (Mrs. J. E. B. Stuart) to David Boyd, May 23, 1896, ibid., Box 16. David's was not the first treatment of her husband disapproved by Flora Stuart. She had already rejected one because it made him appear "too frivolous."
them time to reconsider, but when thirty-seven remained
adamant, he promptly suspended them for the rest of the ses-
sion. The upshot was a public controversy, a legislative in-
vestigation, and Nicholson's decision to resign the presiden-
cy. Tom Boyd was unanimously elected to succeed him in June,
but he refused the position. Next, the Board chose Arthur T.
Prescott, the president of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute at
Ruston. He also declined. At that point the Board adjourn-
ed and letters of application for the job began to pour in. 18

David did not personally apply for the presidency,
but some of his old cadets, like J. W. Pearce of New Orleans,
tried to influence the Board to consider him after Tom
Boyd's initial refusal. Other old friends, like Harney Skol-
field and Dr. J. W. Dupree, thought he was the only one who
could "bring order out of chaos," but they did nothing in
David's favor because they were not sure what Tom Boyd would
do. After a terrific barrage of letters and telegrams, Tom
did take the job when the Board offered it to him a second
time. "Had he not have /sic/ accepted," Dr. Dupree explained

18 Excerpt from an article in the Baton Rouge Weekly
Truth, April 11, 1896, ibid, Printed Items, Box 19; J. W.
Pearce to David Boyd, June 24, 1896, ibid., Box 4.
later to David, "we were ready to move in the matter and I believe we would have succeeded." Tom Boyd did not agree. On August 2, 1896, he explained to David why he changed his mind about accepting the presidency of the University. His friends convinced him, he told his brother, that it was his duty to accept the post, that he was the only one who could bring back to the school the confidence and affection it once inspired. Tom had spent the two weeks prior to his acceptance of the presidency in Baton Rouge. But, he explained:

I did not hear your name mentioned for the presidency of the University by anyone but myself. I had mentioned you in that connection both in letters and conversation before and after the position was offered to me; but, while everyone spoke of you in the kindest terms, the opinion seemed to be general that an effort to elect you would re-open the old wounds . . . and would not succeed. If I had thought there was any chance of securing the place for you, I would not for a moment have entertained the idea of accepting it.

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of Tom Boyd's explanation. Neither is there any evidence to support Dr. Dupree's speculation that David could have won the post if Tom had remained adamant. What is more likely is that the doctor was trying to cheer up his longtime friend, then serving

---

19 J. W. Pearce to David Boyd, July 11, 1896; Dr. J. W. Dupree to David Boyd, July 18, 1896, ibid., Box 1/7/.

20 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, August 2, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Letterbooks, 1896, VIII.
a miserable exile far away from friends, family and his first love, the Louisiana State University.

A month after Tom Boyd accepted the presidency of the University, David's friends contacted him again about a position they thought he could secure in Louisiana. J. V. Calhoun had just become state superintendent of public education, leaving a vacancy in the principalship of the Boy's High School in New Orleans. Harney Skolfield, treasurer of the University Board of Supervisors, was the prime mover in the effort to get the job for David. He and Jonathan Jastremski, ex-superintendent of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum at Baton Rouge, contacted former Governor S. D. McEnery and the current governor, Murphy Foster, in David's behalf. They also asked a prominent citizen of Orleans Parish, Colonel Arthur W. Hyatt, to use his influence with the New Orleans School Board. No "politics" were involved, Skolfield assured Hyatt. The "Board of Control" wanted a "scholar and a teacher" for the principalship and David was both. In Skolfield's words:

The dear old man needs help and will give his best service to your high school. He could have been President of this school today had he not thought he was rebuked by the University Board when they requested him to endeavor to be more economical in his management:
. . . He resigned simply because, in my opinion, he was oversensitive.  

For the next two months, August and September, 1896, E. B. Kruttschnitt, president of the New Orleans school board, was literally inundated with letters from David's friends. David himself took an active part in soliciting those letters, asking friends all over the country to write the New Orleans authorities in his behalf. Kruttschnitt, David remarked to his son, was probably growing weary of the number of "testimonials" he had received, not to mention the flood of personal calls friends of David's had paid him at his office. Tom Boyd agreed. On August 30, 1896, he wrote his brother that the job was probably "safely" his unless "too many cooks" were "spoiling the soup."  

21 Harney Skolfield to Col. A. W. Hyatt, August 7, 1896, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 6. Skolfield may have been wrong about David's ability to keep the presidency until 1896, but he was certainly correct in his description of him as "oversensitive."

22 Thos. T. Heath to E. B. Kruttschnitt, August 10, 1896; Col. J. Stodard Johnston (former Board member of the Kentucky Military Institute) to E. B. Kruttschnitt, August 11, 1896; Professor J. H. Lane, (Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College) to E. B. Kruttschnitt, August 12, 1896; Professor W. H. Butts (Michigan Military Academy) to E. B. Kruttschnitt, August 14, 1896, in ibid.; S. D. McEnery to E.B. Kruttschnitt, September 9, 1896, in ibid., Box 15; David Boyd to LeRoy Stafford Boyd, August 25, 1896, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, Selected Papers, 1896-98, Box 1; Thomas Boyd to David Boyd, August 30, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers,
School Board President Kruttschnitt himself favored David's appointment to the vacant principalship. But in his opinion David could not be elected without the support of F. D. Chrétien of Orleans Parish. Chrétien was chairman of the Committee on High Schools, a subcommittee of the school board. Normal procedure called for Chrétien's subcommittee to present its candidate for the principalship to a second subcommittee, the Committee on Teachers, for concurrence. Then the entire Board would make the formal appointment. If Chrétien's committee acted decisively, there would be no contest. However, if the members could not agree, the full board would have to settle the issue. In 1896 the situation was especially complicated because of local politics. As Tom Boyd explained to his brother, many of David's partisans in New Orleans had supported the Citizen's League movement against the "machine;" they would have little or no influence with influential members of the School Board. Besides, David's strongest opponent was the current vice-principal of the high school, Frank W. Gregory. Many people believed that the incentive of "in service" teachers would be killed if persons "not connected" with the system were
appointed to supervisory positions. 23

David thought one other factor might cost him the job. On September 4, 1896, he wrote Harney Skolfield that the "Catholic influence" in New Orleans was being used against him. Vice-principal Gregory was a Catholic; so was State Superintendent of Public Education J. V. Calhoun, the former principal. Calhoun, David learned from a New Orleans friend, was "helping his brother Catholic."

It is but natural, and proper, for Calhoun to stand by his old colleague and friend; but I don't like to be beaten by Catholics! If I am, my wife will have a good laugh. It has been her fear for years that if I joined any church it wd. be the Catholic. 24

In spite of his letter to Skolfield, David must have thought his campaign for the principalship would ultimately prove successful. At least he prepared a speech some time during August or September designed for delivery at his inaugural. Addressed to the faculty and students of Boys' High School, it consisted of some thirty-five pages and sought to reconcile any who might have resented his appointment rather than Gregory's to the "much sought after" position. However,

23E. B. Kruttschnitt to Governor Murphy Foster, August 28, 1896, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10; Clipping from New Orleans Times-Democrat, September 30, 1896, ibid., Box 6; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, August 30, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1896, Box 2.

24David Boyd to Harney Skolfield, September 4, 1896,
when the School Board finally did act, it chose Gregory, not David. Chairman Chrétien's Committee on High Schools had not been able to agree on a single name to present to the Committee on Teachers. A majority favored David, and a minority, including Chrétien himself, supported Vice-principal Gregory. The two subcommittees conferred, but no decision could be reached. At that point David's name was withdrawn, leaving only Gregory and a contestant from Waco, Texas, in the field. A few days later the entire School Board elected Gregory by vote of nineteen to four.25

David was crushed. Failure to secure the New Orleans position forced him to borrow more money from Tom Boyd. "You can't imagine," he wrote his brother in mid-October, "how it mortifies me to be a beggar in this way." If possible, David wanted Tom to get a statement from Board President Kruttschnitt explaining that his failure to win the principalship was due to the Board's unwillingness to break its

25 David Boyd, Address to the Faculty and Students of Boys' High School, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 8; Clipping from New Orleans Picayune, September 26, 1896, ibid., Box 17; Clipping from New Orleans Times-Democrat, September 30, 1896, ibid., Box 6.
rule about promoting classroom teachers. Otherwise people in Ohio and Kentucky would misunderstand.

People away from there /Louisiana/ can't understand why so ordinary a position shd be refused me; nor can I blame them; for it does seem to me that Louisiana has but one more kick to give me—refuse me a nigger school in CatFish Town /a black slum in/ B.R. and, maybe, fate has this disgrace in reserve for me.

Then, in a final burst of despair, he asked his brother to omit his name in anything he planned to publish about the University's history:

Don't speak of me. Nicholson was pleased to 'drop' me out of the history /he wrote/ of the school. I don't regret my work for the school. I wish it well and I dearly prize the affection the old cadets have for me; but I don't want my name publicly or officially used in connection with the Univ. I wish the public would forget that I was ever there and I wish I cld forget it too . . .

The last three months of 1896 may well have been the most miserable David ever spent. After losing the New Orleans job he considered opening a private school in Cincinnati or Louisville, but poverty forced him to abandon the idea. Nor did anything come of a friend's suggestion that they collaborate in the establishment of a "classical" school in the Crescent City. Instead, David eked out a bare existence by delivering lectures on Civil War themes to any audience.

---

26 David Boyd to Tom Boyd, October 11, 1896, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1896, Box 2.
willing to engage him. A handbill he had printed in November, 1896, announced his availability as a speaker on "Lyceum circuits" and at posts and encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic. Interested parties were invited to contact "D. F. Boyd, a soldier under Jackson, at 112 Malvern Place, Cincinnati, Ohio." The address listed was a rooming house which David first made his headquarters while still connected with the Michigan Military Academy in 1895. By late 1896, however, he was so poor that he had to ask the landlady to wait for the rent. "I have been trying to arrange my affairs," he explained, "so that I could leave Cincinnati; if I should find no occupation in the city. I find it difficult to find work here. I think I must leave your city."27

---

27 David Boyd to /?, landlady, November 6, 1896, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 14; Newspaper account of lecture to Nelson Business College, undated, in unidentified Cincinnati newspaper; Newspaper account of lecture by David Boyd to unidentified post of the Grand Army of the Republic, December 31, 1896, in unidentified Cincinnati newspaper, ibid., Scrapbook; David Boyd, Notes for lecture series, December, 1896, ibid., Box 12; David Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, November 15, 1896, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, Selected Papers, 1896-98, Box 1; Handbill announcing Lecture Series by David F. Boyd, 1896, reprinted in Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, January 25, 1942. City and county directories for Cincinnati did not list David's name in the 1890's. However, the directories were not indexed by streets until 1920. At that time Malvern Place was composed of flats and rooming houses. According to the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton
By mid-December, 1896, David was bitter as well as poor. His son, LeRoy Boyd, wrote to announce that he was leaving Auburn where he had been a librarian at the college for approximately three years. LeRoy wanted to "read" law and had made arrangements to do so in the office of a judge in Clinton, Louisiana. David did not want LeRoy to go to Louisiana, but "since the living is not easy anywhere," he did not order him not to go. However, for David's sake, LeRoy was to avoid the University at all costs. He should visit his Uncle Tom and the family, of course, but only in the town. "I love the old school . . . ," David explained to his son, "but the Board . . . did not treat me right, and I wish nothing to do with them; . . . I do not wish to visit the school, and I wd like my children not to go there."28 Ironically, David himself was on the University campus only a month later. On January 4, 1897, Tom Boyd wrote to his brother's Cincinnati rooming house, not even sure that David would still be there. Mr. Edward H. Goodale, professor of "moral philosophy" and civics at the University, had suffered a fatal accident during the Christmas holidays. While

County, residents of such dwellings were easily overlooked by compilers of the city directory. John Mullane to Germaine M. Reed August 1, 1966.

28LeRoy Boyd to David Boyd, December 11, 1896, in Boyd
riding his bicycle in downtown Baton Rouge, Goodale caught the front wheel in a wagon rut, was thrown head first into the street and broke his leg. A few days later he died from internal injuries. Tom wanted David to replace Professor Goodale. Harney Skolfield had already spoken to Governor Foster about recalling David and Vice-president William Garig approved wholeheartedly. David could take over all or part of Goodale's teaching duties and serve as secretary to the president and the Board as well. If David agreed he could start at once. Or, if he chose, he could defer his return until the fall session.29

David accepted. He would settle his affairs in Ohio, "run by" Auburn, Alabama, to visit his family, and arrive in Baton Rouge in plenty of time to help Tom arrange an agricultural conference scheduled to take place on the campus sometime in late January. But a telegram changed his plans. On Saturday, January 16, 1897, a message from his daughter, Mary, arrived at his Cincinnati address announcing, "Leigh

---

29 Tom Boyd to David Boyd, January 4, 1897, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 15; Wilkerson, Thomas Duckett Boyd, 85-86.
LeRoy Stafford Boyd was accidentally shot, is dying, come immediately." With money Tom provided a few days earlier, David left for the South at once. He went through Auburn, but did not stop until he reached Clinton, Louisiana, where Ettie Boyd was already caring for their gravely wounded son. Convinced after a few days' vigil that LeRoy would probably survive, David left him in Ettie's care and proceeded to Baton Rouge where Tom Boyd, about to undergo a frequently postponed operation, put him in charge of arrangements for the agricultural convention.30

In a letter written to Ettie from Baton Rouge on Sunday, January 24, 1897, David apologized for not visiting Clinton that weekend. But in addition to preparing for the convention, he had to take over his ailing brother's official correspondence and conduct the weekly inspection for him as well. This restricted him almost exclusively to the University campus. However, David informed his wife, "I

30David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, undated, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, January 13, 1897, ibid., Box 12; Mary Boyd to David Boyd, telegram, undated; David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, January 24, 1897, in ibid., Box 5; David Boyd to Mary Boyd, January 21, 1897, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, Selected Papers, 1897-98, Box 1. David was in Baton Rouge when he wrote to his daughter. He explained that Leigh was "on the mend" and that Tom needed him "so much that I came here, subject to your Mother's call."

attended services today at your (Baptist) Church." Ettie was pleased. On the envelope of David's letter she scrawled a comment to one of her children, "How lovely in your Papa to go the first Sunday he spent on his return to my church. It was unfashionable, perhaps unattractive outwardly, but he had a reason for going. E. G. B."31

Tom Boyd did not return to the University until February 6, 1897. By that time the spring term had already begun, but operations were not disrupted. David and the "senior professor," J. W. Nicholson, made the necessary classroom assignments based on Tom's written instructions. Because he had a great deal of office work planned for his brother, Tom suggested that David teach only ten hours a week. But the illness and subsequent resignation of a staff member soon increased his teaching hours to thirteen. Nevertheless, David threw himself totally into all sorts of work outside the classroom. For one thing he prepared a long memorandum for his brother composed of what he considered serious shortcomings in the University's operations. The faculty, David thought, was "too casual" about keeping

31 David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, January 24, 1897, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5. The note on the envelope was probably to LeRoy Stafford Boyd who later became the family genealogist and archivist.
records. It should be done in ink, not pencil. The same criticism applied to the reports and communications submitted by professors to the president's office. Next, professors should report all "violations" of the rules by cadets, wherever they occurred. Third, there should be no smoking tolerated, in classrooms or in front of the barracks. Fourth, all professors should be required to attend chapel and to arrive on time. As for the commandant, his office needed a thorough cleaning. The "football" clothes were merely "piled in the corner." With the advent of warm weather, David remarked, "such filth might generate disease." Other serious criticisms concerned the dining room and the food. The room should be painted in "light colors" and its floors scrubbed three times a week; the food was poorly cooked and "rather scanty," particularly at supper. In addition, the cadets needed a "good talk" from Tom about their unkempt, untidy appearance and their "sloppy drill." They often reported to meals with hair uncombed and too long, and their hands unwashed. David thought most of the fault lay with Lieutenant C. C. Gallup, the assigned United States officer, whose "disinterest" in his job probably arose from the fact that the army, not the University, paid his salary. Finally, David
commented on the scholarly attainments of the corps of cadets. He was not impressed. "In passing casually among them, and talking with them their standard of general information appears low." The "whole place," David thought, seemed to suffer from a "want of interest" on the part of those "entrusted with the work." What, he wondered, was the school like five months earlier, before Tom replaced Nicholson? "You know," he concluded, "I shd be excused at feeling sad and depressed at such a deplorable state of things. I believe you can rectify matters here; and I believe too you will. But I don't believe you can do it without a sweeping reorganization." 32

Tom did not record what he thought of his brother's "impressions." However, he must have considered the remarks about cadet discipline and unsanitary facilities worthwhile because David spent much of the spring of 1897 seeing that conditions were "rectified." In April, the school newspaper, the Reville, commented on David's progress:

Persons in Baton Rouge and vicinity in need of 'scrub-outs' can apply to Col. D. F. Boyd. The 'old colonel' is

32 David Boyd, Memorandum Book for Thos. Boyd, Pres., February 18, 1897, ibid., Manuscript volumes, Box 22; Tom Boyd to David Boyd, February 3, 1897, ibid., Box 7; David Boyd to Tom Boyd, February 4, 1897, in Boyd (Thomas D.) Papers, 1897, Box 3.
having his 'Ku Klux Klan' scrub off their demerits. His classroom floor is beginning to glisten like a ship's deck. Down on his knees 'holy stoning' a floor, is about as near to heaven as a 'Ku Klux' will ever get.33

The "Ku Klux Klan" was a recently formed organization of the "less serious" cadets who insisted that they should not be confused with an older group of the same name which terrorized carpetbaggers and "political niggers." Describing themselves as "innocent fellows, if a little wild," the Ku Klux considered themselves the "special pets" of David, whom they affectionately labeled "the Old Colonel." They groaned about the demerits David assigned during Sunday morning inspections, but they invited him to their social functions, at least those which took place on the University campus.

In May, 1897, they reproved him mildly in the columns of the Reville for failure to attend an "entertainment" at the Pavilion. "If it had been a 'stag' German or something where the boys didn't want him," the Ku Klux correspondent remarked, "he would have been on hand, sure. He is never on hand at the right time. The boys missed him because he was not there to chase them around."34

In spite of his excellent relations with the cadets

33The Reville, April 24, 1897.
34Ibid., May 1, June 12, 1897.
and a few old friends like Dr. Dupree and Harney Skolfield, David was heartily sorry he had returned to the University. By March, 1897, he had applied for the vacant presidency of the University of Alabama, and nine months later he sought the same position at the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical college. In neither case did he expect serious consideration. But his life at the University was so miserable, he wrote his son, that he had to get away, perhaps to Kentucky or Ohio.

To stay in La. even if the situation were not a sort of hell on earth would not be wise or prudent; to work at my age [sixty-three] about 10 to 18 hours every day 7 days a week in this climate, with no recreation or change, always in this office or classroom, is simply death and that very soon. . . . But about all this, please say nothing.35

LeRoy Boyd did not agree with his father about leaving Louisiana for Kentucky or Ohio. David's job at Baton Rouge provided a "good living," and the family certainly needed the money. How Ettie Boyd and the three children still living at home "continued to subsist," LeRoy remarked, was a mystery. He could not assist his mother just then, and he would

35Ettie Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, March 27, 1897; David Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, April 20, 1897, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, Selected papers, 1896-98, Box 1; Professor C. W. Hutson to David Boyd, January 8, 1898, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.
not be able to when he left Clinton for Tulane Law School unless he secured a government job. Meanwhile, he hoped what he had said did not offend his father. But considering the family's "present condition" he felt it was necessary to speak out.36

David did not resign his professorship in 1897, but he did go to Ohio that summer to lecture at the Miami Valley Chautauqua on "General W. T. Sherman: His life in the South Before the War." Then he visited his family in late August, returning to the University on September 1, just in time for a yellow fever epidemic. Ettie Boyd thought David "seemed tired" when he was in Alabama. They discussed the family's situation fully, she told LeRoy Boyd, agreeing that it was best for her and the children to stay in Auburn. David, however, had spent such a "wretched" year at Baton Rouge that he still intended to leave the University if conditions

36LeRoy S. Boyd to David Boyd, July 13, 1897, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 10. In 1897, David French Boyd Jr., or Rex, had just graduated from Annapolis and been assigned to a two-year cruise on the U. S. S. Maine. Jack Boyd, the eldest son, was working somewhere in Texas. Mary Boyd was completing a bachelor's degree at Auburn and the two youngest children, Guy and Jesse, were undergraduates at the same school. Ettie was still giving music lessons and David sent home whatever he could after paying something to all of his numerous creditors scattered throughout the country.
did not improve.37

Because of the epidemic, the University's 1897-98 session did not begin until December 1. But David was not idle. He spent the enforced holiday having the buildings renovated and the grounds thoroughly cleaned. Later, when the army recalled the commandant to active duty because of the impending war, David inherited many of his duties. Tom announced David's added responsibilities in a general order issued in the spring of 1898. Besides supervising buildings and grounds, David would conduct "special" inspections of the mess hall and the meals, the hospital and the sick and the "sanitary" conditions of the University. He would also make regular daily and weekly inspections and report the results to the president. But more work did not cure David's depression. "It was the great blunder of my life that I ever came down here," he wrote his son in January, 1898. "The climate makes against hard mental work; and then we are a mongrel set--no unity--of race, religion or anything--except in doing nothing." Even an invitation to deliver a lecture in New Orleans did nothing to lift David's spirits. "I don't wish ever to see the place again," he declared of the

37Ettie Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, September 2, 1897, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, Selected Papers, 1896-98, Box 1.
Crescent City, "And I would not like Rex, or you, or any of my people to visit here--B. R. No; all of you keep away; and I want to get away--and stay away, as soon as I can. I have had enough of La." 38

The Spanish-American War diverted David's attention somewhat during the spring and summer of 1898, not only because his son, David French, Jr., or Rex, was an ensign aboard the Maine, but also because he thought the "splendid little war" might be exactly what the nation needed to dispel any discord left over from the Civil War. When he learned that Alabama Congressman Joseph Wheeler, once a Confederate General, planned to form a volunteer brigade, David immediately offered his services. Later he proposed to Wheeler that the government encourage the enlistment of Negro troops. The congressman responded graciously to David's "patriotic offer" of service. But his other suggestion, Wheeler thought, would create more bad feeling than good will between the sections and the races. David must have persisted, however, because Wheeler was still

38David Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, January 17, 1898, ibid.; Thomas D. Boyd, Bulletin to Louisianians, November 1, 1899; Thomas D. Boyd, Circular, November 24, 1897, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Printed Items 1890-99, Box 19; Draft of General Orders to cadets, undated, ibid., Scrapbook.
corresponding with him on the subject in May, 1898. By that time he had also presented his idea to Congressman S. M. Robertson of Baton Rouge. Robertson discussed the matter with General Wheeler in Washington, and they agreed, he wrote David, "that the glory of the defense of our country should be committed to the hands of the Caucasian race." In his opinion, David would be well-advised not to "agitate" such an "unpopular question." 39

By the time school opened in the fall of 1898, the war was over and David, after a brief visit to Auburn during September, was busily supervising buildings and grounds, making inventories of plant and equipment and seeing to it that every cadet observed his high standards of neatness all over the campus. He took his duties very seriously as the following excerpt from a January, 1899, issue of the student newspaper indicates: "Professor--'What parasite is it that takes possession of and destroys your books when they are left lying around?' Student--'The Old Colonel!'" 40

39 Congressman Joseph Wheeler to David Boyd, March 14, April 26, 30, May 3, 1898; S. M. Robertson to David Boyd, April 30, 1898, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 5.

40 The Reville, January 4, 1899; Inventory of Property, Louisiana State University, 1898, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Selected Papers, 1898, Box 2; List of Cadets at University 1889-97, February 25, 1898, ibid., Box 15; David
Clearly, much of David's work was self-imposed, and while the cadets may have considered his constant harassment an amusing idiosyncrasy or a quirk of old age, employees of the University probably wished he were a little less conscientious. By early May, 1899, even he realized he could not keep up the pace. In the last letter he ever sent his son, LeRoy Boyd, he apologized for not writing earlier. But his usual work week, he explained, included twenty-four hours inside the classroom and an additional thirty hours outside in "extra" work for the University.

Indeed, I have no rest here; and some of this extra work is so monotonous & wearing--such as being present during every cadet meal and surgeon's call, with looking to the care and cleaning of the buildings. I will not be here next year. Nor have I yet other work elsewhere. But I hope I can find something somewhere. 41

As the term drew to a close, David was practically exhausted. He wrote his wife on Friday morning, May 26:

I fear I am breaking down. I am not sick, but so weak, and at times faint, with some dizziness. I have simply worked too hard--especially exposed too much to the sun since I came back to La. . . . . Yes, I am glad my time is so short in La. I could not possiby go through another year here. 42

---

41 David Boyd to LeRoy S. Boyd, May 5, 1899, in Boyd (David F.) Papers, Scrapbook.

42 David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, copy, May 26, 1899, ibid., Scrapbook.
David mailed his letter, then lay down in his office about one o'clock to take a nap. No one disturbed him until five P.M. when Dr. J. W. Dupree, a frequent visitor, found him in a comatose state and ordered him moved to Tom Boyd's residence. Tom immediately telegraphed Etta Boyd in Auburn, LeRoy in New Orleans, and David's oldest son Jack, then in Cheneyville, Louisiana. But only LeRoy managed to reach Baton Rouge before his father died on Saturday night. Jack arrived early Sunday morning and Etta, with her son Rex (then home on leave), did not get there until Sunday night. Their train had broken down in Alabama causing them to miss connections in New Orleans where Rex learned of David's death from a local paper.

Dr. Dupree attributed his friend's death to apoplexy. For days before he was stricken, David had been working very hard under a hot sun to prepare the cadets for a dress parade and drill at the Louisiana Fair in New Orleans. Almost the entire college community, as well as many Baton Rouge citizens, accompanied the corps to the Crescent City on a special train. But David stayed behind, "to look after what was left." In addition to his regular chores, that included the preparation of a special edition of the Reville. Apparently the several trips back and forth to the printer,
under a hot sun, proved too much for him. On Thursday, May 25, he was so exhausted that he had to lie down most of the day. The next afternoon he was stricken and never regained consciousness.43

After one of the longest funeral processions ever witnessed in Baton Rouge, David was buried in Magnolia Cemetery with "impressive civilian and military honors" on Monday, May 29, 1899. Those who could not attend sent letters or telegrams of condolence to the family from all over the country. One message, from attorney Leven L. Hooe of Alexandria, Louisiana, was typical. "Every boy, who claims the L. S. U. as his 'alma mater'," he wrote, "has lost a true friend, for the Colonel loved us all as his own children."

Hooe chose to believe that even those who once opposed David's association with the University had come to appreciate his unselfish service to it. In his opinion, David alone was responsible for the school's "present success," and to him belonged "all the credit for its very existence."44

43 David Boyd to Ettie Boyd, copy, May 26, 1899, ibid.; Description of David's illness and death, undated, ibid. Although unsigned, the description was probably composed by LeRoy who by 1903 was gathering data for a family history. Ettie Boyd to LeRoy Boyd, October 12, 1903, in Boyd (LeRoy S.) Papers, 1902-1903, Box 1.

44 Levin L. Hooe to Thomas D. Boyd, May 29, 1899, in
Perhaps the most extravagant tribute paid to David, however, came from A. A. Gunby, an ex-cadet, devoted friend and editor of the Monroe (Louisiana) Bulletin. Noting that Massachusetts had honored its noblest educator, Horace Mann, by erecting his statue in front of the state house, Gunby commented that it was probably "too early" to expect anything of the kind in Louisiana. But the day would come, he predicted, when the people and the legislature would "adorn the portals" of their capitol building with a statue of David Boyd, "Louisiana's noblest son . . . truest friend /and/ . . . purest example of unselfish devotion to the public weal."  

A few years later Gunby eulogized David more formally when the alumni society of the University dedicated a new building to their former teacher at cornerstone ceremonies held on May 31, 1904. In an address entitled "The Life and Services of David French Boyd," Gunby traced David's career, emphasizing in particular the hardship he endured during Reconstruction. The diary he kept then, Gunby remarked, was a story of "struggle and suffering, of poverty and sorrow, of

Boyd (David F.) Papers, Box 4; New Orleans Times-Democrat, May 30, 1899.

Monroe (La.) Bulletin, June 1, 1899, in Boyd (David
privation and pain, of foiled efforts and hopes deferred."

But, he continued:

It was also the story of undying faith and trust and confidence in the right. If there was a man in the nineteenth century entitled to enter the 'noble army of martyrs' it was David French Boyd. He trod the wine press alone...46

No doubt Ettie Boyd agreed, in general, with Gunby's tribute to her late husband. But she would probably have disputed his rhetorical flourish that David "trod the wine press alone." With a trace of understandable bitterness she wrote LeRoy Boyd in 1910:

All your Papa had, he placed at the service of LSU... With him LSU was first... I sat in Garig Hall Friday night at a concert and the Lee and Jackson /Julio/ picture was facing the audience. This thought crossed my mind because I knew the circumstances of his 'gift' to the LSU: LSU should make a gift of that picture to me, who suffered privations untold while that picture money was being collected: LSU should now make a gift to DFB's family /of/ that token of sacrifice--of blood! I can hardly bear to look at it.47

---


47/Ettie Boyd/ to /LeRoy S. Boyd/, undated, in Fleming (Walter L.) Collection, Alphabetical File, Box 7. This letter bears no salutation, signature or date, but its contents clearly reveal who wrote it and for whom it was intended. A reference to Walter Lynwood Fleming, Ettie's son-in-law, who was then a professor of history at the University, indicates that it was probably written about 1910.
Finally, the best and most balanced tribute to David Boyd came from his brother, who did not intend it for public consumption. In a brief statement to the Board of Supervisors on June 26, 1899, Tom Boyd declared in part:

It is not for me here to extol his virtues; but whether he was great and good, and wise, or the reverse, all that he was and all that he had he gave to his fellow men. His career is a large part of the history of this institution, which he served so long and with such unselfish devotion; and his best memorial is the monument of love in the hearts of the many men he taught. 48

48 Minutes of the Board of Supervisors, June 26, 1899.
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