

Mid-February, 1855

tee of the Regents, at their request,<sup>1</sup> and I ask also, that the Secretary be required to indicate to your Committee the offensive parts of said paper, that were the cause of removing Prof. Jewett from the Institution.

Your Ob't Serv't  
(Signed) J. Meacham."

I communicate it that you may be prepared to bring with you, to-morrow evening the document called for, for the purpose mentioned by Mr. Meacham.<sup>2</sup>

Your Ob't Serv't,  
(Signed)  
Charles W. Upham.

Select Committee on the Resignation Letter of Rufus Choate and Also on the Management of the S.I., Committee Reports and Papers, 33d Congress, Records of the House of Representatives, RG 233, National Archives.

Extraneous quotation marks have been removed. Printed in U.S. House, 33d Congress, 2d Session, *Smithsonian Institution*, House Reports, No. 141 (1855), p. 45.

1. Jewett's communication of March 1854, for which see Doc. 16.

2. The matter was not raised at the February 16 meeting. On February 19, immediately after the committee voted against forcing Baird to produce a critical memorandum to Choate, Meacham asked to have Jewett's March 1854 communication put on file as evidence relating to the charge of illegal dismissal. He then asked Henry to point out which parts of the communication were offensive and had been considered grounds to dismiss Jewett. Henry answered simply, "I submit the whole paper, and the report of the committee of Regents upon it; and also my own answer to Professor Jewett's paper."

Meacham then made a statement "in regard to the history and character of the paper referred to, and the object he had in view by wishing to have the objectionable portions of it pointed out by Professor Henry." W. H. English closed the matter by remarking that the law authorized the removal by the secretary and Board of Regents of an assistant secretary and that therefore "an examination into the causes for the removal of Professor Jewett is not a proper subject for inquiry by this committee." Meacham presented no further witnesses or materials. U.S. House, 33d Congress, 2d Session, *Smithsonian Institution*, House Reports, No. 141 (1855), p. 84.

112. "STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR HENRY  
IN REFERENCE TO LORIN BLODGET"<sup>1</sup>

[mid-February 1855]<sup>A</sup>

To the Executive Committee of the Smithsonian Institution, to which was referred the subject of the claims of Mr. Lorin Blodget relative to his labors in Meteorology.

Gentlemen,

Mr Lorin Blodget was introduced to me by a member of Congress from the Western part of the state of New York in December 1851. The gentleman who introduced him informed me that Mr. Blodget desired



temporary employment and an opportunity to improve himself, and that he would be satisfied with a small compensation.

Previous to this the Meteorological<sup>B</sup> returns had accumulated and I was anxious that a beginning should be made in deducing results from them. That they contained important material was never for a moment doubted by myself.

I concluded to engage Mr. Blodget on trial and to set him at work at first in arranging the returns relative to the periodical phenomena. For upwards of three months I paid him at the rate of \$1.50 a day or until the end of April 1852. From that time till the end of the following November he received<sup>C</sup> ↑remuneration↓ at the rate of \$50 a month, for which he gave receipts in the following form:

“Smithsonian Institution to Lorin Blodget Dr.

To one month's services reducing meteorological observations . . . . . \$50.00

Received of W. W. Seaton, Treasurer of the Smithsonian Institution Fifty Dollars, in full of the above account.

\$50.<sup>00</sup>/<sub>100</sub>

Lorin Blodget.

At his earnest request, in Nov<sup>r</sup> 1852 I concluded to allow him for a single year ↑payment↓ at the rate<sup>D</sup> of \$800; but<sup>E</sup> beyond this I informed him I could not venture without the sanction of the Executive Committee.

Before the conclusion of the year however the meeting of the American Association for the advancement of Science took place,<sup>2</sup> at which ↑time↓ Mr Blodget much to my astonishment exhibited his peculiar views in regard to his ownership of the results. Previous to this his bearing had been entirely unassuming, he had shown a disposition to render himself useful in every way, and had made none of the claims which he has since set up. It is true he frequently talked to me of the importance of placing the system on a more extended footing, and of applying to Congress for an appropriation for this purpose. I however gave no encouragement to these propositions and made him no promises as to future compensation. Indeed Mr. Blodget's views were so indefinite or at least were so indefinitely expressed, that until I read and studied his communication to the Executive Committee<sup>3</sup> I had no clear conception of them.

From the first moment of his engagement until the meeting at Cleveland, I had no idea that Mr. Blodget considered himself other than as a temporary assistant engaged for a specified salary on a definite work. The only promises which I ever held out to him were, that if his labors proved satisfactory, and the means of the Institution could afford it, his salary should<sup>F</sup> be increased and that he should have due credit for all that he



Mid-February, 1855

accomplished. He, It is true, he questioned me several times as to the pecuniary advantages which would result to him from his labors, and intimated to me that his friends expected something important in this way. I distinctly told him that the prosecution of Science particularly in this country did not result in pecuniary remuneration, but that he would have an opportunity if <sup>↑</sup>he<sub>↓</sub> continued these investigations to improve himself in knowledge and establish a reputation which might be of use to him. I never had the least idea that in any case he expected to be paid extra for past services, or that his salary was to be retrospective.

Although he was very industrious, the work on which he was employed required no special genius, and all the processes<sup>G</sup> he has followed were well known and involved nothing beyond the most elementary scientific attainments. I gave him a copy of Professor Loomis' paper on storms,<sup>4</sup> and allowed him to make such preliminary experiments with the material as he should think fit. My own time was very much occupied, and Mr. Blodget frequently reported to me results, and made various propositions as to the points to be investigated. Some of these I rejected and others adopted.

I never had for a moment the least <sup>†</sup>idea of allowing him to publish a report as his own under the auspices of the Institution, as he has since proposed, but I from the first, intended that after a series of definite results had been obtained, ~~that~~ I would carefully study these myself, and call upon some Meteorologists to assist me, and thus determine what would be proper to publish under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, giving to Mr. Blodget [---] full credit for all his labors. My idea was to publish a series of facts which might be used by Meteorologists in every part of the world as the data on which to found their generalizations.

It should be distinctly understood that in all this I was acting as a mere agent of the Institution, that my own labors whatever they might be would not appear; and whilst I was anxious that the results<sup>H</sup> should fully justify the expenditure of that portion of the Smithsonian fund which had been devoted to Meteorology, I was desirous to give to Mr. Blodget full and liberal credit for the manner in which he discharged his duties.

Up to the present time, the Institution has paid Mr. Blodget, in all \$2323.18 and has expended for assistance to him and for other incidentals connected with the reductions (exclusive of stationary) \$1668.60.

The results I consider clearly the property of the Institution, Mr. Blodget having no other claim in regard to them except that when they are published, credit shall be given him for the reductions and discussions.

After the publication by the Institution of the facts which have been thus obtained they will then be common property, and Mr. Blodget and



Mid-February, 1855

all the Meteorologists in the Country may employ them in any way they may see fit. But previous to their publication, I considered it improper that Mr. Blodget should use them in preparing meteorological Reports under his own name. I have constantly urged him since the meeting at Cleveland, on the contrary<sup>↑</sup>,<sup>↓</sup> to use all due diligence in bringing them into a condition proper for publication and to defer his private essays on the subject until Meteorologists of the Country in general have an ~~similar~~ <sup>↑</sup>equal<sup>↓</sup> opportunity of employing the data produced<sup>l</sup> ~~ed~~ at the expense of the Smithsonian fund. A prominent maxim in the policy of the Institution is cooperation and not monopoly.

Again, it is not proper for an individual employed by the Institution as Mr. Blodget has been on a particular work, to make use of facilities which his position affords him, to collect materials on his own account, or to mingle his own operations with those of the Institution.

The Secretary issued a circular calling upon all persons having meteorological data in their possession to present it or lend it to the Institution.<sup>5</sup> He also wrote a number of letters to individuals asking for data of the same kind. Mr. Blodget I find has<sup>l</sup> also written to a number of persons requesting similar favors, and now if I understand him aright he considers the materials obtained by such letters as belonging to himself. It is true that in case of a personal acquaintance and under particular circumstances the data may have <sup>↑</sup>been<sup>↓</sup> given to Lorin Blodget as an individual, but in most cases they have been presented to him as connected with the Smithsonian Institution, and as such it is responsible for their safe keeping and proper use. (Signed) Joseph Henry. \_\_\_\_\_

I have stated in the preceding paper that I had agreed to give Mr. Blodget \$800 for a year's service<sup>k</sup> but previous to the expiration of that period he developed at the Meeting of the American Association at Cleveland his peculiar views, and claims as to the work on which he had been en[ga]ged. He requested me previous to this Meeting and indeed a year before, to allow him to present some of the results which had been obtained. I consented to this though I informed him at the time and in presence of Mr. Rhees that he must be careful to present the results as having been obtained at the expense and under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution and secondly not to mingle these facts with his own speculations. I also authorized the construction of a number of large charts for this Exhibition which were afterwards paid for by the Institution.

We started together for Cleveland and reached Pittsburgh when I fell sick. Mr. Blodget left me there and hastened on to the Meeting.— When I arrived the Session had commenced, the programme of papers to be



Mid-February, 1855

read had been printed and to my surprise I found that Mr. Blodget had entered all the papers on Meteorology entirely in his own name without mentioning the Smithsonian Institution.

When his first paper was read I rose ~~and stated~~ ↑mentioned↓ the facts in connection with these papers ~~and~~ pointed out the omission and stated that the Smithsonian fund had been accepted by the U.S., with the condition that it was to found an Institution to bear<sup>L</sup> and perpetuate the name of the Donor↑;↓ ~~and~~ that consequently all the good which might accrue to mankind from the employment of the income of the fund ought to be accredited to the name of Smithson, the agents employed in executing the trust having proper credit for the manner in which they discharged their duty.<sup>6</sup>

The first paper which Mr. Blodget read was on the Northers or the tempestuous<sup>M</sup> winds which occasionally prevail in Texas.<sup>7</sup> He stated that this paper was in no way connected with the Institution. I then explained<sup>N</sup> to the audience in what manner ↑this paper was connected with↓ the Smithsonian Institution ~~was connected with this paper~~. A young officer of the American Army Lieut. Couch<sup>O</sup> had presented to the Secretary of the Smith<sup>n</sup> Institution, A plan of a private exploration which he wished to make in Texas and Mexico. I studied this plan and commended it warmly in a letter to the Secretary of War<sup>8</sup>— He considered the request of Lieut. Couch favorably, allowed him leave of absence,<sup>P</sup> and transportation. The Smith<sup>n</sup> Institution gave him scientific instruction, assisted I think in fitting him out with instruments, and especially directed his attention to the existence in Mexico of a valuable collection of natural history and of manuscripts which had been the property of Dr. Berlandier, a member of the Academy of Geneva Switzerland who came to this country to make scientific explorations and after a residence of 20 years died in Mexico. Lieut. Couch was so fortunate as to procure this collection ↑which↓ he sent ~~it~~ to the Institution. We paid about \$150 for the transportation and he gave me in behalf of the Institution permission to use any of the meteorological records we might require. The principal facts relative to the Northers given in Mr. Blodget's paper were derived from this collection though no credit was given by him to Lieut. Couch or the Smithsonian Institution.<sup>9</sup>

Again, an earthquake was felt in Washington and throughout a considerable portion of the Middle States and the idea was suggested by Professor Bache that it would be well to collect the facts in regard to this occurrence— I accordingly drew up a circular in which I asked a series of questions in behalf of the Smith. Inst.—as to the time of occurrence, direction of the motion, state of the atmosphere &c. &c.<sup>10</sup> To these



Mid-February, 1855

circulars quite a number of answers were returned. These I placed in the hands of Mr. Blodget requested him to locate their position on a map in order that the centre of action might be determined— My own time was very much occupied and I gave no farther attention to the subject, and I was surprised to find that Mr. Blodget produced this again as his own without mentioning the name of the Smith<sup>n</sup> Institution.<sup>11</sup> After this development of his peculiar characteristics I was convinced it would be improper to continue to employ him in the Smithsonian Institution and therefore resolved to close my engagement<sup>2</sup> with him as soon as the work on which he was immediately engaged could be completed. The Meteorological correspondence of the Institution had been up to that time conducted by Dr. Foreman who left the Institution for a position of larger salary in the Patent Office.— At the time ↑he ([---])↓ left however and during my absence he published a ~~circular~~ ↑notice↓ in the paper informing the observers that he had left the Institution and requested them to direct all their letters to the Secretary. Mr. Blodget returned to Washington before I did and immediately commenced without my authority to write to the correspondents dating his letters from the Smithsonian Institution and signing them “Lorin Blodget<sup>R</sup> in charge of Meteorology.”<sup>12</sup> I forbid his writing any letters which were not submitted to me previous to being sent. This order he did not obey, but continued to write letters without showing them to me. At length I gave him an order in writing<sup>13</sup> but to this he paid no attention. ↑Also↓ After his return from Cleveland he began to make claims for more salary and to propose various plans for the establishment of a Meteorological Bureau of which he of course was to be the head.<sup>14</sup>

I gave no ~~cooperation~~ ↑~~countenance~~ cooperation↓ to these measures but stated to him that if any means could be found for carrying on a system of Meteorology independent of the Smithsonian fund, the Institution would willingly relinquish the charge, but ~~all~~ that ↑all data↓ the Institution had collected must be reduced discussed and published before closing the work.

He failed of course in all these efforts and then engaged ~~to~~ ↑in the↓ preparation<sup>s</sup> for publication ↑on his own account of↓ a number ~~of~~ ↑of↓ Reports and Essays on Meteorology using the materials of the Institution, for this purpose. To this course I objected. I<sup>T</sup> stated to him that the great object of the Institution was cooperation and not Monopoly—that the results of the computations must be given to the world in a tabular form and then distributed to all the Meteorologists in this Country so that each might have an opportunity of making their own speculations on the subject.— That after they had been thus published Mr. Blodget would have



the privilege in common with all others to make use of them as he might see fit.

He refused to give some of the materials on several occasions to persons who applied for them with my permission even to be used for the purposes of the Institution. His demands for extra remuneration became greater and greater and he at length declared that unless they were complied with, the Institution should not have the materials in his hands and rather than give them up he would as I may ↑was↓ told [---] burn them.

I was therefore obliged in consequence of this and other threats to institute measures for securing the papers and for this purpose consulted Mr. Carlisle the Attorney for the Board of Regents, and took no step without his direction.

Joseph Henry

Select Committee on the Resignation Letter of Rufus Choate and Also on the Management of the S.I., Committee Reports and Papers, 33d Congress, Records of the House of Representatives, RG 233, National Archives.

In unknown hand, except for Henry's signature. Printed in U.S. House, 33d Congress, 2d Session, *Smithsonian Institution*, House Reports, No. 141 (1855), pp. 96-100.

1. Henry prepared the first part of this statement for the executive committee of the Board of Regents. He probably presented it to them sometime between July 20, when Blodget submitted his statement to the executive committee, and August 11, when Joseph G. Totten referred to it in a memorandum (see Doc. 73). Henry presumably prepared the second part for the House select committee investigating the Smithsonian and submitted both that and the first part to the committee sometime in mid-February.

2. The 1853 meeting in Cleveland.

3. [Lorin Blodget], *Statement Prepared at the Requisition of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution* (New York, 1854).

4. Probably Loomis's 1843 paper, "On Two Storms Which Were Experienced Throughout the United States, in the Month of February 1842," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 1846, 9:161-184, in which he analyzed data from numerous observers. Loomis presented his work as a model and claimed that such analysis would soon lead to "some settled principles in meteorology" (p. 183). Addressing the American Philosophical Society at its centennial celebration, he challenged the society to establish and coordinate a national network of some five to six hundred meteorological observers. Loomis predicted that if private efforts were added to those already undertaken by the government, "men would cease to ridicule the

idea of our being able to predict an approaching storm" (p. 184). *Henry Papers*, 6:78n-79n.

5. The circular, dated November 20, 1852, called on people with meteorological data recorded prior to the establishment of the Smithsonian system in 1848 to send the original journals, or copies of them, to the Smithsonian. Correspondence with James H. Coffin, *Henry Papers*, Smithsonian Archives; *Smithsonian Report for 1852*, p. 74.

6. Henry's remarks were reported in *AAAS Proceedings*, 1853, 7:118-119.

7. "On the South-east Monsoon of Texas, the Northers of Texas and the Gulf of Mexico, and the Abnormal Atmospheric Movements of the North American Continent Generally," *AAAS Proceedings*, 1853, 7:109-119.

8. Not found; Henry's Desk Diary entry of December 8, 1852, refers to the letter.

9. In the printed version of Blodget's paper, he mentioned Couch's purchase of the Berlandier manuscripts (p. 114), but did not mention the Smithsonian. The account of Blodget's remarks that was published in the September 1, 1853, issue of the *Annals of Science* (1:222-225), however, reads: "These investigations have been mainly reported under the sanction of the Smithsonian Institution, aided by the personal efforts of Mr. Blodget" (p. 224). It also noted that the Berlandier manuscripts had fallen into Couch's hands and were preserved in the Smithsonian Institution.

10. The circular, dated May 5, 1852, was sent



February 19, 1855

following the earthquake of April 29. "Forms and Circulars," Box 26, Records of the Weather Bureau, RG 27, National Archives; *Smithsonian Report for 1852*, p. 74.

11. Blodget's presentation, "On the Earthquake of April 29, 1852," was not published. *AAAS Proceedings*, 1853, 7:271.

12. The first such letter was sent on July 15, 1853, even before the Cleveland meeting. Fleming, *Meteorology*, pp. 112, 215n.

13. Doc. 20.

14. Blodget's campaign to get Congress to provide funds for meteorology is mentioned in Fleming, *Meteorology*, p. 112. In his statement to the executive committee, Blodget mentioned

proposals to transfer the program "to various offices and departments" or to solicit a special appropriation for the Smithsonian meteorological project. He specifically mentioned two memorials. One was prepared on February 1, 1852, requesting an appropriation of \$3,000 a year for three years to support the collection by the Smithsonian of meteorological data from government offices. The other was an application to the second session of the Thirty-second Congress; this was withdrawn at the insistence of Henry, who was afraid of compromising the institution's position with Congress in other areas. Blodget, *Statement*, pp. 4, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16 (quotation on p. 4).

### 113. FROM [SAMUEL FOSTER HAVEN]

Worcester Feb<sup>y</sup> 19. 1855

My dear Sir

I will send in a day or two the account I have prepared of the progress of information and opinion respecting the aboriginal remains of the United States down to the publication of Mr Atwater's Memoir by the Antiquarian Society. Very little attention was paid to the subject, at least in the way of observation, from that time till the period of the researches of Mess<sup>rs</sup> Squier and Davis.

It has not been my intention to add anything to their remarks relating to that interval; but I propose to annex to what ~~what~~ I have written a very condensed reference to the leading incidents that have marked the progress of investigation since the general survey of the subject by Mr Atwater. It is also a part of my plan to conclude the chapter by pointing out the geographical position of these remains and stating in general terms what facts may be considered as established respecting them.

After examining the manuscript which I shall send, you can determine whether it will serve your purpose, and in that case favor me with any suggestions or criticisms that occur to you or any gentlemen to whom you submit it.<sup>1</sup>

I have hoped that I might be able to visit Washington as proposed in your former letter<sup>2</sup> & consult the rare library of Mr Force;<sup>3</sup> but have found no time when I could conveniently leave home. I have doubted also whether the collection of Mr Force would yield any peculiar information of importance to my narrative, as I had arranged it, that could not be easily appended in the shape of a note. If he has any early notices of aboriginal remains that have escaped my eye, & that are ↑anything↓