

much speaking, placed him in a class apart from men of the Adams type.

But men are ruled by many motives, and in filling public offices, a strong motive may be not so much the desire to put the best man into a place of trust, as to keep another man out. John Adams was apparently to some degree actuated by a malevolent feeling towards Hancock. He describes the rage of the President of Congress when the nomination was made. "Mortification and resentment were expressed," says he, "as forcibly as his face could exhibit them."

To a man like John Adams, who was mentally and morally incapable of discerning high merit in any one but himself, this discomfiture of a townsman and a colleague had its charms. But there was another and more potent reason why John and Samuel Adams should join hands to bring in Washington as head of the army.

These kinsmen were devoted to Boston, and felt that their beloved city, which had virtually, and on her own account, declared war on the Mother Country, must either secure the co-operation of the twelve sister States or perish. It was thus necessary at all costs to secure Virginia; and to nominate Colonel Washington for the newly created post was to secure Virginia. It was also obvious to the rest of Congress that these two Boston delegates had named the only man, American born and with long military experience, whom the American people would accept. Old Artemus Ward could not ride; he was too stout.¹ Gates, Charles Lee, and Montgomery were British born men. Nathaniel Greene was an unknown quantity. Israel Putnam impossible. Schuyler of New York was not acceptable for reasons connected with his high family, wealth, and personal demeanour. The choice of Washington, by a

¹ Ward at Bunker Hill was accused of cowardice. "Can you believe it," writes James Warren to John Adams, "he never left his house all day."—Warren to J. A., 20th June 1775 (in Ford's edition, *Washington's Writings*, p. 480).