

ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

ISSUED BY AUTHORITY OF

THE ASSOCIATION OF LOYAL PENNSYLVANIANS,


OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1864.

---

WASHINGTON, D. C. :  
PRINTED AND STEREOTYPED BY MCGILL & WITHEROW.  
1864.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2009 with funding from  
Friends of the Lincoln Financial Collection in Indiana

# ADDRESS.

---

The transcendent importance of the questions involved in the approaching Presidential campaign, renders unnecessary any apology for an effort to attract attention to their earnest consideration. It cannot be disguised that the issue of the pending conflict of arms is inseparably connected with the results of the Presidential canvass, and that hence a correct understanding of the principles involved in the one is essential to a proper discharge of our duty as regards the other. The rebellion of the Southern States is either right or wrong. If right, we have been guilty of a monstrous crime in lavishing our treasures and the best blood of our people for its suppression. If wrong, then our duty to God and our race alike require that we should crush it at any cost. If the rebellion of the Southern States can be justified at all, it must be either under the right of secession or revolution.

The right of secession, though strongly asserted by northern sympathizers with treason in the outbreak of the rebellion, has been abandoned by themselves as utterly untenable. It is too absurd to bear the test of reason for a moment. It is to assert that a part is greater than the whole; that there may be such a thing as a wheel within a wheel and the inside wheel the largest. It may therefore be dismissed with the single remark of Andrew Jackson—"To say that a State may secede from the Union at will is to declare that the United States are not a nation."

The existence of a right of revolution in any people has, it is presumed, never been doubted since the declaration of independence was promulgated to the world. It is not an arbitrary right however, to be exercised at the dictates of mere caprice, but is governed by tolerably well settled rules and principles, and it is a right always dependent upon the circumstances which may justify its exercise, and these circumstances are utterly wanting in the case of this rebellion. Though it is claimed to bear an analogy to the revolution of our fathers against

the oppression of the British Government it differs from it in most essential particulars. That was a revolution like all others in favor of human rights; this the first in the history of the world in favor of human slavery, and fitly characterized as "a hell-born conspiracy against human rights." The declaration of our independence was a clear statement of our wrongs upon which a confident appeal was made "to the judgment of a candid world," while the southern rebellion is so destitute of any justification that two committees of the same convention, in South Carolina, were unable to agree as to their real grievances. If either section had cause for revolution it was the North, which might have alleged with some show of truth that the Government had been perverted through the machinations of the slaveholder, from its declared purposes which were to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, and had become destructive of all these objects. So far from the South having any well grounded cause of complaint, it cannot be doubted that her rights were never more secure than at the very period when she plunged into the gulf of disunion, Mr. Buchanan himself being the witness. Said he in his last annual message to Congress :

It is a remarkable fact in our history, that notwithstanding the repeated efforts of the anti-slavery party, no single act has ever passed Congress, unless we may possibly except the Missouri compromise, impairing in the slightest degree the rights of the South to their property in slaves, and it is not probable that any such can be passed at the present or next session of Congress.

And he further asserts that no right of the South in the Territories had been impaired by any act of Congress and never would be, and that the Supreme Court had just affirmed their right to take their slaves into all the territories. He then proceeds further to show that even the personal liberty bills of some of the Northern States need occasion no alarm, as he declares they had been pronounced unconstitu-

tional as fast as they came before the courts, and that it would be the duty of his successors, as he boasts it had been his, to vindicate the supremacy of the fugitive slave law over the conflicting enactments of State Legislatures. Not only have we this testimony that all efforts of the Abolitionists had failed to impress upon the legislation of the country a character unfriendly to the rights of the South, but it will be remembered that the last Congress previous to the outbreak of the rebellion, had passed an amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting any interference with the institution of slavery in any of the States where it then existed.

In view of these facts, well might Mr. Stephens, in his oft-quoted speech at Atlanta, challenge them to name one single act of governmental oppression, deliberately and purposely done, of which the South had a right to complain. It is, of course not to be denied that there were certain individuals in the North who did dare to disagree with Judge Woodward in his conviction that "slavery is an incalculable blessing," and did dare to agree with Henry Clay in his conviction that it was "an everlasting curse." But of this surely the South had no right to complain, as these men had learned their lesson at the feet of such Southern men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Pinckney, Patrick Henry, McDowell, Clay, and Benton, all of whom have left on record, in some form, their undying protest against the system of Human Bondage.

Having thus endeavored to show that the revolt of the South can be neither justified under the right of secession nor of revolution, and having incidentally answered the incessant allegation that the abolitionists are responsible for the war, we proceed to inquire as briefly as we may what were the real causes that induced the South to inflict upon the country all the untold horrors of civil strife. It is in vain to try to escape the conclusion which "fastens itself as with hooks of steel" upon every reflecting mind that the election of Mr. Lincoln was the veriest pretext for dissolution, and not this only, but that the Southern leaders themselves created the pretext by their own deliberate action. The proofs of this assertion are abundant. Southern men declared in the last Congress before the outbreak of the rebellion, that they wanted no compromise; that they would accept no terms; that they would stay no longer in the Union, even if we would furnish them a blank sheet of paper and permit them to inscribe upon it themselves the conditions of their remaining. And since that outbreak, they have repeatedly and emphatically declared that the election of Mr. Lincoln was not the cause of their action, that it was the result of a scheme of dissolution cherished and persistently pursued for more than thirty years and culminating in the disruption of the Democratic party at Charleston by the agency of these very leaders, prompted in their action by the sole desire to insure the election of a sec-

tional candidate, and thus fire the Southern heart, and, in the language of Mr. Yancy, "precipitate the cotton States into a rebellion." The political course of John C. Calhoun is utterly inexplicable on any other hypothesis. Himself the father of the protective system, he soon abandoned it as he became fearful that its effect would be to increase the power of the free States, and haunted with an apprehension that they might get the supremacy in all the departments of the Government; that they might be able ere long to elect both branches of the Federal Congress and the Chief Executive; and thus, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, be enabled to reconstruct the Supreme Court of the United States, he bent his energies to the sole purpose of maintaining at least an equality for the South in the Senate of the United States, as a check upon the increasing power of the free States, and failing in this, to prepare the Southern mind for dissolution. Hence the introduction of a free and a slave State *pari passu* into the Union, the admission of Texas, with provision that it might be divided into four States, giving the South eight Senators in Congress; the struggle for the possession of the Territories—manifestly unadapted as they were to slave labor—the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; the treachery and foul wrong by which they sought to get control of the political destiny of Kansas, and the ultimate demand of many of the Southern leaders for a dual Senate, one from the South and the other from the North, the assent of both of which should be necessary to any legislation; or for a dual presidency, one to be elected from the North and the other from the South, each armed with a veto power to protect his own section from unfriendly legislation.

If then we have rightly interpreted the motives which produced the war, and have fixed the responsibility for it where it properly belongs, our next inquiry is, under these circumstances what do our interests and duty require? Can we say to the Southern States, "Erring sisters, go in peace?" Can we in any manner consistently with our self-respect and our duty to our race put an end to the desolation that war has wrought? We must either compromise on some basis or continue the war until one party or the other shall have been subjugated. Peace is certainly desirable if it can be permanently assured; and compromise is our duty if it be practicable and can be had in such way as not to involve us in more direful calamity than that from which we seek escape. Compromise must be had either upon the basis of dissolution or reconstruction. It is difficult to believe that there is any considerable number of the people of the North who would consent to a dissolution—to have our place blotted forever from the map of nations—and sacrifice the glorious memories of the past, the rich blessings of the present, the glad hopes of the future which are garnered in our Union and cannot exist without it. That Union has been

the source of untold blessings to our own people and the world; it has insured us prosperity at home and made the simple declaration, "I am an American citizen," a talisman of safety wherever the flag of the Union floats. But apart from the more general consideration of the blessings which the Government has assured to the people there are some particular reasons that render such a course both base and impracticable. Where shall we draw the line of division between the two sections? Shall we yield up the noble State of Maryland, whose people have just given renewed proof of their devotion to the Union, and are beginning to chant the song of deliverance from the foul blot that has so long tarnished her escutcheon? What shall we do with Kentucky and Missouri, and Arkansas and Louisiana, all just about to wheel into freedom's line? What with the people of Eastern Tennessee, whose sublime endurance and unyielding devotion to their country challenge the admiration of the world? Shall we remit them to the tender mercies of the demons of rebellion, who will surely reward their love of the Union with the rack the faggot and the halter? If there was no other reason for continuing the war for the preservation of the Union, a consideration simply of what is due to that heroic people ought to stimulate us to resolve that rather than yield them up, we will prosecute the war until "the last man and the last dollar shall have been followed by the last woman and the last dime, the last child and the last copper." But again: Is it possible to believe for a moment that we can live in peace as two nations, having failed to do so as one, with two thousand miles of imaginary border separating us and with the same distracting causes that now exist still remaining in intensified force? It may be safely affirmed that if it were possible to make peace on such a basis, and to settle all disputed questions about the Territories, the return of fugitive slaves, and the payment of the expenses of the war, it would not be a year until we should find ourselves again embroiled, and we should have war continually until the exhaustion of one party or the other would eventually force a reconstruction on some kind of terms. The God of nature has forbidden the idea of dissolution in the very geographical features of the country.

"Our Union is river, lake, ocean, and sky,  
*Man breaks not the medal when God sets the die;*  
 And the star-flowing banner must never be furled,  
 For its blossoms of light are the tops of the world."

If then permanent peace on a basis of dissolution be impracticable, can we compromise upon any basis of reconstruction? What assurance have we that the authorities who control the rebel armies will compromise on such a basis? So far as may be learned from their declarations, the acknowledgment of their independence is *salus qua non* to any adjustment. They uniformly scout the idea of a reunion, and tell the miserable cravens who are begging on their knees in the dirt for peace and reconstruction on the old basis of a division of the

Government plunder that they will have nothing to do with them; that they would not have them for their slaves; that "they are sick of Northern society, that it is made up of small tradesmen, greasy mechanics, and fifth-rate farmers struggling to be genteel, but who are not fit for companionship with a Southern gentleman's body servant;" that the only thing they will ever do will be possibly to make a treaty of trade and commerce with us, provided we will agree to let them stand off at a respectable distance and hold their noses. Said Jeff. Davis, in a speech a year ago in Virginia, "We would prefer Russian serfdom or European vassalage to a reunion with the North. We had better be in union with a nation of hyenas than with the Yankees." Said Mr. Stephens, at Charlotte, North Carolina, last fall, "Such a thing as a reconstruction is impossible; the idea must not be entertained for a moment. Reconstruction would not end the war, but would involve us in a more horrible war than that in which we are now engaged. The only terms upon which we can obtain peace is complete and everlasting separation from the North." And the last utterance we have had from the rebel leaders on this subject was the declaration of Jeff. Davis recently made to Mr. Gilmore, author of "Life in the Pines." Said he: "The North was mad and blind; it would not let us govern ourselves, and so the war came, and now it must go on till the last man of this generation falls in his tracks and his children grasp his musket and fight his battles, unless you acknowledge our right to self-government. We are not fighting for slavery; we are fighting for independence, and that or extermination we will have." These declarations may serve to show what prospects of peace we have on the basis of a reconstruction of the Federal Union. And in their light what a miserable farce does the recent peace pow-wow at the Clifton House become! Surely the cheat is too transparent to deceive anybody or mislead the people anywhere, unless it be in the non-accepting school districts of Pennsylvania, the Five Points of New York, and other such intelligent localities, where the bow of modern democracy abides in its chief strength. The fact that such a miserable ruse has been resorted to is evidence of the desperate straits to which the opposition party is reduced, though the attempted cheat is in perfect keeping with the utter disregard of truth and decency, which proclaimed to the people of Pennsylvania recently that the amendment to the Constitution, designed to extend the elective franchise to her soldiers in the field, was intended to give the negroes a right to vote. That the purpose of the peace conference in Canada was solely for effect on the coming election is so manifest, that we should have been inclined to regard Mr. Lincoln as more completely destitute of sense than even his political adversaries allege if he had suffered himself to be deceived by any such miserable jugglery. It will not surprise us to hear of renewed offers of peace

and more liberal concessions by the rebels if the political success of their Northern allies shall require it; but let the people be warned how they suffer themselves to be misled by any such specious pretexes. Once permit the use to succeed in securing to the Democracy the control of the Government, and the rebels will find no difficulty in repudiating all the offers of peace as having been made without authority, as, indeed, those recently made in Canada do not pretend to have been, and then with the aid of a compliant administration they will force a settlement of the question upon terms to suit themselves. We say then let the people be aware how they trust the faith of men whose souls are reeking with the crime of their fore-sworn obligations to their country, and suffer not their natural desire for peace to lead them to trust the plausible promises of a party who have more than once basely betrayed them.

But granting that we may be mistaken as to the temper of the rebel leaders on this question of reconstruction, is it at all clear that we can compromise with them without degrading our manhood and yielding up all, and more than all for which we have so lavishly poured out our blood and treasure for the past three years? Have we duly considered the subject? Such a compromise of course involves an amnesty for all past offences, particularly those of the rebel leaders for with them, if at all, must the compromise be made; it involves their reinstatement in all their personal and political rights and privileges, their return to the high places of the nation with more insolence and arrogance than that which forced the people of the North to accept the issue of an appeal to the God of battles, rather than longer tamely submit to, and renders possible by the aid of northern dough-faces the accession of Jeff. Davis to the presidency of the United States at the end of another four years. Are we prepared for all this? Are we ready to clasp the hand of Davis and his confederate devils reeking with the best blood of our people once more in fraternal fellowship? Surely we are not ready for all this—and yet it is the price which we must pay for peace upon the basis of reconstruction.

Then, if peace be impracticable on either basis named, there remains to us but war to the bitter end, until one party or the other is completely subjugated, and we need be in no doubt as to the result. Surely eighteen millions of men, stimulated by the consciousness that they are fighting in a just cause, with all the resources of the vastest empire in the world, possessed of a land fruitful in the production of all the necessities of life, and with an unrestricted commerce with all nations are equal to the endurance of a struggle with six millions, pent up in narrow limits daily contracting, with their ports blockaded, destitute of money or credit, recognizing no God but the god of slavery, and fighting for a cause that is abhorrent to the better sentiment of all mankind. In such a struggle as this, to doubt that victory shall,

sooner or later reward our efforts is to impeach of injustice that God who "hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell upon the earth," and hath conferred upon them as their "inalienable rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It matters perhaps but little to the result of this great conflict whether we be found upon the one side or the other for in the hands of that "mighty God who wields the thunder and upholds the world" are the issues of the conflict, and He will work out its grand results to the accomplishment of His own purposes. But it matters everything to us that we be found arrayed on the side of human liberty in this her last and mightiest conflict with her ancient foe—that we put ourselves in such a position that we leave no tarnished name to our posterity—that we give them no cause to rise up and curse our memory with bitter curses for the heritage of shame and disgrace which we shall have bequeathed to them if we are wrong now; and we may rely upon it that unless all the teachings of history are false, no party ever yet arrayed itself against the government in a great crisis like this that did not sink under a weight of everlasting obloquy. It was so in all the great wars of England; it has been so in our own history; it will be so now. The men claiming falsely to be democrats who are opposing the Government in this great struggle will in a few years be calling upon the rocks and mountains to fall upon them and hide them from the face of their fellow men, and will be raking among the dead ashes of the past for some even equivocal utterance in behalf of the Government in this its crisis hour, and be found endeavoring to console themselves with the reflection that they were not opposed to the Government, but only to the administration of the government—a plea that may satisfy their own consciences but will hardly satisfy posterity, who will fail to appreciate the distinction, and will be unable to comprehend how a man could be in favor of the Government and yet opposed to granting any men or means for its support.

It is certainly one of the strangest developments of these strange times—this new-born love of peace and hatred of war which has recently taken such hold of leaders of the modern democracy. They have always been the war party of the country heretofore and bitter were their denunciations of those who dared lift their voices against their policy, and now their feeble lips keep piping continually the weak song of peace and they declare there can be no such thing as a *war Democrat*. So however thought not that great light of the democracy, the Hon. Amos Kendall, who says in a letter written to the democracy of Connecticut since the outbreak of the rebellion—

There cannot be such a thing as a *peace Democrat*. I deny their right to the name. The democracy has always been the war party of the country. There were no peace Democrats in the war of 1812, there were no peace Democrats in the war with Mexico, there were none such in Jackson's time. Down with secession and nullification and up with the Constitution and the Union was the Jackson

battle-cry. These men who cry peace are the subjects of King Cotton, and they ought to go South where they can flaunt their peace flags in the face of their Klug. Let them go South where they properly belong and get up a peace party there who will be willing to live in peace under the Constitution and they will entitle themselves to the thanks of all good men.

In the view that we have taken of the subject then but a single inquiry remains, but it embraces the whole of the general policy of the Administration. Has the Government pursued the proper course to crush the rebellion? And whether it has done so or not we deny the right of the Democracy to criticize or condemn it for several reasons, and—

First, because it is impossible to escape the conclusion that so closely are the Democracy linked in sympathy with the rebels that the complaint of one is the complaint of the other. The proofs of this identity of interest and feeling are abundant. It crops out most strongly in Mr. Buchanan's last annual message to Congress in which he says—speaking of the improbability that there was any just ground for apprehension that his successor would be likely to make an attack on the rights of the South—

Reason, justice, a regard for the Constitution, all require that WE should wait for some overt and dangerous act on the part of the President elect before resorting to the remedy of revolution.

And again:

Surely under these circumstances WE ought to be restrained from present action by the precept of Him who spake as never man spake, "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Showing by this most significant word, WE, how completely he felt himself and his party identified in interest with the Southern rebels.

Again: humiliating as is the fact it is nevertheless undeniable, that the success of the rebels depends upon the success of the Democracy, and *vice versa*. The success of the Democracy at the polls would be worth more than a triumph of their armies to the rebels, and the surest road to Democratic triumph at the polls is that which is most slippery with the blood of our brave soldiers in the field. There is no possible escape from the conviction of the truth of this allegation, and that any man not doubly dyed with treason can remain in such a position, when he sees it clearly, is a proposition so monstrous as to be incredible. Fellow-citizens who have thoughtlessly acted with a party which depends for success upon the slaughter of your sons, and brothers, and neighbors we implore you, as you value your reputation your manhood or your honor consider this thing well.

Were more evidence needed on this point it is to be found in abundant measure in all their papers, in the speeches of their leaders, and in their general conduct in regard to everything that concerns the war. You may read their papers from one year's end to another, you may listen to the speeches of their leaders in and out of Congress and you shall fail to find in them all one single hearty sentiment of sympathy with the Government in this awful struggle—one single earnest exhortation to rally

around its imperilled banner. Nor on the contrary shall you find in them all one single hearty denunciation of the rebellion or its outrages against humanity and violation of all the usages of war. They are haunted with an apprehension of the outrage and violence which might result from the liberation of the slaves and their employment as soldiers in the Union army, and yet they have no words of indignation at the starvation of our prisoners in rebel hands. The cowardly massacre of non-combatants by Quantrell and his dastardly horde of villains in Kansas, the horrid butchery at Port Pillow, the burning of Chambersburg, have failed to evoke from their stony hearts a single murmur of remonstrance even, while they actually quote columns from Richmond papers and parado extracts from speeches of Early in justification of the last-named horrible outrage. They grow eloquent over the unconstitutional outrage of rescuing a negro from the curse of bondage and shut up the bowels of compassion for the defenceless women and children who were driven forth destitute in the light of their burning homes. You find them ever eager to depreciate the results of Union victories and to magnify the results of rebel triumphs, and it is impossible to resist the inference gathered from all their conduct that they regard the liberties of the country as being in more danger from Mr. Lincoln than from Jeff. Davis, and the arrest of Vallandigham as a greater outrage than the rebellion itself. The voice of their party conventions is ever silent as to the outrages of the rebellion, but waxes loud and fierce over the deserved arrest of some miserable northern traitor who has been guilty of endeavoring to incite domestic insurrection among the people at home or stir up mutiny among our soldiers in the field. They study the Constitution solely for the purpose of finding limitations that may lessen the force of the blows dealt at the rebellion and seek to restrict its provisions within the narrowest limits in this regard, and yet stretch indefinitely to shield the traitor from well merited punishment. They justify the rebellion because it is based on the sacred right of revolution, and deny the right of the Government to crush it because the Constitution gives no right to make war upon a sovereign State. They constantly invoke its provisions in behalf of those who have ignored their obligations to it and voluntarily put themselves beyond the pale of its protection, and they ignore all its provisions when invoked for its own preservation. They deplore the employment of negro soldiers for fear that they may commit excesses not sanctioned by the usages of modern warfare, and yet had no words of denunciation when in the outbreak of the war the southern leaders endeavored to enlist the services of the red-handed savages of the wilderness in their support, and boasted with hellish malignity that they would come to the work armed with the tomahawk and scalping knife. The resolutions of the last Democratic State Convention

of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg teem with denunciations of all the measures which the Government had adopted for the suppression of the rebellion—are barren of suggestions as to any better means of accomplishing it—glow with sympathy for the lion-hearted Democracy of Ohio in their glorious struggle for the right as crucified in the person of Vallandigham and yet contain not a word of denunciation of the rebels whose guns were at the moment thundering in their very hearing against Carlisle. At the very moment when the electric wires were flashing over the country the earnest call of the Governor for troops to defend the State against the rebel invasion of 1863, a Democratic County Convention meets at Washington, Pennsylvania, and after transacting the business that brought them together a resolution was offered to the effect that the Convention do now adjourn, and that its members solemnly pledge themselves to go home and use every effort to raise troops for the defence of the State, *and they vote it down* by an overwhelming majority, thus declaring their fixed determination to do nothing for the rescue of their State from the rebel grasp or to defend their own homes and hearths from rebel pollution. Their prominent leaders have, many of them, made it their boast that they had never raised a man nor a dollar for the suppression of the rebellion and have declared that they never would. They may endeavor to delude the people with the plausible excuse for their apathy that the policy of the Administration had been changed, and that the war had degenerated into a crusade against slavery, but the fact is that from the outset they never lent any support to the Government except for a while when we seemed to be waging the war on the principle of not hurting anybody, when we were trying to shoot rebels with bullets cased in cotton for fear we might break their skins, and were carefully stationing Union troops around every rebel plantation for fear his negroes might get off or a poor wounded Union soldier get on, while white men, our sons and brothers, were permitted to die in the ditches and trenches and negroes could not be employed in their place for fear of a violation of the constitutional rights of the rebel master. No sooner however did the Government awake to a consciousness that this war must be waged on the common-sense principle of hitting your enemy where you can hurt him most, than the Democracy suddenly took refuge in the miserable subterfuge that it had become an abolition war and “they would none of it.”

Nor are the evidences of this identity of interest between the rebels and the Northern democracy less abundant in the South. Their papers teem with encomiums of Vallandigham, Voorhees and Long and with ardent longings for the success of the democratic party, of which the following extract from a speech recently delivered by J. L. M. Curry, a member of the Rebel Congress, is a fine sample:

Again, my hearers, we should remember that much de-

pends upon the choice the Northern people make for a President the incoming fall. There will be at least two parties represented, to wit: the war party, who will doubtless make an effort to have Lincoln retained, and the peace party, who will make a bold effort to elect a man pledged to give the Confederates justice and restore peace—long-desired and ardently-prayed-for peace—to our bleeding country. We hope, we trust, we pray that they may be successful. [Tremendous cheering.]

Should they be successful, such a shout as was never before heard would spread over our afflicted South. Songs, sweet songs of praise, would ascend from every heart to the mansions of Paradise, and the many myriads of holy angels who surround the bright and dazzling throne of Omnipotence would join in the chorus, and tune their harps to a new song of liberty to man on earth. If such be the happy result, our independence will be forever established. [Cheers.]

But should Lincoln be re-elected, our fond hopes will be dashed to the ground; our independence but a thing dreamed of; for we have exhausted our resources, and could not possibly hope to be able to continue the war four years longer. Past experience has taught us that we could expect no favors at the hands of the indomitable tyrant and usurper, Abraham Lincoln. Let us repose our trust in the God of battles and anxiously await the result.

If further Southern evidence is needed on this point, it is to be found in the anxiety which they evince for the action of the Chicago Convention, leading to the irresistible conclusion that upon its action are all their hopes for success dependent.

Says the Richmond *Sentinel* of August 20:

We have arrived at a very critical stage of the war. To weather the next six weeks will be a most difficult task for the North. Within that time it is not at all improbable that the armies of Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan will have been almost annihilated. Within that time it is almost certain that the Chicago Convention will have thrown the apple of discord and destruction into the already discordant and distracted ranks of the North. *Let us await patiently the results of that Convention before committing ourselves to any specific terms of peace, for they have much to fear from that result—we nothing to apprehend from it. It may make their situation worse, but cannot affect ours.*”

If we were to refer the question to the armies confronting each other on the banks of the James river as to which party they respectively desire to see succeed in the coming elections, can we for a moment doubt the response?—that while from the rebel army we would get an expression of their earnest desire for the success of the democracy, we should have an answer to our inquiry coming up in thunder tones from our own gallant army, “For God’s sake stand by the Government at home while we endeavor to maintain it on the battle-field.”

But again: not only have the democracy no title to complain of the conduct of the war, for the reason that they are identified in sympathy and interest with the rebels in arms, but further because they are to a great extent responsible for the war itself. That they deliberately invited the rebellion by their own acts and declarations will be the certain judgment of impartial history. We are aware that we here make a serious allegation, and we regret that time alone prevents our citing all the proofs. Let a few suffice as a sample of many more that might be adduced.

It cannot be denied that both on the floor of Congress as well as elsewhere throughout the country prominent leaders of the Democratic party expressed their determination not to raise an arm against the South if she attempted



disunion, and Southern papers complained bitterly after the outbreak that they had been deceived by their Northern friends in their assurances that they would stand by them. They counted on Northern dissensions as a chief guarantee of their success. Judge Woodward had declared in Independence Square, in 1860, and his judicial station gave emphasis to his declaration, that "the time would come when the South might lawfully fall back on its natural rights and employ whatever means it possessed or could command in defence of its slave property." Mr. Buchanan had told them in his annual message that they had no right to secede, but if they did he had no right to prevent it." The Democratic Convention of Pennsylvania speaking for the party, had on the 22d of February, 1861, told the rebels by a resolution, that "they never would take up arms against the South until the personal-liberty bills of the North should be repealed." F. W. Hughes and others had volunteered to declare that in case of a dissolution of the Federal Union Pennsylvania should link herself with the South. Fernando Wood had expressed, in the politest possible manner his regret to the Governor of Georgia that he had been prevented from getting fire-arms to murder us with. A Democratic meeting at Philadelphia after the Star of the West had been fired into by rebel balls on her errand of mercy to relieve the wants of the starving garrison at Fort Sumter, declared that in case of a dissolution of the Union the natural geographical position of Pennsylvania would be with the South. And that no assurance of immunity from the blow of the Government might be wanting the constitutional adviser of the President, Judge Black, had deliberately announced that "the Union must utterly perish at the moment when Congress shall arm one part of the people against the other for any other purpose beyond that of merely protecting the General Government in the exercises of its proper constitutional functions."

And now we ask: Can any man doubt that if, instead of this miserable policy the Democracy, true to their past traditions and true to the motto of the party in its earlier days, "Our country, may she ever be right; but right or wrong, our country," had stood up in their manhood and had said to the South as they might have said in all truthfulness, "Gentlemen, we have been your friends from the very organization of this Government; we have stood by Southern interests through good and evil report; we have carried heavy loads (politically) in defence of Southern rights; we have given you three-fourths of the patronage and four-fifths of the offices of the Federal Government; we have supported your postal system at our expense; we have suffered you to fill the high places in the Army and Navy, while we 'mudsills' have been content to fill the ranks or work the vessel; we have given you every right you were entitled to under the Constitution, and have interpreted every doubt-

ful provision of it liberally in your favor, and we pledge you that we will do so yet, and that if our influence can accomplish it, your rights under the Constitution shall be kept sacred; but we want you distinctly to understand that we will not permit you to destroy this Government, and if you attempt that we will only endeavor to outvie the other party in voting men and means for your destruction,"—we ask if this had been the position of the Democracy, is it to be doubted for a moment that the South would have paused and weighed well the chances before she had hurled herself against the bosses of the bucklers of a united people? Never had the Democracy a more glorious chance for immortality, and never was glorious chance more shamelessly lost forever.

Not only did they invite the attack, but they did nothing to repel it after it was made. They declared in advance that they would not, and they remained true to the declaration. We are aware that the contrary has been asserted by our opponents who, even from their places in Congress, have declared Mr. Buchanan was anxious to repel the assault and asked Congress to give him the power by the passage of a *Force Bill*, which was refused. But an examination of the record will show that this allegation is but a part of the misrepresentation that characterizes all the allegations of the opposition party. We confidently challenge the production of a single request from Mr. Buchanan at any time for a Force Bill, or for authority to put down the rebellion. In his message of the 8th January, 1861, the only one in which it will be pretended that he asked for additional powers, after speaking of the executive authority to collect the revenue and protect the public property and declaring, as he had done in his annual message, that this "was still his purpose," though he had done nothing toward either, and had permitted the capture by the rebels of Forts Moultrie, Pulaski, and Morgan, and the arsenal at Mount Vernon, Alabama, and, subsequently, the capture of Forts Jackson, St. Philips, and Pike in Louisiana, of Pensacola Navy Yard and Forts Barancas and McRae, of Baton Rouge Arsenal and the New Orleans Mint and Custom House, and the transfer of the government property in Texas by Twigg's without a single blow struck in their defence, he says, "my province is to execute, not to make the laws. It belongs exclusively to Congress to repeal or enlarge their provisions to meet exigencies as they occur. I certainly had no right to make an aggressive war upon any State," and then, evidently fearful that Congress might construe what he had said into an intimation that he desired enlarged authority he hastens to declare: "I am perfectly satisfied that the Constitution has wisely withheld the power," (that is, the power to declare war against a sovereign State,) "even from Congress." He then proceeds to say that "the fact cannot be denied that we are in the midst of a great revolution," and "commends the subject in all its bearings, to Congress. To them exclusively

belongs the power to declare war in all cases contemplated by the Constitution," of which cases he had just taken care to inform them the right to declare war was not one. We have been thus particular in quoting from this message to show how utterly groundless is the assertion that Mr. Buchanan asked for a force bill which Congress refused to give him. And we affirm that the language quoted is the nearest approach to any request of the kind that the message contains. The fact was that the last thing Mr. Buchanan wanted was a force bill; for if it had been passed he would have found himself either stripped of the thin disguise by which he sought to excuse his dereliction of duty, or he would have been compelled to swallow the sentiments of his annual message in which he had declared that the General Government had no right to coerce a sovereign State. The only show of a disposition to do anything was his flourish about protecting the public property, &c., and that it was only a flourish is shown conclusively by the fact already adverted to that he did nothing for its protection; but on the contrary had permitted Floyd to send the army to the confines of Texas, with a full understanding doubtless of the disposition that was to be made of it, and Toucy to scatter the Navy to the four quarters of the globe, and Cobb to so impoverish the Treasury and beggar the credit of the Government that he could not raise a dollar at less than twelve per cent. interest.

Now, in contrast with this undisguised treachery compare the course of the very idol of the democracy in the past, Andrew Jackson, in a similar emergency. He dispatches General Scott to Charleston on the first whimper of nullification, orders his ships of war to its harbor, sends to Congress a message that meant and was intended to mean something, and issues a proclamation that will ring through coming centuries. The idea that there was no power in the Government to protect itself from destruction could never have found a lodgment in his brain; and that he must act strictly on the defensive, as Mr. Buchanan thought he was bound to do, in other words, "stand still and be shot at," was too much for the fiery courage of the hero of New Orleans. He never thought it worth while to look beyond the obligation he had taken as Chief Executive of the United States for direction as to his duty. Says he, in his message to Congress, "the Constitution, which the President's oath of office obliges him to support, declares that the Executive shall take care that the laws shall be faithfully executed;" and with such an obligation resting on his soul, it is not to be doubted that he would have taken care that it should be done, and if the Constitution did not give him the means to do what it required he should do, he would have taken it for granted that he was to use all the means that God and nature had put in his power for that purpose.

Having thus shown that the democracy have no title to complain of the acts of the Admin-

istration because they are identified in interest and sympathy with the rebellion, because they invited the revolt and did nothing to quell it, we might fitly conclude this address with an appeal to the people, whether they are willing again to entrust the Government to the hands of a party who have been shown to have been chief instruments in its destruction; whether they are willing to entrust with the duty of subduing the conflagration the miscreants who with their own hands kindled the flames, but we feel that our task would be incomplete did we refrain from casting a rapid glance at the measures of the Government which have provoked the fiercest hostility of the opposition.

And first as to the general charge of unconstitutionality of these measures, it may be remarked that it is no time to study Constitutions when the assassin's knife is at your heart or the incendiary's torch applied to your dwellings, and if Mr. Lincoln had waited the slow operation of Constitutional measures in the outbreak of the rebellion, in the language of Judge Holt, "Washington city had been a heap of smouldering ruins." There is a law of paramount obligation to all laws and Constitutions, not written in books nor upon stone, but on the "fleshy tablets of the human heart"—alike applicable to nations and to individuals—the great law of self-defense, which makes constitutional all measures adopted for the preservation of either individual or national life. This may seem a broad proposition, and we therefore propose to inquire what support it finds in the practice of the very party who now condemn it as the tyrant's plea. The battle of New Orleans was fought, as it will be remembered, after peace had actually been declared between the United States and Great Britain, but before the news of its ratification had reached New Orleans, owing to the want of means of communication between the Capitol and that distant point which modern science has since supplied through the agency of railroad and telegraph. General Jackson then in command had been compelled, as many a general in similar circumstances, to declare martial law in that military district. Shortly after the battle news was brought from Mobile that a British vessel had arrived in that port bringing the intelligence of the ratification of peace. Nobody doubted the truth of the report and the people, restive as any people must be under the restraints of martial law, soon became clamorous for its abrogation. No attention was paid to their complaints by General Jackson and the press soon began to inveigh against his military usurpation and teemed with articles which it is impossible to distinguish from the modern Copperhead productions with which the press of our day abounds. Complaints of infringement of the freedom of speech and of the press, charges of undue exercise of arbitrary authority by Jackson in violation of the constitutional rights of the people and of dangerous invasion of their rights everywhere abounded, things soon reached a crisis. Jackson ordered the arrest of a

Frenchman by the name of Louillaier for having written an inflammatory communication in one of the city papers and brought him into his camp; a friend of Louillaier who witnessed the arrest, applied to Judge Hall of the United States Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, which was granted and put into the hands of an officer to execute; on his arrival in camp, Jackson put him under arrest and took his *habeas corpus* from him and stuck it in his pocket (rather a summary suspension of *habeas corpus* that), and then sent a detachment to arrest Judge Hall and brought him into camp on the charge of endeavoring to excite insubordination in his military district, and after keeping him there a few days sent him up the river outside his lines with directions to remain there until the news of peace should be officially received. During this excitement a courier arrived from Washington bearing, as he supposed, the official despatches of the Government announcing the ratification of peace, but on opening his papers he found that he had by a mistake left the packet containing the despatch lying on his table at Washington. There he was however, willing to swear to the truth of his mission, and not only so, but having with him the order of the Postmaster General of the United States requiring his deputies on the route to afford the courier bearing the news of peace all the facilities in their power for the rapid performance of his journey. Here one would have thought was sufficient evidence certainly to justify the abrogation of martial law, and yet Jackson, resting on the mere military punctilio that he could not pay attention to anything short of an official despatch still maintained his rule with iron hand. A few days afterwards another courier arrived from Washington with the missing despatches; military rule was abrogated, the laws resumed their sway. Judge Hall returned to the bench, at once issued a warrant for Jackson's arrest on a charge of contempt of court in refusing obedience to the *habeas corpus* and on the hearing of the case imposed a fine of one thousand dollars upon him, for which the old hero gave his check and left the court room. Now in this case—with the facts of which every school-boy is familiar, and a reference to which would be perhaps unpardonable but for the fact that the constant perversions of truth by the Democracy seems to require it—there was military usurpation, martial law, suspension of civil remedies and of the writ of *habeas corpus*, illegal arrests, abridgment of the freedom of speech and of the press, all perpetrated, not by the President—who is Commander-in-Chief of the Army, but by a subordinate military commander in a distant military district, acting without orders on his "*own responsibility*"—without the slightest pretence of a justification of his conduct; and yet what was the result? Why, nearly forty years afterwards a Democratic American Congress impelled by a sense of justice to that old hero and a conviction that he had simply done his duty, ordered

that fine to be paid with its accrued interest, by which act, as his biographer Mr. Purton, from whose work this account is taken truthfully says "Congress notified the future commanders of armies, first, that they may place a city under martial law when threatened by an enemy. Second, that they may keep it under martial law for the space of two months after the enemy has been vanquished and driven from the soil and from the waters of the State in which that city is situated. In other words Congress invested the military commanders of cities in time of war with supreme authority." Now what answer is attempted to this argument drawn from the history of the country? Will it be pretended that the action of Jackson was confined in its operation to a particular district while that of Mr. Lincoln extends over the entire nation? This would only affect the extent of the exercise of the right, but in no wise effect the existence of such a right and for the exercise of the right the President is, of course, responsible to the country. It is a question of necessity of which he alone must judge. And that the assertion of the existence of such a right is not a novel thing in our history is shown conclusively by the opinion of Jefferson, as declared in the great Burr Conspiracy. Says he:

A strict observance of the written law is one high duty of a good citizen, but not the highest. The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger are all of higher obligation.

Surely, the people are not willing to discard the teachings of the great leaders of parties in our past history for the teachings of the Woods, Vallandighams, and Woodwards of the present. What is a constitutional way of putting down the rebellion has never been disclosed by these modern illuminators. When the committee of Vallandigham sympathizers waited on the President a year ago to ask that the sentence of banishment might be revoked, the President agreed to it on condition that they would endorse as true the proposition "that there was a rebellion in the land, and that an army and a navy were constitutional means of putting it down, and by their refusal to do so, they impliedly declared their disbelief in its truth." They thought it was a constitutional way of putting down a whisky insurrection, a Shay rebellion, and the riot at Boston in the case of the fugitive slave Burns, on which occasion it is said that President Pierce stood in the telegraph office at Washington and almost worked the wires himself to assure the authorities that the whole military power of the nation should be used to enforce the fugitive slave law.

There may be a difference as to the means that may be rightfully employed to suppress an abolition riot from those that may be used to suppress a slaveholders' rebellion; but we fail to perceive it. It may be possible that an insurrection in favor of human rights is to be punished with fire and sword, and an insurrection in favor of human slavery is to be punished by "digging it down;" but our ob-

jection to the latter is that it would exhaust the iron mines of the country in making picks and shovels before the work would be accomplished. But to look at this subject a little more in detail, it may be safely affirmed that it would be impossible to raise armies or maintain military subordination in time of war without imposing limitations upon the rights which have free exercise in time of peace; neither is the justice of shooting a poor boy for desertion and suffering the scoundrel who told him to desert escape under the plea of freedom of speech very apparent. Nor will it suffice to answer that the ordinary tribunals are open for the punishment of such offences, for, as Mr. Lincoln has quaintly observed, it would be very likely there would be some traitors in the jury-box who would rather hang the panel than hang the criminal. This plea of freedom of speech comes too with bad grace from a party who, under Jackson's administration and thenceforward, sanctioned the rifling of the mails and authorized the postmasters to throw out any documents going South which they might deem incendiary in their tendency, from a party which has practically denied all freedom of speech or of the press, and almost of thought for a half century in the Southern portion of the Union and has tamely sanctioned outrages which if perpetrated by any foreign nation would have been regarded as just cause of war. How much they are influenced by any real regard for freedom of speech may be learned from the remarks of Judge Woodward, in his speech in Independence Square, in 1860, wherein he declares, expressly referring to the Abolitionists, "The Constitution has become too weak to restrain us who have outgrown the grave and temperate wisdom of our fathers, which excited no irrepressible conflict among brethren, but taught them to dwell together in unity. I would make it strong enough to restrain the madness of our day;" in other words he would apply the gag law to every man in the land who dare raise his voice in denunciation of the "sum of all villainies." The riots of last year that have cast a foul blot upon the city of New York, stimulated as they undoubtedly were by the allegations of Vallandigham and others, that the Conscription Bill was merely the highwayman's plea of "your money or your life," is the best practical illustration of the consequences of unbridled licence of speech in times of great public excitement like the present.

As to the suspension of the *habeas corpus*, it may be dismissed with the single remark that there is no sincerity whatever in the clamor that has been raised about it as is clearly evident from the fact that the first objection to it was that the President had no power to suspend it; and then when he asked Congress to give him the power, nearly every Democrat in the House voted against it.

In regard to the confiscation measures adopted by the Administration, let it suffice to say

that the constitutionality of them is a question for the courts and by their decision we abide. As to the justice of such measures against the rebels, it may be sufficient to recall to recollection the fact that one of the first acts of the Rebel Congress was to confiscate the property of all northern men in their midst upon which they could lay their hands. It is alleged, however that the effect of such measures is to crush the union sentiment of the South; in other words that the severity of such measures defeats their object. It may be a sufficient reply to such objection to remark that its falsity is shown by the fact that no sooner does a union man of the South escape from the clutches of the rebel leaders, than he "out-Herods Herod" in support of the severest measures; and his only complaint is that we have not adopted measures severe enough. No such complaint comes up from Andy Johnson, or Parson Brownlow or Col. Montgomery of the Vicksburg *Whig*.

The conscription bill has been another subject of bitter complaint. Although its unconstitutionality was affirmed by Judges Woodward and Lowrie of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, smarting under their recent defeat at the hands of the people, it has been affirmed to be constitutional by Judge Cadwalader of the District Court of the United States, with the sanction of one of the most eminent judges of this or any other country—the Hon. Robert C. Grier of the Supreme Court of the United States. But to show the utter insincerity of the complaints made against it by the democracy it is surely unnecessary to do more than refer to the fact that they bitterly denounced the three-hundred-dollar clause in the original bill as an unjust discrimination in favor of the rich, and made it the instrument of exciting insurrection and civil war in the North; and then, when the exigencies of the military situation required its repeal they were equally bitter in their opposition to such repeal, and are now making that very repeal the pretext for again arraying the people of the North in treasonable hostility to the Government. Such conduct needs no comment. But they allege that but for the removal of McClellan from the command of the armies the people would have kept the ranks of the army full by volunteering, and rendered a resort to a draft entirely unnecessary. This allegation is completely disposed of by the following documents, which are not found in McClellan's report of the Peninsular Campaign.

WASHINGTON, August 20, 1861.

SIR: I have just received the inclosed dispatch in cipher. Colonel Marcy knows what he says, and is of the coolest judgment. I recommend that the Secretary of War ascertain at once, by telegraph, how the enrollment proceeds in New York and elsewhere, and that if it is not proceeding with great rapidity that drafts be made at once. We must have men without delay.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,  
GEORGE E. MCCLELLAN,  
Maj. Gen. U. S. A.

The following is the dispatch of Col. Marcy,

to which General McClellan alludes in the above letter:

New York, August 20, 1861.

I urge you to make a positive and unconditional demand for an immediate draft of the additional troops you may require. Men will not volunteer now and drafting is the only successful plan. The people will applaud such a course, rely upon it.

R. B. MARCY.

We propose to next glance briefly at the policy of the Administration on the slavery question, particularly as regards the emancipation and the employment of negro troops in their connection with the prosecution of the war. Let it not be forgotten that the objection to the employment of negroes comes from a party who have made it their boast that they have never voted a man or a dollar to support the Government, and have deliberately declared they never would, and many of whom have by every means in their power endeavored to dissuade others from volunteering. The prejudice on this subject is however fast giving way before the resistless current of events, and it is beginning at last to be discovered that for every negro in the ranks of the army there is one chance less for a white man to be drafted. The democracy are at last beginning to get their eyes opened to the fact that *a negro is not one whit better than a white man*, and his life of no more value. Why this extreme tenderness of impairing the constitutional right of the slaveholder? It has never been doubted that the usages of war justify the seizure of any property of your enemy which may weaken his power or strengthen your own, and confessedly, by the testimony of Southern men the emancipation of the negro is the hardest blow yet dealt at the rebellion; then why spare it? Is it because the master holds his slave by a higher title than he holds other property; that while he holds all other property by deed or gift or will of man he holds his negro by patent from the Almighty? We do not recognize the Divine sanction of slavery, and therefore cannot admit the plea. The democracy as well accept the fact that their black idol is dead and aid in giving it a decent burial. So long as it remained quiet within the Union it was entitled to the protection the Constitution gave it, but when it laid its filthy hands upon the pillars of our political temple, and in the fury of a blinded Samson attempted to hurl it in ruins on our own heads, it provoked its own destruction. The first gun fired at Sumter sounded its death knell and it becomes not the freemen of the North to attend as chief mourners at its funeral. Nor let us trouble ourselves about what we are to do with these freedmen. When the children of Israel found themselves upon the shores of the Red Sea with Pharaoh's hosts hard pressing on their rear, they were, alike with us troubled as to what they should do, and in the hour of their perplexity the voice of the Lord was heard unto Moses, "speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." So in like manner let us be not deterred by seeming difficulties but

with unwavering faith in God "*go forward,*" and ere long shall be heard the voices of our Miriams singing a new song of glory to the Lord for his great deliverance.

The complaints about extravagant expenditures, corruption of Government, and burdens of taxation, are alike destitute of foundation with the rest, and come with an equally bad grace from the party of Thompson, Floyd, Cobb & Co., whose rapacity spared not even the trust funds of the poor Indian.

Time forbids our entering into any elaborate discussion of our financial system. Nor is it necessary, until it be shown, which never can be shown because it is not true, that it is worse than the financial system of any other country in anything like similar circumstances. Indeed our financial system may challenge comparison with any that the world has ever seen, and instead of complaining at the burdens it has imposed upon us we have rather cause to blush for our material prosperity. Never have the wages of labor been more remunerative, never have our people revelled in greater luxury, never have we enjoyed in more abundance plenty all the necessaries of life than at this moment. The Secretary of the Treasury tells us in a recent statement that on the 14th June, 1864, the whole annual interest payable on the public debt, was \$71,699,730 15; of which there was payable in gold, \$50,823,672 45; and in paper money, \$20,876,057 70.

Truly there is nothing alarming in this when it is remembered that in a few years previous to the outbreak of the rebellion the annual public expenditure had risen from about fifty millions to about one hundred millions, and that it was paid so easily that the people really were unaware of its increase. It is perfectly evident that if the war was to stop tomorrow the annual interest could be paid, in addition to our ordinary expenditures, without resorting to direct taxation for a single dollar, and with our vast resources as yet scarcely developed, stimulated beyond all precedent as they undoubtedly would be by the removal of slavery, the only clog upon the wheels of our national progress, it is not to be doubted that we could liquidate the principal debt without impairing in any manner the industry of the country or imposing any burdens upon the people that they could sensibly feel. The shortest way to get rid of our burdens is to infuse renewed vigor and energy into the war, and push it on to a glorious consummation.

Such then is our view of the general measures of the Administration, and such is the record of the Democratic party. That party has recently met in Convention at Chicago, and with that profound duplicity which has marked their conduct for the past few years, they have put forth a platform that means, and is intended to mean, nothing. They have constructed one plank out of the rotten material of general denunciation of the Government; another, *hol-low to the core*, made out of a hypocritical assurance of their sympathy with our brave

soldiers of which they gave most powerful practical illustration in their persistent attempts everywhere to deprive them of the freeman's highest right, the elective franchise, and, as usual, not a single plank in denunciation of the rebels, whose hopes they knew centered in their action.

They have nominated a candidate of whom it may suffice to say only, that whatever be his personal, political, or military merit, he is the candidate of *such* a party on *such* a platform; whatever qualities he may possess calculated of themselves to win the admiration of the people, have become soiled, dimmed, obscured totally by the associations in which he has voluntarily suffered himself to be placed. This is a contest in which, if ever, the motto of "principles not men" should be our pole star, not who is the standard bearer but what flag does he carry, not who is the commander but what army does he command? Whatever of regard there may have been in the public mind for George B. McClellan, sprang from the conviction that he bore the banner of his country at the head of the armies of the Republic, and it is vain to expect that regard to continue when he has deserted his flag and his post, and is endeavoring to rally the distracted cohorts of the rebel reserve guard of northern Democracy, under the dirty banner of base submission and unmanly peace. If Gen. McClellan has seen fit to put himself in a position so humiliating, it is perhaps, a most forcible illustration of the attractions which the Presidential office possess, and which have been powerful enough to warp the better judgment of better men but the people will not be deceived, and the soldiers will not be deceived into following him in his recreancy to his country in this trying hour. They will not fail to see that the shortest road to peace is the support of the constituted authorities in their efforts to crush the rebellion by force of arms, and that support they will surely yield, undeterred by such clap-trap cries as the "Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was." They know full well that we can have no "Union as it was" until they can call back to life the thousands whose bones lie bleaching on the battle-fields of the country, or repose in unknown graves with Southern wild flowers blooming around them: until they can repair the "wild waste that war has made," and repay to the National Treasury the thousands of millions of dollars which this unholy war has cost. We should be sorry indeed to think that we should have a "Union as it was:" that all this expenditure of blood

and treasure shall have been for naught, and that peace shall leave us where the war found us. No! thank God for the hope! we shall have no Union as it was, but a more glorious Union, and one far truer to the purposes of its origin: a Union in which "truth shall be no longer gagged, or conscience dungeoned;" in which no being born in the image of his Maker shall be denied the right to read his Maker's revelation of His will: a Union in which no man shall be adjudged incompetent to speak the truth before the tribunals of public justice, because forsooth his skin is a shade darker than the standard color of the times: a Union which shall give practical illustration of the truth of the declaration of our independence, that "all men are created equal:" a Union in which the glad message of "Peace on earth and good will to men" which has come echoing down the corridor of the ages shall be caught up and re-echoed with a mightier emphasis.

Let us then determine to accept our destiny without complaint and go forward in the discharge of the duty which God has assigned us with unflinching trust. Let us at least not abandon this struggle and tamely submit to the destruction of our institutions until we have suffered at least as much for their preservation as our forefathers suffered to establish them. Or, if we cannot catch an inspiration to duty from their example, let us at least determine that we can suffer in a good cause a tithe of what the rebels have been able to endure in a bad one. We have not yet begun to put forth our strength in this struggle. We enjoy a prosperity that is the wonder of the world and but for the occasional sight of a widow's weeds or a wooden leg, we could scarcely realize that we are in the midst of the most tremendous struggle the world has ever witnessed. The rebellion is fast tottering to its overthrow; its resources are nearly exhausted. Its only hope now is for a change of administration of the Federal Government and if disappointed in that, we may confidently hope to see it soon succumb. Let us, then, determine to redouble our blows and show the rebels that they have nothing to hope for unless they lay down their arms and return to their allegiance; and we may rest assured that, ere long, we shall greet with gladness a restored union, and "shall behold the glorious ensign of the Republic," now first trailed in the dust by traitor hands, again "full high advanced its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, without a single stripe erased, or a single star obscured."



# LOYAL PENNSYLVANIANS.

The ASSOCIATION OF LOYAL PENNSYLVANIANS of Washington city, D. C., was formed on the evening of March 3, 1864. Previous to this date several meetings were held in the Clerk's Room of the House of Representatives, at which time a general feeling was manifested in favor of combining the patriotism and intelligence of Pennsylvanians residing in Washington and vicinity, and form an organization for the purpose of promoting the election of the candidates of the Baltimore Convention by the dissemination of information upon the great issues of the day amongst the people of the State of Pennsylvania, especially those districts now represented by "Copperheads" in Congress.

The proposition met with a hearty response, and at the time specified a Constitution and Bye-Laws were adopted, and the Association fully organized by electing the following officers:

## PRESIDENT.

Hon. JOHN K. MOORHEAD.

## VICE PRESIDENTS.

Hon. JOHN W. FORNEY, A. B. GROSH, Esq. JUDSON HOLCOMB, Esq.

RECORDING SECRETARY.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

JOHN M. SULLIVAN, Esq.

J. PENN JONES, Esq.

## TREASURER.

H. C. FAHNESTOCK, Esq.

An *Executive Committee* was appointed, upon whom devolved the duty of taking cognizance of passing events; to advance the objects of the organization; to call public meetings of the Association as the exigencies of the time might demand, and in every way strive to support the Government in the enforcement of the Laws and the suppression of the Rebellion. The nominations having been made at Baltimore, and the proposition to continue for another term ABRAHAM LINCOLN for *President* and ANDREW JOHNSON for *Vice President* of these United States, renewed ardor has been awakened in the breast of every loyal son of the good old State of Pennsylvania.

The moral honesty of the President, his political integrity, his model conscientiousness of purpose, and his ever present and all pervading love of Liberty has gained for Mr. LINCOLN a lodgment in the hearts of the American people. Whilst his far-reaching wisdom, his political sagacity, his freedom from prejudice, and the gravity with which he treats all important questions, has secured the admiration and gratitude of his fellow-citizens.

To ANDREW JOHNSON we turn and see the devoted friend of freedom, one who "has learnt in suffering" what his eloquent tongue has so fully and fearfully portrayed; one who is an enemy of all those who are enemies of the Government of the United States.

The Father of "The Homestead Bill," a Bill giving to all men a "Home" upon American soil, one who hates Rebels in arms, and Copperheads in private life, fully understanding the enormities of the one, and the villanous meanness of the other.

The nomination of these men is fully, openly and enthusiastically sustained by every LOYAL PENNSYLVANIAN in Washington, and in order to aid in their Election, up to this time between one and two hundred thousand documents have been issued by the Association, and to awaken still further interest in behalf of an object we hold most dear, at a meeting of the *Executive Committee* held August 24, 1864, a committee was appointed consisting of Messrs. CLINTON LLOYD, *Chairman*, Joseph M. Wilson, B. F. Stem, Lorin Blodget, J. N. Dickson, A. W. Kimmel and A. L. Hengershotz, to prepare an ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA, upon the great issues of the day. This address was reported at the meeting of the Executive Committee, September, 1, and ordered to be printed.

At the same time, a Committee was appointed consisting of Messrs. LORIN BLODGET, *Chairman*, Col. Francis Jordan, J. H. Wells, and W. H. Gardner, to prepare an address to the Soldiers of Pennsylvania, to be distributed in the field, the camp, and the hospital, where our brothers in the conflict are scattered throughout the land—and explain to them the opposition of the Copperheads against their exercising the right of voting, beginning with the opposition of Judge Woodward, of the bench. The votes against them cast by Copperheads in the Legislature of our State, and finally the votes cast at the Polls on August 2, when they even violated that sanctuary of the American citizens, the BALLOT BOX, by casting in their Copperhead votes to prevent the soldiers from enjoying their sacred right of suffrage.

These two addresses are now respectfully presented by the Loyal Pennsylvanians of Washington, to our brethren at home, in our good Old State, and our brothers at "The Front" fighting for God and Freedom.

The Executive Committee consists of the following persons.

BLODGET, LORIN	GARDNER, W. H.	MATHER, JOHN	ROHNER, MARTIN M.
COOK, WILLIAM A.	HENNERSHOTZ, A. L.	MOORE, W. D.	STEM, B. F.
CUNNINGHAM, W.	HUBSMAN, A. P.	MCPHERSON, EDWARD	WARFEL, J. B.
DICKSON, J. N.	JENKS, W. N.	PERLEY, S. TODD	WELLS, J. H.
EATON, D. L.	JORDAN, COL. F.	PORTER, W. M.	WILSON, JOSEPH M.
EKIN, JAMES A.	KIMMEL, A. W.	POTTER, J. B.	YOUNG, EDWARD
FRANCISCUS, C. N.	LLOYD, CLINTON		

EDWARD MCPHERSON, *President*.  
JOSEPH M. WILSON, *Secretary*.

WASHINGTON, September, 1864.